Stephane Baquey

DISSIDENCE, AND THE POET, TRANSLATOR AND EDITOR KIRIL KADIISKI

A representation of the self as dissident?

In 2003, a voluminous Literary Investigation appeared in Bulgaria, on the poet, translator and editor Kiril Kadiiski.[1] This “inquiry” consists of interviews between Kadiiski and Svetlozar Zhekov, a friend for more than thirty years, as well an editor in his own right, and therefore equally involved in Bulgarian literary life. Although the exchange was conducted in writing, it has the tone of a freely-digressive conversation. It is on one hand an essay on a life, a testimony on an epoch, and an account of a certain point of view on literature. The approach is most often extremely factual. The personalities under discussion are mentioned by name: beyond the concern for accuracy, there is also the desire to obtain justice or take the law into one’s own hands. One question comes up repeatedly: how to explain the fact that Kadiiski is recognized in Bulgaria as a translator, mainly of Russian and French poetry, and much less as a poet, while in France, where a large number of his poems have been translated, it is the poet who has achieved a certain recognition? These interviews are also a plea pro domo in response to this question. A strange “document”. Zhekov explains in a note to the reader that in the beginning the assumption had been that Kadiiski’s poetic oeuvre was accomplished – a deluxe bibliophile publication of his collected work had just appeared -, and that it was now possible to make an assessment of it. However, in reality, at the moment when the interview was undertaken, Kadiiski, who was born in 1947, was still not only director of his published house, Nov Zlatorog, and continued working as a translator, but above all he was publishing new poems. To make a prestigious comparison, it was not a case of Goethe as an old man of seventy putting up a statue to himself in conversations which an Eckermann would piously collect: instead, we are speaking of an individual who remains actively involved in the field of Bulgarian literature, not to mention internationally, and who is not without ambition on both these fronts. No trace here of rigorous objectivity. Meanwhile, in spite of a certain bias, this book is no less revealing as a testimony on Bulgarian literary life from the end of the 1960s to the present, as a result of the singular position of the witness.

Would the uniqueness of this account, marked by awareness of the historical reality and a freedom of expression which openly unmasks the lies that obscure that reality, amount to what might be called a position of dissidence? There is no doubt that Kiril Kadiiski lays claim to a code of dissidence, without necessarily glorifying himself with a title that carries a heavy historical burden and has become an overused cliché. It is sufficient to read the two quotation which serve as an epigraph to the inquiry. The first is from Baudelaire: it defines “the ethics of art” and “the freedom of genius” as exceptions to the common, socially-sanctioned rule of morality and liberty. The second is from Tzvetan Todorov. He himself is a witness to the constraints weighing on speech in communist

[1] Kiril Kadiiski. Literaturna anketa, Svetlozar Zhekov, Sofia, Pero, 2003. The references in parentheses refer to pages of this edition. I wish to thank Nina Arabadjieva-Baquey for her help with the translations.

Bulgaria: “the only way to escape the system,” he writes, “was to learn to make use of metaphors and euphemisms.” So poetry, thanks to the example of Baudelaire and a poetic which analyzes the possibilities of discourse in a totalitarian society, in these two epigraphs is presented as a privileged route of resistance to an alienating social conformity. This clearly places him in the position of being a dissident. And, in fact, dissidence has historically based its struggle on a conviction of the need to preserve the values of culture and, at the same time, personal liberty vis-a-vis government and its ideology.

Moreover, in the course of these interviews, Kiril Kadiiski consistently brings forth an extremely negative opinion, not only of the literary world, but Bulgarian society as a whole, as much in the communist period as for the present. For example, “In Bulgaria,” he states, “there is still no civil society, no normal structures or normal relations, and a normal literary life is nothing but a dream.” (340) Here, Kadiiski is not denying the liberalization of public life since the change of the political regime, but he believes that in spite of all this, in the world of literature, as a reflection of what goes on in the rest of the society, the same corporatism and populism continue to exist as in the era of the single party. Confronted with this reality, he calls for the creation of a true public arena. This demand for the full and complete recognition of individual rights in an open society is also linked to a major theme: the long-standing dissidents’ campaign for human rights.[2] In this respect, Kadiiski, by positioning himself in the world of literature, seeks to set an example for society as a whole, would contribute to setting up an autonomous space which would not only protect the freedom of the writer, but also allow his works a wider audience by no longer subjecting them to a heteronomous social purpose.[3] To reclaim this practice of dissidence, it is necessary, if one dares, to broaden the notion of it. Beyond affirming cultural and individual freedom in the face of a totalitarian regime, dissidence would consist in ensuring that both culture and the individual can escape from the social construction of reality, especially when ideology encroaches heavily on reality, as Kadiiski puts it, “a Mendelevian classification.”

In consequence of this, we can identify three types of dissidence. First, historic defiance of totalitarian control, at the risk of being tried, interned, exiled, or deported, as exemplified by Brodsky, Solzhenitsin, and others. From this perspective, it is important to be wary of analogies. The Bulgarian situation is not that of Soviet Russia and the attitude of Kadiiski himself was not, according to his own admission, exempt from compromise. Therefore he states that as a man with family responsibilities, he made compromises, “from among those” according to him, “which we had grown accustomed to defining as acceptable”, while on the other hand, as a poet, he made none in respect to art (335-336), The second category, might be dissidence as an inalienable moral and cultural heritage which depends on a certain idea of culture. From this point of view, the

---

[2] Cecile Vaissie, referring to interviews she held with Serguei Kovalev in 1997, writes: “Today, Serguei Kovalev stresses the essential importance of the growth of a civil society, i.e. “a society which knows it does not exist on behalf of the State, but that the State exists on its behalf […]”. Cf. *Pour votre liberte et pour la notre. Le combats des dissidents en Russie*, Paris, Robert Laffont, 1999, p. 283.

[3] For a sociological analysis of this process of emancipation of “minor literatures”, see the book by Pascale Casanova, *La Republique mondiale des Lettres,* Paris, Seuil, 1999.

case of great Russian authors such as Pasternak or Mandelstam, which Brodsky describes in an essay as “the offspring of civilization”, meets that of Baudelaire, defender of the autonomy of art. There can be no doubt: Kadiisky has adopted this heritage and continues to define himself in relation to it. This has brought him up against the controlled culture of the communist regime, but these days also against his new adversaries, those he calls the “postmodernists”. Finally, the third form of dissidence might be called, more generally, in a small country like Bulgaria, whose literature is still young, the effort of a poet, translator and editor, to affirm an independent literary world whose creations have a chance to grow beyond the frame of a national literature.

Dissidence and the code of art

Kiril Kadiiski’s own literary beginnings may illustrate the way in which he has adopted the ethical and artistic heritage of great poets concerned with the autonomy of their pursuits. In 1965 Kadiiski left Kjustendil, the region of his birth, to study Russian philology at St.Kliment Oxridski University. His first attempts at poetic composition date from this period. From the time he began writing, he chose to study a foreign language, not, he points out, in order to abandon Bulgarian literature, in which he ceaselessly confirmed his roots, but because this decision permitted him “to live in a different spiritual world” (104). This language was Russian. And “the spiritual world” in question, was certainly not to be found in soviet literature, but in what he calls the “forbidden fruits” of Russian literature: the “pre-revolutionary” writers, who chose emigration, and particularly those who, like Mandelstam and Pasternak, chose to stay and pay the often tragic price of being deprived of their freedom in soviet Russia. He declares that he was one of the first of his generation in Bulgaria to obtain a mimeographed copies[4] of Mandelstam’s poems, and that “in a couple of nights” he “devoured” a copy of Doctor Zhivago. What is more. Russian gave him access to other literary traditions, and to works like those of Kafka, which had yet to be translated into Bulgarian. Thus, Russian was not only the mother tongue of authors who had pioneered resistance to totalitarianism, thereby perpetuating the values of the 19th century Russian intelligentsia in a new context, but also afforded a larger window on world literature in the sense that it offered more possibilities for translation than Bulgaria.

Kadiiski wrote his first poems in 1965. In later publications he has preserved nothing of his writing from before 1968, the year in which, he reckons, he found his own voice. He accuses his early texts of being too didactic, like much Bulgarian poetry written at the beginning of the 1960s, by the “April generation” which had benefited from the relative liberalization of cultural life after de-Stalinization. He nevertheless recalls a moment of exceptional freedom that this period happened to produce: a public reading in the amphitheatre of St. Kliment Oxridski University during the 1966-67 academic years (119 sq.). After reading a few poems, he received a lively round of applause. In retrospect, he explains this success as the convergence of poems with real circumstances. One was entitled, “The ballad of hunger”. If this text was greeted with enthusiasm, he thinks it was not because it gave voice to a literal “physical starvation”, but because it could be

[4] Poems which he mentions he also quickly recopied: copying being the first act of an editor also a basic principle of samizdat.

understood as a metaphor for a "spiritual starvation" which allowed for the indirect public expression of an "existential truth" and of a "discontent" which was otherwise kept under constant control. Nevertheless, this coming together of poems and real life was not enough, in Kadiiski's view, to turn them into real works of art. This explains why he has left them out of his later publications. On the other hand, he admits that his proven ability to reach an enthusiastic audience had certain consequences including the long-standing refusal to admit him to the Writers' Union.[5] However, it was not due to Kadiiski having taken explicitly political stances: on the contrary, he was convinced that poetry should stand outside political conflict.[6]

The first texts which would subsequently be retained by Kadiiski in his books are in effect far from the didacticism of this so-called poetry of circumstance. They have also been criticized as excessively "metaphoric, paradoxical, mannered" (204) or for their "flight from reality" (143) – in other words, from the ideological construction of reality. With their suggestive style, these texts allowed a possibility of projecting all the uncertainties awakened by that historical situation while avoiding exposure to eventual censorship: Kadiiski insists that they were calling for the reader to participate. These were compositions built on images, most often very concrete ones, derived from a village landscape and the cycles of nature. These pictures had a metaphoric meaning. Frequently they were accompanied by a more or less explicit metaphysical and historical meditation, as in allegories whose interpretation hung suspended in a presentiment of apocalypse. Thus, by the composition of images, and using the simplest and most concrete vocabulary, Kadiiski sought to express "the shuddering of Bulgarian spirituality" (445). "My goal," he says, "was to speak of a new inner world, a place of spirit which, if not at first very extensive, was at least sovereign […] It was real life refracted in my own prism, and not the life were being shown in the mirror of ideology and aggressive propaganda." (144) Kadiiski's poetic practice was at the same time close to Brodsky's approach to defining poetry a few years later, in his Nobel Prize address: it is the irrepressible demand for personal expression freed of all state control and, simultaneously, above and the State, the expression of a collective destiny based on the material which it uses, the national language. In the end, it is precisely because it is not political that such writing becomes undesirable to those in power. And it is undoubtedly no accident if the affirmation of this pure style of writing, around 1968, coincides with a hardening of the Bulgarian regime

[5] If there existed a "genre" of dissident narrative, without doubt it would have to include this initial stage of scandal, in which the power of speech is suddenly unleashed. On this note,Vaclav Havel evokes the effect of beginning to speak out as an unknown youth, on the occasion of a meeting of young writers in the autumn of 1956 (*Distant interrogation,* interview with Karel Hvizd'ala, translated from the Czech by Jan Rubes, editions de l'aube, Paris, 1989, p. 32 sq.); Yakobe Gordine relates how Brodsky's reading of a poem provoked a scandal during a "poetry tournament" on February 14, 1960 in Leningrad's Gorki palace of culture (in *Voices in the darkness. Joseph Brodsky and his interlocutors,* translated from Russian by Marianne Gour, Odile Lelnik-Ardin and Irene Sokolog*orsky*, Monaco, Anatolia – Editions du Rocher, 2004, p. 204 sq.).

[6] Even after the fall of communism, in contrast to other writers and intellectuals, he did not become involved in political activity. He did approach one party, the RP, and even became a member of the political bureau. But it did not take him long to withdraw. "Politics in the Balkans," he notes, "is a tainted word. Poets are intent on keeping watch in order to restore words to their purity and in some cases, their radiance."(358)

after the repression of Prague Spring. Each new political context has its corresponding new poetic.

Kiril Kadiiski's first attempts at literary translation date from 1966 (114 sq.). They are therefore the contemporaries of his first poems. Translation is an integral part of his poetry project: he does not put "his body of work as a translator on a lower level than his original work" (145). Kadiiski is convinced of the importance for a poet of doing translation, particularly when he is working in a language whose literature is still new and marginal on the scale of world literature. Now, this double activity as poet and translator is no stranger to the criticism that has been made of Kadiiski, of imitating the poetry he translates, especially French poetry.[7] It's possible to understand the motivation of this critique in three ways: as nationalism (favoring an authentic culture for the people of Bulgaria, against European influence), as ideology (western poetry is capitalist and/or decadent), or again as the notion that poetry must break off from every specific tradition (in order to turn towards social discourses, for example). But Kadiiski's creative undertaking is opposed to the different conceptions of poetry implied by these arguments against imitation. Translation for him is a necessary cultural exchange from one language to another and it also has something in common with recreation. In effect, he insists on this paradox of literary translation which must be absolutely faithful to the work in the language of departure while at the same time becoming the work of the translator in its language of arrival, which it enriches. "Translation," he asserts, "must lead the reader to experience the same feelings, emotions, aesthetic enjoyments, as he would have undergone by knowing the language and reading the poem in the original" (287). This transposition depends on taking into account the form of the works. Also, Kadiiski has taken a similar stand against "Marxist translation" which, for example, neglects the versification of Goethe's Faust, under the pretext that during the period of socialist democracy, rhyme and meter are no longer necessary (116). Translation, in Kadiisky's view, participates in the defense of culture which is a form resistance against the social construction of reality as much in the communist era as in that of globalized communication.

It is as a translator of Russian that Kadiiski first made a name for himself. He justifies this initial decision with the following argument: to translate non-conformist poets, who come from a society which is officially considered to be the model to follow, gave more weight to his search for an alternative vision to the ruling dogmatism. Apart from Russian, soon his discovery of those he calls "the poetes maudits", and above all Baudelaire, led him to learn French in order to translate, or rather re-translate, these poets into Bulgarian. It was in a translation of Georgi Mixajlov's Between-two-wars that, in 1967, he came upon the works of Baudelaire, Verlaine and Rimbaud, works which he rushed to acquire in French. The choice of these poets, far removed from partisan

---

[7] This reproach would only make sense if it demonstrated that this imitation is not a recreation of one language into another, but purely mimetic. Kadiiski underscores the absurdity of the judgment according to which he attempts to imitate French poetry *as a whole.* Besides, criticizing a poet for going through a "foreign trial" implies a misunderstanding of the traditional logic of poetic creation. Such reasoning condemns most of European poetry, one of whose driving motivations is precisely imitation, in particular through the transition between one language to another. What would have become of Bellay if he had not imitated Petrarch, who in turn, following the poets of the *dolce stil novo,* imitated the Occitan troubadours?

optimism, was not without meaning. Among them, Baudelaire represents, as we know, the exemplary affirmation of a code of art which is distinguished by its support of a demanding aesthetic which is above ordinary morality : it was he who unveiled the hypocrisy of the society and government of the Second Empire at a time when the justice system condemned Les Fleurs du Mal as an outrage to morality. In a general way, Kadiiski asserts: "I turned to the *poetes maudit* at first because of a personal affinity, secondly because I wanted to show that there were literary worlds far removed from the one we were being offered, and above, worlds which were truer, more authentic. In other words, it was an original way to erode the milieu surrounding us, and from which there was no other way of escape, except by taking refuge in one's one construction. This is the meaning of my translating the *poetes maudits:* a new reality as much for myself as for a certain group who were like me." (179-180) Thus translation is a form of inner resistance, when direct self-expression through original works has become problematic. And in fact, Kadiiski is not the first poet living under communism to turn to translating recognized works from foreign literatures, as a means of expressing indirectly aspirations which would otherwise be consigned to silence – one thinks of, for example, Pasternak, translator of Shakespeare and Goethe, of Brodsky translating the English metaphysical poets, and also, in Bulgaria, of Daltchev.

In the case of translation, as in that of the composition of poems themselves, it appears, at least as he recounts it three decades later, that Kadiiski positions his first literary efforts under the sign of dissidence. A dissidence which, without seeking to enter directly into conflict with the State, still strives to express another view of the world than the one imposed by ideology. Whatever the political context, one could say he possesses a code of originality which compels him to put forward his individual sovereignty through opposition to the dominant trends. Does he not go so far as to declare that his enemies in the end did him a favour (146) and that the roadblocks to publication under communism contributed to the elaboration of his books on a grander scale?

Dissidence and social practice

Beyond this ethical stance, affirmed from the outset, Kadiiski's narrative in the Inquiry interviews in which he discusses his later trajectory shows that the part played by dissidence in his social practice must be nuanced according to the different areas, as distinct as they are connected, in which it is divided: the poems, the translation, and the work of editing.

As a poet, he presents himself as the victim of a misunderstanding which continued after the fall of the communist regime. Also, he is not inclined to explain this misunderstanding only as the result of ideological condemnation. We have already seen that he qualifies it in two ways: as incomprehension of the role which translation can play in an original body of work, and also as a result of structures stemming from the institutional organization of literary life in Bulgaria – while also underscoring the fact

that that he is recognized, as much in Bulgaria as in France, by peers whose judgments lie outside the logic of this organization. Nevertheless, one must not misinterpret the difficulties he faced as a poet under communism. We must recall, first of all, how important is was to be officially recognized as a writer, and because of this, first and foremost, to be accepted as a member of the Writers' Union – which was precisely not what happened in his case.[8] To be recognized as a "professional" writer according to a well-determined degree program, allowed many advantages: ease of publication, vacation residences, trips abroad, literary prizes, bursaries… In the opposite case, one would find oneself consigned to relative marginality.

For example, Kadiiski had serious difficulties in publishing Celestial Concerts, his first collection of poems, in 1979, although he had been writing since 1965 and considers his "first serious poems" date from 1968. One may revisit some of the mishaps which preceded this publication. They illustrate the restrictions imposed on freedom of expression. Without doubt, state censorship had been outlawed, but there were so many obstacles to publication which amounted to no less a form of censorship based on State control of all the means of cultural production. Before publishing a book, one had to first make a name for oneself in literary reviews, on a scale beginning with student journals and leading up to national publications. Another factor coming into play was the priority placed on the text in the publication in question. Kadiiski also remembers as a significant disappointment, that his photographs, which were intended to accompany some poems, were in the end omitted in the final editing of one issue of the university magazine (202). It is true that he played with the limits of what was acceptable, in particularly in 1971 when he published a cycle of poems dedicated to the Russian émigré and Nobel laureate, Ivan Bounine. Although Bounine had been published in the USRR, Kadiiski nevertheless qualified the occasion as a "white guard" ?, which from the ideological point of view, constituted slander. Can it have been an accident that he subsequently experienced various frustrations in his first efforts to publish Celestial Concerts, then entitled The Lamp. Before publication, one had to gain a second reading by an editor chosen more for ideological orthodoxy than literary judgment. This, despite everything, censorship continued to operate, and led in this case to suppression of the cycle of "Poems to Ivan Bounine", or even to corrections based on the most farfetched ideological suspicions. When finally a sanitized version of The Lamp appeared in 1975, it was not in the form of a self-contained book, but in a collection entitled Lyric Summer, which brought together texts by a number of young poets. Kadiiski observes, "This was an act of pure intellectual repression. […] Their only goal was to humiliate you, crust you, by demonstrating that you were not the author of a book, that you were not like them, that you were entirely beholden to them." (212) Finally in 1979 Celestial Concerts, which Kadiiski considers his first book, appeared, in which new were added to the original texts of The Lamp. This publication by The Bulgarian writer editions finally brought him considerable critical recognition. From that time on, until the fall of the regime, he was able to publish his book with state-sponsored houses, without much difficulty – although this did not mean

[8] It was only after the fall of communism, in 1992, that he was accepted into the Bulgarian Writers' Union… which he would leave noisily two years later. After a term equal brief and stormy with the Association of Bulgarian writers, he settled down from that time on as a member of the Bulgarian chapter of PEN. Moreover, Kadiiski's poetry has never received a single Bulgarian literary award.

he was officially recognized as a writer, having still not been accepted into the Union. His literary activity was tolerated, although mistrust of his work had not dissipated.

His situation as a translator was radically different. In this area, he managed to adapt perfectly to state institutions, which he portrays as much more liberal in this regard than in the world of creative writing as such. His work as a translator offered him the opportunity for social recognition, and also to earn a comfortable living: he was able, therefore, to gain relative independence. It is true that in this domain he followed the official line, so to speak. Having completed his Russian studies, in 1970 he translated a selection of poems by Vladimir Solouxin which won him a literary prize, and in 1971 he obtained his diploma in theory of poetic translation with flying colours. Subsequently, he was hired in 1972 as literary editor for Radio Sofia, where he was employed as a translator of poetry. Looking back at this experience, he considers it to have been formative work for him as a translator, and which took place in an atmosphere of tolerance, collegiality, and professionalism (150). He has no recollection of having undergone censorship, in contrast to what went on in other publications which were politically more sensitive. He left this job in 1976, having contracted hepatitis, and continued working as a freelance translator until 1979. He then found work at Popular Culture editions, where he was placed in charge of foreign poetry translations. There again, he remembers the overall quality of the work accomplished, when one looks at the quality of translations, the importance as well as the numbers of authors who were brought to the attention of the Bulgarian public. He admits that the editorial policy was not totally free of constraint. Compromises had to be made: for example, accepting that Soviet poets would be published in deluxe editions, in order to bring out more modest offerings of Volochine, Tarkowski or Eliot (176). There again, the state organization set the final standard, according to Kadiiski – who, paradoxically, tends to be severe in his assessment of the quality of most translations published after the fall of the communist regime, and of the state's ongoing disengagement from cultural affairs. Through his professional activity, Kadiiski was also perfectly integrated into the institutional structures that dealt with translation. And, after the creation of a Translators' Union, he quickly became a member. This allowed him certain "advantages", such as the possibility of taking a first trip to France in 1979, an event of great significance for him. Finally, his career as a "professional" in the field of translation earned him numerous prizes and a reputation which has not diminished since 1989. All this represents a striking contrast to his situation as a poet.

Kiril Kadiiski came to the Popular Culture state publishing house on his translation experience. There he also gained competence as an editor. Undoubtedly, this was what led him to publish private editions of works, even before 1989. He is considered the first Bulgarian writer to bring out a samizdat publication. This was a rather belated initiative, however, as if preceded the fall of the regime by only a year, and occurred in a climate where such a gesture was implicitly accepted: even the government saw it as an inevitable development. Kadiiski explains this more as a show of independence than as an act of dissidence in the true sense: "On the question of samizdat, my goal was not to distribute texts which were banned. In any case there was no such thing in Bulgaria, and one must recognize this responsibly, and with regret, so to speak. […] My aim was to show that you could publish books in another way – and to prove it was more than a

pious intention, but an actual reality." (187) After this brief adventure in samizdat, Kadiiski launched Nov Zlatorog magazine, linking it to the heritage of Zlatorog which, under the direction of Vladimir Vassilev, had upheld standards of literary classicism during the period between the wars, in defiance of experiments in avant-garde and proletarian literature. Later, from 1991 onward, Nov Zlatorog became the leading independent literary magazine in Bulgaria. Kadiiski therefore maintained his independence by becoming an entrepreneur in the market economy, maintaining an editorial policy which took care to balance quality and profit, usually publishing his new poems and translations at his own expense.

The defence of culture: an ongoing dissidence ?

Considering his career as a whole, it appears Kadiiski has succeeded in maintaining his independence as a poet, both during the communist era as well as after the transition to democracy, thanks to his work as a translator and editor. One cannot really say he has acted as a dissident. However, his concept of the role of culture and poetry is partly inherited from the great dissident poets – not to mention the 'poetes maudits". And it is certain that the notion of culture which he adopted in about 1968, at a time when the communist regime was hardening its stance once again after a phase of relative liberalization, brought him into conflict with the official aesthetic thinking. In interviews, he continually reiterates his desire to create a "new arena" by means of poetry, whether translated or original. This work, in which poetry becomes a mean of keeping alive a cultural heritage, is a form of resistance in our time, and Kadiiski continues to practice it today under new conditions of the market economy and pluralist democracy. He is no longer at war with his old enemies in the Writers' Union, but with a new generation which has appropriated "French theory" and threatens its cultural heritage: the "postmodernists." Looking at them, he has arrived at a generalized dissidence: continuing to demand a "different arena" for culture, but connecting it, beyond the context of Bulgaria itself, with a "global republic of literature" which is possible from now on. This is why the recognition which his translated poems have achieved in France is of such great importance for him: it represents the road to a reputation which transcends the particular context of Bulgaria.[9] Unquestionably, this Literary Inquiry is not just a statement about the world of Bulgarian writing, but one of those publications[10] which will

---

[9] One must meanwhile note that this recognition in France exists in a particular context, in response to expectations which are not shared in all instances, whether among poets, editors, translators or critics. An analysis of this response remains to be done. Some suggest it would include: 1) a particular interest in Bulgarian literature; 2) recognition for the translator of French poetry (and also of the classic of French classics: Moliere), which could be accompanied by reciprocal translations (with Alain Bosquet and Jeran Orizet(; 3) the ethical image of the dissident poet in eastern Europe; 4) the desire of some, since the "turn of the 1980s", to break away from experimental poetry, since the eastern European poet stands in a very different relationship to tradition, due to having a different history.

[10] In 2000, Zaxarij Stoujanov brought out, under the title *Vetcherja v Emaus (Pilgrims of Emmaus) a collection of all his published poems (a new edition of the complete poems is now in production); in 2003 Liment Oxridski University Press published the second edition appeared of a book showcasing his work as a poet and translator in two languages, Russian and Bulgharian: Mezdu dvojna bezna (Between two abysses. Poems, translations, and essays) ;and finally a volume of collected essays on Kadiiski is currently underways …*

permit Kiril Kadiiski to return to his homeland as “one of the greatest Bulgarian artists” (Svetlozar Zhekov dixit, 9).