

INTERTEXTUAL DIALOGUE IN CONTEMPORARY BULGARIAN POETRY

Abstract. The theory of intertextuality shifted the focus of the literary scene from the literary influence towards the (critical) dialogue with tradition, and not only the literary one, but also the cultural one. Intertextual dialogue is a meeting/contact, a replica, a quote, a reminiscence, but also a conflict between two views of the world, between two discourses and two types of poetics. This conflict can take the form of parody, the grotesque, travesty, and carnivalization. Intertextual dialogue represents at least two authors' perspectives and implies a temporal, cultural and stylistic distance. The author updates, but also revises the literary (archive, memory, oblivion) and cultural memory (collective, conscious, institutional, unconscious). It can be given in the form of quotation, remake, and evocative replica (zero dialogicity), but also (in the form of) revision and irony (high dialogicity). Poetry, traditionally defined as a monologic genre, practices intertextual dialogue as a strategy of performative reminiscence. Modernist and postmodernist intertextuality in contemporary Bulgarian poetry are a reflection of the local and regional socio-cultural and aesthetic environment. This interpretive essay makes a typology of intertextual dialogue in contemporary Bulgarian poetry with modernist and postmodernist characteristics: Lyubomir Levchev, Alexander Shurbanov, Georgi Gospodinov, Roman Kisyov, and Lyudmila Mindova.

Keywords: modernist/postmodernist intertextuality, contemporary Bulgarian poetry, Levchev, Shurbanov, Gospodinov, Mindova

Intertextual poetics versus poetics of intertextuality

The intertextual (dialogic) vision and revision in literature “come from a rereading of history”¹. Considering that history is a graphic-descriptive method (historiography), its fundamental tenet is to be reflexive, and to think

¹ “Yet Borges’s readers know that he never invented anything; his most improbable stories come from his rereading of history. In fact, at a certain point Borges says that one of his sources was a work by Johann Valentin Andreae, which (though Borges got this information secondhand from De Quincey) described the imaginary community of the Rosicrucians; a community that others later genuinely founded from the example of what he had imagined”. (ECO, U. The Power of Falsehood. In: *On Literature*, 2005, p. 328).

over the inherited archive of larger and smaller 'stories' (stories or narratives), both those that are true, as well as those that are false (plausible and implausible, realistic and fictional, or imaginary ones). Historical narratives are often vacant, or empty and fabricated, based on misconceptions and forgeries, desires and intentions, instead of being built upon authentic factography.

If history can be founded on illusions, invented and imaginary pseudo-realities, then, we can only imagine what the bases of literature are like. It is so because literature, by its nature and *per definitionem*, is a fruit of the imagination and fantasy, a liberal reconstruction of fractions of the past, the present, and the future, a reconstruction by memory, eyeballed, through visions and games. In other words, literature and historiography are sufficiently autonomous and legitimate discourses, to have their own particular codex (constitution, cosmos, and order). Still, history often uses certain literary strategies, while, in turn, literature uses some historiographical strategies. Namely, both history and literature deal with memory and imagination, remembering and fantasizing, reconstructing the absent, shadows, with the shadows of the shadow. Or, as Borges claims, poetry combines picture and myth with intellectual expression (abstract thinking, reflection).²

Memory, on the other hand, is a phenomenon on its own. Memory is a performance. It is the other face of oblivion. It plays out in different scenographic ways: as an evocation of real entities, a reminiscence of desires, dreams, pleasures and trauma, an actualization of mythical images from the treasury of folk tradition and the collective unconscious, a reflection and metareflection of other people's narratives, a replica of traditional memory clichés, a conflict of associations, paraphrase and allusion, and as irony and parody.

What is relevant is the act of the remembrance, and not its real basis. Relevant is the performance power of memory, its dramaturgy, and not its truthfulness. It is precisely that dramaturgy of memory, adapted to the literary codex, which drives the poetics and style of the text – whether prose, drama, or poetry. It is precisely that dramaturgy of the conflict between memory and oblivion that defines the shape in which the intertext of a literary work appears.

In this particular instance, we are interested in the intertext in contemporary Bulgarian poetry, seen through the prism of the opus of several Bulgarian poets. The selection has been made, primarily, to show that forms of intertextuality exist both in modern and postmodern poetry. So, it cannot be said that the poetry of the Modern doesn't recognize the intertextual principle. On the contrary.³ The difference is in that postmodernist intertext-

² BORGES, J. L. *Sabrana djela 1923–1982*. Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske, 1985 p. 97. Borges writes this in the prologue to his poetry collection *The Cipher* (first edition in 1981, in Spanish *La cifra*) – reference to Croatian edition.

³ Analogous is also the situation in European poetry. For example, the intertextuality in the poetic opuses of Ezra Pound, Thomas Stearns Eliot, Robert Graves, or Constantine P. Cavafy, is paradigmatic.

tuality is raised to a level of awakened strategy, as it is supported by literary theory and criticism. The theoretical discourse precisely lifts intertextuality to a level of poetic convention and author's intention, and even as a stylistic manner, compared to modernist intertextuality that is more spontaneous, liberal, and unburdened by the dictates and stereotypes of literary criticism.

In the time of the Modern, they speak of dialogic and monologic poetry (Bakhtin, 1982), not of intertext, but that doesn't mean that intertextual strategies are not applied to this type of poetry. And not only during the Modern, there have always been poets and poetics, which are more sensible to previous poets and poetics. The right to identification (recognition in someone else), admiration, idealization and influence, criticism and negation of tradition, fear of others, a dialogue with the inherited and existent, are all legitimate creative rights. We can be original when replicating too. Extroversion is legitimate, as well as introversion.⁴ The poet is not apathetic and ataraxic, but on the contrary. Intertextuality is one of the ways to show a non-apathetic consciousness, an above-average sensibility, which makes the interpretative strategy all the more interesting.

Without the pretension of generalizing and making a strict classification of contemporary Bulgarian poetry based on intertextuality, and all the more because I have not studied it integrally, I will point to a few poets and examples of intertextual dialogue in Bulgarian poetry. My aim, truly, is to locate several sensible places of experiencing the world as a language, in some contemporary Bulgarian poets.

Intertextual dialogue between two worlds and two types of poetics (quote, replica, motto, identification, mirror projection)

Lyubomir Spiridonov Levchev (born 1935), who turns the tide from engaged to modern poetics in the specific Bulgarian socialist-realistic environment, should get off from a critical, and even a conflict and dissident position towards the recent, domicile poetic, artistic, and cultural constellation. He, nevertheless, opts for a variant of compromise. The poet Levchev focuses on global currents, and thus manages to avoid open and direct conflict with the dominant poetic conventions in Bulgaria. The trauma of division of the public persona from the private one (and the poet is a paradigmatically-private reflection of the persona!), is poeticized in his poem „Нишалото на Фуко“/„Махалото на Фуко“ (1980, citation according to Levchev, 2010, p. 109–113).⁵ He calls that division “a diarchy”, and characterizes the epoch as “catastrophic” and tempestuous (“destructive tempests”).

⁴ C. G. Jung related the attributes of extroversion/eccentricity to non-psychological and visionary literature, while he associated the attribute of introversion with psychological literature.

⁵ Translator's note: “Foucault's Pendulum”.

Umberto Eco's novel ("Foucault's Pendulum") serves him as a mirror which reflects his strife-torn nature on the stretch between the roots (origin, tradition), and the wings (poetic freedom, the world, modernism). The option of indifference and a silent ("cold") and moderate resistance towards the domicile tradition leads him, in reverse, towards a subjective communication, and even a loud dialogue with the European tradition of the Modern. Such duality generates a wide interest for global art, and not only literature. Namely, the intertextual dialogue in Levchev is marked by the presence of:

a) ecphrasis (visual-art reminiscences in the poem: Bruegel the Elder⁶, Van Gogh, Albert Duerer, Joseph Turner, Henri Matisse);

b) cultural intertext ("Јас, кој не избегав од Помпеја"/„Аз, който не избягах от Помпей" [1994]; "Spiderman" [2005])⁷;

c) as well as some biblical reminiscences ("Сон"/"Сън", 2010, p. 301–303, 1st edition in 2006).⁸

The relation towards modernist poetics is inclusive, and not divided by block, ideology, and strategy (versus the dominant global division between West and East!). He, namely, addresses, on the one hand, Federico G. Lorca, Pablo Neruda, William B. Yeats, Rafael Alberti, Walt Whitman, Michel Foucault, and William Meredith, and on the other hand, Vysotsky, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, and Vladimir Mayakovsky. With that, Levchev, implicitly, indicates that he distances himself from an ideological interpretation of reality, and the obsessive attachment to social reality, and that he orients himself towards cultural history, the matrix of the Modern, as well as the personal maxim of existence in the world, and in the world of language.

Such discursive strategy makes his dialogue with cultural tradition moderate, reflected, and with an understandable dose of admiration for the ancestors and the established models of the Modern. Therefore, the intertext in his poetry is more than a tool for self-identification, through selection and interpretation of select values. In this respect, we could also read into the title of his book „Убий българина“⁹, published in the late 80s (1988), on the eve of the fall of communism's walls, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the Cold War between East and West, as well as the breakup of the Soviet Union as a paradigm of the Eastern world. The removal of ideological and regime barriers also signifies the liberation of poetic expression, which, by definition, is a particular aesthetic form of freedom of language and idea.

Levchev projects the Cold War with its domicile ideologicalized system of artistic values by evoking Yeats' verses, which he takes as motto in his poem

⁶ Please see the poem „Микроскопска балада“ [“Microscopic Ballad”], 2010, p. 183–187, 1st edition in 1994 – liberal translation from Macedonian edition.

⁷ Translator's note: “I, Who did not Flee Pompeii” (1994); “Spiderman” (2005).

⁸ Translator's note: (“Dream”, 2010, p. 301–303, 1st edition in 2006).

⁹ Translator's note: “Kill the Bulgarian”.

“Срт“/”Било“ from 2001 (2010, p. 219–223)¹⁰ – “Those that I fight I do not hate. Those that I guard I do not love.” Without hatred for the surrounding, and without love for his dearest, simply – without illusions, no hope, or “reigns”, he becomes, finally, free and ready to face his own doom, that is, his own Pompeii.

In conclusion, Levchev dialogues with select like minds, but also evokes thoughts and positions that are near to him, and in which his *condition humaine* can be seen. This condition, on the other hand, is paradigmatic for many poets that worked and lived in closed and indoctrinated societies. Therefore, his intertextual dialogue inclines towards that pattern that is characteristic for cultures in the process of transformation, which, in a given moment, are being recoded, and initiated into a state of freedom, bearing the “cross“ of auto-censure, that is, of an adapted anxiety with extended action.¹¹

Dialogic revisions (skepticism, irony, reminiscences, and actualizations)

Just a single decade of later appearance (since 1974), the poetry of Alexander Shurbanov (born 1941) does not have to openly confront the necessity to practice the socialist-realistic poetry, the poetics that, with its subjectivity towards reality, is forced to be deafened by the texts of other writers. The sensibility for others’ textuality and poetic code, is highlighted in Shurbanov, taking into consideration that he himself, as a translator, comes into close contact with original poetic opuses of different epochs – primarily Anglo-Saxon (John Dunne, Geoffrey Chaucer, John Milton, William Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe, Ted Hughes, Dylan Thomas).

The intertextual dialogue that Shurbanov leads with his ancestors and soulmates of world poetry shows signs of a sophisticated performance. Because of that, his poems resemble theatrical fragments, scenes the message of which needs to be experienced by evoking the ancestors, with the difference that now the attitude towards them includes a dose of scepticism. Characteristic of this modus of intertextual dialogue is the poem „По трагите на Меркуцио“/„След Меркуцио“ (2015).¹² That the intertextual connection is internalized, is only

¹⁰ Translator’s note: “Ridge”.

¹¹ The poetry of another poet of the generation at the crossroads towards the Modern, Dragomir Petrov (born 1937), is illustrative for the intertextual modus. Its geography is marked by the topoi of myth („Кон Одисеј“ [“To Odysseus”]), Christianity (“Кон мојот двојник“, “Кон син ми“ [“To My Double” and “To My Son”]) – liberal translations from Macedonian edition, literature (T. S. Eliot, J. P. Sartre, W. Shakespeare), and of culture (Byzantium, the Balkans, the Levant, and Turkish-Ottoman matrix).

¹² Translator’s note: “After Mercurio” (2015) – citation according to the Macedonian edition, translated by Bogomil Gjuzel (Зимски пејзаж со врана [Winter Landscape, With Rooks], 2016, p. 111).

heralded in the title of the poem, which also serves in its literal meaning as a “trace” in tracing the source, and interpreting the sense of the poem.

There are no direct allusions to the dramatic situation in Shakespeare’s tragedy “Romeo and Juliet”, but only a parabolic evocation of Mercutio’s scepticism of death, an absence of humor in inevitability, but also a mockery of inevitability of our youthful (Romeo – Juliet) naivety. Present is that the face of which is invisible. Invisible, yet, powerful intertext. The reflection of paradoxality and antipodal figures and worldviews. One involute transformation of people by facing not only mortality, but our own delusions. In several poems there are discreet misenscenes, which play the role of theatrical intertext – without citations and replicas, but simply as an ambience parable, as well as metaphorical and visual-art contextualization of the poetic image.

Such is the case, for example, of the poem, „Претстава“ / „Представление“¹³, which contains the description of “театралната смрт на есенските брези“ / „Тази театрална смърт на есенните брези“ (2016, p. 93)¹⁴. The title of the poem „Неромантична посета во куќата-музеј на Вилијам Вордсворт“ / „Неромантично посещение в къщата-музей на Уилям Уърдсворт“ (2016, p. 79, 1st edition in 1977)¹⁵ also indicates to Shurbanov’s intentional approach, marked by the yearning to terminate the romantic, idolatric relationship/attitude towards inherited values. His intertextual platform strives for the world to be seen from its banal side, with the goal to demystify myths, a mythomania and mythologization of reality, and in that context, to add a certain emotional dimension to expression, a personal and intimate stamp of the poem. At that, a sort of alchemy occurs, one of the transformations of identity, the act of inconspicuous identification – through scepticism, irony, and revision.

Then again, Shurbanov’s poetry also includes ekphrastic poems with *visual-art intertext* by Pieter Bruegel the Elder, or Vermeer (“А ако претпоставиме...“ / „А ако предположим...“ from 2009; “Млекарката на Вермер“ / „Млекарката на Вермеер“ from 2015)¹⁶, and mythical intertext (the myth of Icarus, Paris, and Noah), and *biblical intertext* („Синот човечки“ / „Плаж“, “Бог“ / „Като бог“, “Богојавление“ / „Богојавление“, “Преображение“)¹⁷. What he is represented by is the dose of scepticism, irony, and the intention to demystify. It is also visible in some poems that see the revision of inherited moral stereotypes, serving a function of cultural intertext (for example, the poem “Размена“ / „Размяна“, 2016, p. 100).¹⁸

¹³ Translator’s note: “Performance”.

¹⁴ Translator’s note: “Ah, this theatrical death / of autumn birches” (2016, p. 93).

¹⁵ Translator’s note: “An Unromantic Visit to Wordsworth’s Cottage” (2016, p. 79, 1st edition in 1977).

¹⁶ Translator’s note: (“And What If We Suppose” from 2009, “Vermeer’s Milkmaid” from 2015).

¹⁷ Translator’s note: (“Beach”, “God”, “Epiphany”, and “Transfiguration”).

¹⁸ Translator’s note: “Exchange”, 2016, p. 100.

From intertextual conflict between two worlds and two types of poetics to intertextual manner

It is unusual that the poets that establish the Modern in Bulgarian poetry (Lyubomir Levchev, Valeri Petrov, Alexander Shurbanov, Dragomir Petrov, and others), on the one hand, show resistance to socialist-realistic poetics, and on the other hand, initiate the poetic strategies and acts of the Postmodern. They, in a relatively small amount, dedicate themselves to the historical topos, and it could also be said that they withhold from historical interpretations. It seems that they are abstinent towards the patriotic discourse, burdened, probably, by the shame and anxious attitude caused by communism's mortgage.

However, while modern poetry marginalizes the patriotic topos as a reflection of ideology, and the understanding that the interest for national history is the other face of the interest for the communist reality, postmodern poetry rids itself of such frustrations. Thus, postmodernist poetry actualizes the patriotic topos, in its own personal, ironic, even sarcastic way. There is even a sensation that postmodernist authors purposefully and intentionally parade with marginalized topics.

I will point out to one example only, namely it is the poetry book „Черештата на един народ“ (1996/2014)¹⁹ of Georgi Gospodinov (b. 1968). In it, freedom of expression is seen as a rude revision of taboo topics, as a ridicule of the serious approach to cult themes of the past, an infantile memory, and need to sensibelize poetry for banalized patriotic-historical subjects. He does that by evoking family stories that become an intimate replica of the dominant and collective mega Bulgarian narrative. He does that through non-pretentious memorial fragments. He does that easily, demystifying not only clichés, but promoting freedom of the perception of major histories through the prism of smaller ones. Thus, history is shown as an intimate interpretation, and not as an institutionalized and tabooed image of the past (“Не е Италия на Вазов, не е Величков“; “Край Босфора“, 2014, p. 10)²⁰.

It is safe to state that the Postmodern renews the interest in history, in a way that it breaks away from the fear of history. The overcoming of the fear from the influence is a condition to be original even when leading a dialogue with the other. Intertext is an inclusive discursive and poetic strategy. Postmodernist poetry also revises the imagological stereotypes of the idealized world – neither the Western world is what it has been anymore (“Зоо на географията“, 2014, p. 12; „Европа квартална“, p. 15; „Зелени-

¹⁹ Translator's note: “The Cherry-Tree of the Nation” (1996/2014).

²⁰ Translator's note: (“It's not Vazov's Italy, it's not Velichkov“, “By Bosphorus“, 2014, p. 10) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

те поля на Венеция“, p. 16).²¹ Intertextual dialogue is primarily a conflict between two images of a world, two stereotypes, and two misperceptions.

G. Gospodinov consciously pushes the act of profanation of the poetic vision of the world. Holy is nothing, except for personal freedom. It is no longer a move to criticize the Bulgarian narratives. It is time to submit the global narratives and stereotypes to revision. Thus, he moves along the route of popular microtoponyms – Venice, Bosphorus, Istanbul, the Acropolis, the Eiffel Tower, etc. He freely combines and directs the subjective vision of objective reality. The very definitions of objectivity, history, and reality are being redefined. Gospodinov combines more liberally than he chooses (selects). What is important for him is to conquer freedom, that is, freedom itself, and freedom as such.

All is allowed, including a quote, vacant citation, motto, allusion, reinterpretation, as well as loud bar conversation („Балади и разпади“).²² The realization that nothing comes out of nothing is not traumatic. Ancestors are not only a necessity, but also a virtue („Из браното“, p. 44)²³. In that postmodernist euphoria, freedom of combination (the patchwork, pastiche) becomes a stylistic marker. This marker does not always lead to high quality, nevertheless it has played a significant cultural role. It is important that sensibility is not engaged. The poetic genre is hybridized – lyricism is combined with diary-like notes, essayist and prose fragments, family traditions, rituals, citations, etc. „Какво искаше да каже историята? Че за всичко е виновно объркването на езиците?“²⁴

Gospodinov's manuscript-book „Писма до Гаустин“ (2003)²⁵ radicalizes the initiated variant of postmodernist intertextuality.²⁶ The intertextual dialogues are epistolary, photographic and associative, as if reflecting the rhythm of jazz, as if creating jazz poetry – from Adam and God to Madonna, from Babylon to the Balkans, from Charles Bukowski to Allen Ginsberg, from Melville to Kafka, from the minotaur to the third pole, from tweet-couplets to ballads, from “Hey, Jude, 7’09” to Slaveykov Square („Покриване с найлони на площад „Славейков““).²⁷ The concept is in that there is no strict genre and stylistic concept.

²¹ Translator's note: (“Zoo of Geography”, 2014, p. 12, “Europe Quartile”, p. 15, “The Green Fields of Venice”, p. 16) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

²² Translator's note: “Ballads and Break-Downs” – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

²³ Translator's note: “The Chosen”, p. 44 – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

²⁴ GOSPODINOV, G. *Chereshata na edin narod*. Plovdiv: Zhanet 45, 2014, p. 64. Translator's note: “What did history intend to say? For the mix up of the languages is guilty for all?” – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

²⁵ Translator's note: “Letters to Gaustine” (2003) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

²⁶ Gaustine of Arles, 12th century.

²⁷ Translator's note: (“Covering Up with Nylon at Slaveykov Square”) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

Conceptualization of mystical intertext

Roman Kisyov (b. 1962) makes a particular intertextual experience (an experiment) in Bulgarian poetry, not because he mannerizes the strategy of dialogue, but because he conspires for a form of conceptual, total, and mystical *prototext* and *archetext*. Namely, dominant in his poetry is the idea of a universal ancient divine text, an archetypal text from which all other texts have come out, even those that constitute text within text, or “second-hand” citational text fragments (Antoine Compagnon). That mystical archetext is a divine “garden – birthplace” (motto of the book, 2016), one that all other texts remember.

Every text, not just intertext, is an incarnation of that archetextual garden, its reflected shadow.²⁸ Even our “I” is a shadow of the original “I”, second by its nature, thus poetry is only a quest for the original “I”, the original text, the genesis, it is an awakening from the dream („Поетът“, 2016, p. 30).²⁹

This type of conceptual, generic intertext promotes a general dialogue that is carried out not only between the new and old authors and images of a world, but vice versa as well – an active subject of the dialogue may also be the ancestors. The concept of universal archetext enables this circular approach, which sees the time of the future as time of the present, the present as past, etc. („За гения“, p. 28–29, „Заклучена врата“, p. 36).³⁰ The 90s saw the fall of some walls and creation of others, not as visible, but they still played a reversal part in the liberation of poetic expression in a way that they freed poetry from the stigma of religious prohibitions. This liberation also occurred in the shape of explicit poetics of the mystical and biblical, which became legitimate references.

Thus, the biblical intertext became a mark of postmodernist literary production. It is not easy to say that the dialogue with the biblical text is primarily critical, conflictious, and ironic. There are examples, as the one of Kisyov in Bulgarian poetry, or that of Eftim Kletnikov (1980) in Macedonian poetry, which show that biblical text is returning to its glory in poetry, only in one extended context, filled with liberal interpretations, associations, allusions, and paraphrases. Freedom on its own does not mean liberation from religious identity, on the contrary, in some cases, it fulfils itself through its fortification.

In this sense, the intertextual dialogue with a biblical canon leans more towards a worship of the mystical interlocutor – The Predecessor, The

²⁸ КИСЬОВ, Р. Към теорията за прераждането. – В: *Мистичната роза. Избрани стихотворения*. София: Ерго, 2016, p. 22, 1st edition in 1989.

Translator’s note: (“Towards the Theory of Revival”, 2016, p. 22) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

²⁹ Translator’s note: (“The Poet”, 2016, p. 30) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

³⁰ Translator’s note: (“For the Genius”, p. 28–29; “Locked Door”, p. 36) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

Holy Spirit, The Sabaoth, The Heavenly City, The Saint, Cosmic Soul, The Angel („Затвори след себе си вратата“, р. 79).³¹ Here, I will point out to the motto included in the poem „Дървото на живота“ (р. 136)³², in fact a double quote by Plato and Seferis – „И душа, ако желае да се опознае, във душа чужда, трябва да се види отразена“.³³ Intertextual dialogue is a performance of reflection, a ritual of dedication, and mutual mystical identification, because isn't God letter, and the letter God. The poem is, in that sense, a natural home of the sacral. The poetic intertext is a symbolic “blessing”.³⁴

Demythization of biblical narratives

In her collections, „Тамбос“ (2014), and „Живот без музика“ (2016),³⁵ Lyudmila Mindova (born 1974), a member of the newer generation, actualizes certain subtle topics of reading and translation, through reminiscences of works of South-Slavic writers (Danilo Kish, Igor Isakovski, Nikola Madzirov, Charles Simic, Josip Osti, Mak Dizdar, Tomaz Salamun, Ales Debeljak, Dubravka Ugresic, Elisaveta Bagryana), but also some other European authors (for example, on Zbigniew Herbert, in the poem „Както винаги“, 19–25.10.2016).³⁶ She includes metapoetic reflections and allusions in the poems themselves, hence, it can be stated that the innate poetics are amplified by an internal dialogue with the stylistic formations („Класическа нощ“, 2016, р. 46).³⁷ As a translator, she understands the intertextual dialogue as a translation of one language into another, and as a moving in of the other language in the first one.

She also demythicizes biblical narratives („Стълба към небето“, 2016, р. 27; „На тревата“, 2014, р. 69)³⁸, aided by dark humor, sarcasm, allusions, and games with words. She is sensitive to semantics and the etymology of words. Witty and analytical, her poem is founded upon paronomastic assemblies that

³¹ Translator's note: (“Close the Door After You”, p. 79) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

³² Translator's note: (“The Tree of Life”, p. 136) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

³³ Translator's note: “The soul too, if it wishes to be met, in a foreign soul, it needs to be seen reflected” – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

³⁴ See the author's foreword (the essay) of the book *За поезията / Или тайната йерархия на думите* [*For Poetry/Or The Secret Hierarchy of Words* – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition], Roman Kisyov, 2016, p. 437–442.

³⁵ Translator's note: “Tambos” (2014), and “Life Without Music” (2016) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

³⁶ Translator's note: (“As Always”, 19–25.10.2016) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

³⁷ Translator's note: (“Classical Night”, 2016, p. 46) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

³⁸ Translator's note: (“Stairway to Heaven”, 2016, p. 27; “On the Grass”, 2014, p. 69) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

are performative on their own („Без отговор“, 2016, p. 40; “Път и плът“, 2016, p. 75).³⁹ As a representative of postmodern-day poetics, it could be expected of her to radicalize intertextual dialogue, but she, in fact, internalizes it, she does not flirt with intertextuality as a postmodernist act of alteration of personal speech, and as fragmentation of the entirety of the worldview.

Judging by Lyudmila Mindova's trial, a revision of the postmodernist hierarchy of acts comes about, and a switch between dominant and marginalized deeds occurs. Thus, Bulgarian poetry avoids the trap of mannerization of quotism (precise or vacant), but it does not lose its sense (sensibility) for the speech and poetics of others. There is an environment of generational communication and cooperation between the Balkan poets of the beginning of the 21st century. Perhaps this environment is a sign of departure from the strategy of fragmentation and Balkanization as its synonym. With that, a parting from the poetics of the Postmodern, and the beginning of a new type of poetics of intertextual dialogue between the poets themselves, and not only between their works, is heralded. As if the dialogue that is distanced from tradition is being replaced with an immediate personal contact, opening up a perspective for new literary translations, but also a new approach to related languages. An innate intercultural closeness is foreshadowed, as a motto of a new epoch and type of poetics.

ИЗПОЛЗВАНА ЛИТЕРАТУРА

ГОСПОДИНОВ, Г. *Писма до Гаустин*. Пловдив: Жанет 45, 2003: <http://www.slovo.bg/showwork.php3?AuID=28&WorkID=6709&Level=1> [прегл. 20.09.2018].

ГОСПОДИНОВ, Г. *Черештата на един народ*. Пловдив: Жанет 45, 2014 (1 изд. 1996).

КИСЬОВ, Р. *Мистичната роза. Избрани стихотворения*. София: Ерго, 2016.

КЛЕТНИКОВ, Е. *Окото на темниот*. Скопје, Градска Библиотека „Браќа Миладиновци“, 1980: <https://digitalna.gbsk.mk/items/show/129> [прегл. 20.09.2018].

ЌУЛАВКОВА, К. *Демонот на толкувањето*. Скопје: МАНУ, 2009.

ЛЕВЧЕВ, Љ. *Одбрани песни*. Струга: СВП. Едиција Златен венец, 2010.

МИНДОВА, Л. *Живот без музика*. Пловдив: Жанет 45, 2016.

МИНДОВА, Л. Както винаги. – *Литературен вестник*, 25, 2016, бр. 34 (19–25.10.2016).

МИНДОВА, Л. *Тамбос*. Пловдив: Жанет 45, 2014.

СТЕФАНОВА, Н. (избор, предговор, белешки). *Современи бугарски поети*. Скопје: Култура, 1998.

ШУРБАНОВ, А. *Зимски пејзаж со врана. Одбрани песни*. Превод на македонски: Богомил Ѓузел. Струга: СВП, 2016.

³⁹ Translator's note: (“Without an Answer”, 2016, p. 40; “Road and Body”, 2016, p. 75) – liberal translation from Bulgarian edition.

REFERENCES

- BAHTIN, M. M. *Problemi poetike Dostojevskog*. [*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*.] Beograd: Nolit [publ.], 1982.
- BORGES, J. L. *Sabrana djela 1923–1982*. [*Collected Works 1923–1982*.] Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske [publ.], 1985.
- ECO, U. *On Literature*. New York: Open Road Integrated Media, 2005.
- GOSPODINOV, G. *Chereshata na edin narod*. [*The Cherry-Tree of a Nation*.] Plovdiv: Zhanet 45 [publ.], 2014 (1st edition 1996).
- GOSPODINOV, G. *Pisma do Gaustin*. [*Letters to Gaustine*.] Plovdiv: Zhanet 45 [publ.], 2003. Retrieved: <http://www.slovo.bg/showwork.php3?AuID=28&WorkID=6709&Level=1> [seen 21.09.2018].
- KISIYOV, R. *Mistichnata roza. Izbrani stihotvorenija*. [*The Mystical Rose. Selected Poetry Works*.] Sofia: Ergo [publ.], 2016.
- KLETNIKOV, E. *Okoto na temniot*. [*Eye of the Dark One*.] Skopje: Gradska Biblioteka "Brakja Miladinovci" [publ.], 1980. Retrieved: <https://digitalna.gbsk.mk/items/show/129> [seen 21. 09.2018].
- KULAVKOVA, K. *Demonot na tolkuvanjeta*. [*The Demon of Interpretation*.] Skopje: MANU [publ.], 2009.
- LEVCHEV, L. *Odbрани pesni*. [*Selected Poems*.] Struga: SVP [publ.]. Edicija Zlaten venec, 2010.
- MINDOVA, L. *Tambos*. [*Tambos*.] Plovdiv: Zhanet 45 [publ.], 2014.
- MINDOVA, L. *Zhivot bez muzika*. [*Life Without Music*.] Plovdiv: Zhanet 45 [publ.], 2016.
- MINDOVA, L. Kakto vinagi. [*As Always*.] In: *Literaturen vestnik*, № 34 (19–25.10.2016).
- SHURBANOV, A. & B. GYUZEL (trans.) *Zimski pejzazh so vrana. Odbрани pesni*. [*Winter Landscape, With Rooks. Selected Poems*.] Struga: SVP [publ.], 2016.
- STEFANOVA, N. (Selection, foreword, notes). *Sovremeni bugarski poeti*. [*Contemporary Bulgarian Poets*.] Skopje: Kultura [publ.], 1998.

Katica Kulavkova, Prof., DSc

Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts (MANU)

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4007-4402>

Web of Science Researcher ID: J-8669-201

E-mail: kulavkova@manu.edu.mk; kkulavkova@gmail.com