

The rhetoric of sincerity in Bulgarian underground literature from the 1960s to the 1980s

JAKUB MIKULECKÝ

DOI: [10.31577/WLS.2026.18.2.5](https://doi.org/10.31577/WLS.2026.18.2.5)

© Institute of World Literature

Slovak Academy of Sciences

© Jakub Mikulecký 2026

Licensed under [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

The rhetoric of sincerity in Bulgarian underground literature from the 1960s to the 1980s

Rhetoric of sincerity. Bulgarian unofficial literature. Georgi Mitskov. Mehmed Karahyuseinov. Boris Hristov. Emiliya Dvoryanova.

Postwar Bulgarian literature under the communist regime was divided into three currents: official, exile, and unofficial. From the perspective of the rhetoric of sincerity and its literary manifestations, the most relevant object of research appears to be unofficial texts, i.e., those that were published in samizdat or remained in the form of manuscripts or typescripts. This article examines the manifestations of the rhetoric of sincerity in selected underground works and particularly the ways in which it was expressed in poetry by Georgi Mitskov and Mehmed Karahyuseinov, prose by Boris Hristov and Emiliya Dvoryanova, and samizdat almanac *NLO*. Among other approaches, it is based on Michel Foucault's concept of *parrhesia* (free speech), as he understands it in the context of ancient philosophy and literature, and applies it to the situation of state socialism in the second half of the 20th century, in which speakers (or literary characters) express their personal relationship to truth, risking oppression, ostracism, and denigration. The study explores how authors and their literary characters respond to social hypocrisy and insincerity in their efforts to maintain their own human dignity.

This study was published with the support of the Strategy AV21: Research programme Identities in the World of Wars and Crises.

Jakub Mikulecký
Institute of Slavonic Studies
Czech Academy of Sciences
Prague
Czech Republic
jakub.mikulecky@slu.cas.cz
ORCID: 0000-0002-3644-5402

In the postwar period, Bulgarian literature developed under similar sociocultural conditions as literature in the Soviet Union and other Eastern Bloc countries. Bulgaria witnessed a complete *Sovietization* of cultural life from 1947–1949 accompanied by the rise of state censorship.¹ To write freely in the People's Republic of Bulgaria was possible only “for the drawer,”² while uncensored publication was limited to *samizdat* – a phenomenon that did not reach a significant scale in Bulgaria.³ Nevertheless, even the officially published literature during the four decades of state socialism was not entirely homogeneous with regard to the ideological boundaries of acceptability. Signs of the rhetoric of sincerity could be found in a whole range of literary works published through official channels, particularly during periods of political thaw: after Stalin's death and the subsequent 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956, and during the *perestroika* and *glasnost* of the Mikhail Gorbachev era.

Poetry, prose, and theater began to break free from ideological dogmas during the 1960s and especially in the 1980s, when the writing of some authors became increasingly *sincere*.⁴ Following Ellen Rutten, I understand the rhetoric of sincerity as “the discursive gesture of honest self-disclosure (whether the artist in question is indeed honest is another quest; what matters is her or his insistence on the trope of emotional transparency)” (2017, 9). Rutten also links the rebirth of sincerity in Russian (Soviet) culture with the period of Gorbachev's *perestroika* and *glasnost*. She suggests that the development of the rhetoric of sincerity in literature dates back to the period of the political thaw after Stalin's death (82–83) despite the fact that during that time, the possibility of self-expression still faced the limits of hard censorship. In the 1960s, honest self-disclosure was not permitted to attack the ruling socialist discourse. If such “problematic” texts appeared (particularly if the sincerity of the expression gained political and ideological dimension), the author often had to face sanctions or repressions (e.g. loss of job, loss of Sofia residence permit, and in some cases imprisonment or confinement in psychiatric hospitals).

The issue of sincerity under conditions of unfreedom is connected with the phenomenon of *parrhesia* (“free speech”) as understood by Michel Foucault: “In *parrhesia*, the speaker is supposed to give a complete and exact account of what he has in mind so that the audience is able to comprehend exactly what the speaker thinks” (2001, 12). Foucault also uses the term *parrhesiastes* to designate the speaking subject – that is, the one who practices *parrhesia*. Concerning artistic expression under the unfree conditions of state socialism, Foucault's concept of risk and danger appears to be particularly important, because “the fact that a speaker says something dangerous – different from what the majority believes – is a strong indication that he is *parrhesiastes*” (2001, 15). The situation in the People's Republic of Bulgaria was fairly similar as the sociocultural development of the Balkan Soviet satellite closely mirrored developments in the USSR.

This article focuses on selected unofficial texts that can be retrospectively read as the discursive gestures of honest self-disclosure. First, it concentrates on the unpublished poetry of Georgi Mitskov and an attempt to reconstruct the feelings of non-conformist students at the end of the 1970s, for whom sincerity was a key value that

caused conflicts with the state authorities. Next, it examines the manner in which sincerity, as a discursive gesture, was attributed to the literary characters in the prose of Boris Hristov and Emiliya Dvoryanova. The phenomenon of the youth subcultures in the 1980s appears interesting in connection with the rhetoric of sincerity, because representatives of these subcultures considered themselves bearers of sincerity, as will be illustrated with diary notes by Dimitar Voev. Finally, it outlines how the discursive gestures of sincerity were present in the unpublished poetry of Mehmed Karahyuseinov as an intellectual resistance to the assimilation policies against Bulgarian Turks during the “Revival Process”.

GEORGI MITSKOV’S “MASQUERADE BALL”

A significant case in this respect is the unpublished poetry of the marginalized poet and translator Georgi Mitskov (1921–2002), whose intimate lyricism from the late 1960s fits well into the general effort of literature during socialism to expose the dichotomous model of sincerity versus hypocrisy. Mitskov’s poems explore the eternal tension between the inner feeling and its external manifestation, between the mind and the word, between the soul and the body, and between the individual and the unfree society of the totalitarian state. At present, Georgi Mitskov is cautiously included in the canon of Bulgarian “queer literature”, although such lyricism certainly did not aspire to gain publicity in Bulgaria during the 1960s, and his poetic expression was veiled in a web of metaphors. Mitskov’s love poetry, in its directness and eroticism, collided with the normativity of the dominant discourse of the time.⁵ One of these texts, for example, is his 1967 untitled poem:

And blessed silence.
Only you and me.
An embrace of azure
and light. And there is no me and you.

The forest hid within us,
nobody to be.
Far from the rabble.
And there is no me and you.

The azure wed us!⁶

Mitskov’s love poems are often set in wild nature, specifically in the majestic landscapes of the Bulgarian mountains, which frequently emerge as a free and unconquered milieu in which one can act honestly and without pretense. A person retreating to the mountains thus escapes the dangers lurking in the city or town – far from the society (“far from the rabble”) that seeks to control and direct one’s social behavior. This dichotomy between pure nature and corrupt (evil or bad) society is evident, for example, in another of Mitskov’s poems, “Zaminavane” (Departure), dedicated to the Portuguese poet and writer Fernando Pessoa:

A black wind blows from the pines,
chasing clouds, the moon, and shadows,

once they were my guards
and protected me from the evil eyes,
when they pursued me stubbornly
and wanted to know all about me,
even whom I would love...⁷

Nature protects the subject from the evil eyes of society; perhaps, in this specific case, it relates to the evil eyes of the secret services and their informers, who want to know information about whom the pursued person loves. The speaker of these poems must conceal his feelings, emotions, and social behavior; otherwise, he risks repressive punishment from the authorities. In another poem titled "Na noshtta" (To the night), a life within a hypocritical society is metaphorically compared with a masquerade ball; furthermore, the motif of man as a toy in the hands of unknown forces corresponds to postwar existentialism:

What in fact are we,
reality or fiction,
what a model of Being,
thrown by a blind force
that plays with our fate?
What a masquerade ball,
we dance, play and live
and each day we shove and squash each other,
and each day we kick and bite one another,
like horses in the Augean stables,
but not a thing we know about each other?
What miserable masks we are, alas,
and we want to live forever
in the unsolved riddle of the world!⁸

In the poems of Georgi Mitskov, the lyrical speaker frequently appears in the position of an outsider, an accursed poet pushed to seclusion, as he is not permitted to fully express his authentic feelings. He therefore most often seeks refuge in wild mountain nature; otherwise, he is condemned to remain merely a participant in a masquerade ball, which here serves as a metaphor for a hypocritical society. The lyrical speaker attempts to resist this situation primarily by trying to describe it (although in a metaphorical way); he does it by opposing authentic *modus vivendi* to the hypocrisy of everyday life. In other words, the rhetoric of sincerity here aligns with the concept of alienation.

"SINCERE" WRITING IN STUDENT SAMIZDAT

In the late 1970s, a group of university students in Veliko Tarnovo decided to start publishing a samizdat almanac called *NLO* (UFO), envisioning it as a platform for independent poetry, prose, essays, reviews, and other writing. In total, five issues appeared, and the editorial text from the fifth issue in 1979 emphasizes that the almanac does not aspire to the status of an official journal nor is it based on any unified philosophical or artistic conception. However, by emphasizing ideological diversity and heterogeneity of opinions, the student almanac *de facto* openly opposed the uni-

form culture of Soviet-type socialism. The author(s) of the editorial preface hinted that the possibility of expressing one's opinion is crucial to the concept of their samizdat project. It appears that free expression and refusing any type of censorship were crucial issues for young people from the Bulgarian provinces: "our almanac excludes the possibility of lying, of promoting false, insincere materials written for personal profit or 'at the behest' of the censorship" (1979, 5).

The samizdat project soon attracted the attention of state authorities and the State Security, which subsequently pressured the young publishers to cease all their activities. The fifth issue was the last publicly distributed edition of the *NLO* almanac. This brief operation of the student samizdat from the late 1970s demonstrates that young people in Bulgaria were aware of the situation in the field of official culture at the time. They perceived the official cultural scene as insincere mainly owing to the censorship and self-censorship associated with the production and reproduction of the dominant socialist discourse. This sociocultural situation gradually intensified throughout the 1980s; the final decade of Bulgarian socialism was marked by a clear division between official and unofficial cultures: a dichotomy between public (state-controlled) and private cultural spheres.

BORIS HRISTOV AND *SLYAPOTO KUCHE*

The abovementioned dichotomy manifested in an increasing number of samizdat publications and a rise in literary works written "for the drawer", that is, works whose authors were clearly aware that their writing would not be officially published under the current socio-political conditions (or they did not want it published by official publishing houses). Shortly after the student samizdat interval, in 1980, Boris Hristov (b. 1945) wrote the manuscript of his remarkable novella *Slyapoto kuche* (The mole). One of the main characters of this underground novella, which remained unpublished during socialism, is Lazar the Junkman, a former tailor who decides to gather all the clothes that he has ever sewn to erase all his traces from world history. Lazar is one of the regulars at the peculiar tavern The Old Carriage, which is situated in the suburbs and used as a "shelter" for an extraordinary company of strange and unusual people. When Lazar dies, his friends from The Old Carriage decide to give him a proper burial (in the old-fashioned way, with an Orthodox priest), which goes against the interests of the ruling state apparatus.

In Hristov's novella, the state apparatus is represented by the Funeral Home, a dehumanized, omnipresent Moloch that tries to deprive people of their inherent humanity. The Funeral Home and morgue in the novella are depicted as extraordinarily impersonal, monstrous environments inhabited by perverted attendants with overtly pathological behavior. The final farewell in the institution is understood merely as a ritual serving state propaganda, facilitated by prefabricated speeches and eulogies from the funeral staff, which Lazar's friends try to resist. The Funeral Home (and the entire apparatus standing behind it) can be understood as a symbolic zone of insincerity. The clash with the machinery of the Funeral Home initially appears to be a lost cause, but the crew from The Old Carriage in their genuine desire to bid a sincere farewell to their friend, ultimately overcomes all the obstacles, ensuring

that Lazar receives a dignified burial. Thus, the community of friends from The Old Carriage stands as the last bastion of pure humanity.

The division between the official sphere and the unofficial (independent) sphere became more evident in Bulgaria in the mid-1980s, when Gorbachev's perestroika and glasnost were implemented in the Soviet Union. Despite the fact that perestroika was implemented in Bulgaria only halfway and with significant reluctance, the number of samizdat publications began to increase during the second half of the 1980s. These samizdat activities had specific features in Bulgaria, and they were not always openly dissident in nature. Nevertheless, samizdat became an important platform for uncensored and more "open" writing and publishing; authors in Bulgaria felt that the advent of glasnost in the USSR legitimized the development of parallel publishing activities beyond state-controlled structures. These socio-cultural changes made it possible for some authors to escape the fear of direct political repression that would be the consequence of a public expression of a nonconformist attitude. Glasnost enabled a greater degree of sincerity, which was manifested in literature.

KASHTATA BY EMILIYA DVORYANOVA

Emiliya Dvoryanova (b. 1958) wrote the manuscript of her novel *Kashtata* (The house) from 1984 to 1986 (1994, 127), but it was not published during state socialism; it appeared in 1993 after the political regime changed. The main character of this "drawer novel" is the Boy. Growing up during state socialism in a family with an old "bourgeois" background, the Boy has always stood out from the others. Influenced by his great-grandmother (a representative of the old, pre-revolutionary bourgeois elite), the Boy distances himself from contemporary socialist society. He longs to become an artist, and he paints his nonconformist abstract paintings at home, storing them in the basement of the old family house.

When the Boy applies to the academy of arts, he discovers that the academic environment is limited by craft conformity and is far removed from "the true art", which, in his view, stems from creative *arbitrariness* (*proizvol*). Arbitrariness is the key concept of Dvoryanova's novel – a frustrating and unsettling feeling for those around the Boy (mainly for his mother Eliza and the professor at the academy with a large belly, indicative of his status in the system). The Boy's mother, Eliza, represents the principle of the one-dimensional (wo)man (according to Marcuse 1991), that is, the conformity of the mass society, which Eliza tries to instill in her adolescent son. His arbitrariness frightens her as it deviates from the "norm" and the "normal" collective. However, the Boy is devoted to his artistic activities and refuses any type of submission. A personal antithesis to the Boy's creative arbitrariness is also a professor at the academy portrayed in the novel as a *socialist bourgeois* – a representative of the state-controlled, moderated art that must not stray beyond the boundaries set by the apparatus.⁹

The key motif of the novel is the conflict between inner freedom (the Boy's creative arbitrariness) and the external world of the apparatus, which forces people to abandon their desires and true selves. This conflict reaches its peak when Eliza destroys her son's paintings and throws away his brushes and colors to cure him

socially and “bring him to his senses”. However, this only strengthens the Boy’s arbitrariness. It is symptomatic that Dvoryanova argues for this eternal existential conflict using psychoanalytic terminology: the Ego (Ich) is suppressed, and the Id (Es) takes the stage; the Id leads the Boy to his ultimate act of human arbitrariness: suicide. The relationship between sincerity and suicide as a manifestation of spiritual despair would require a separate study. Literary history, however, knows countless such cases; let us mention, above all, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, about whose tragic fate Lionel Trilling writes: “He is in all things the sincere man” (1972, 52).

THE SINCERITY OF COUNTERCULTURE DISCOURSE

Concerning the discursive gestures of honest self-disclosure in unofficial Bulgarian literature from the period of state socialism, other examples include the remarkable nonconformist poetry by Konstantin Pavlov, the atavistic confessional verses of the young rebel Ruscho Tihov, and the distinctive confessional poetry of young poets publishing their first verses within the so-called Ruse samizdat in the early 1960s, which included lyric authors, such as Ivan Tsanev, Veselin Tachev, and Zdravko Kisyov. A common feature among these authors was their enthusiastic desire (almost an existential need) to express themselves through poetic texts. This was a type of confessional lyrical poetry often shared within a small circle of friends, as evidenced by the small number of copies of samizdat. I would also include the artistic activities of the nonconformist group *Kukuv den*. The community around this artistic group organized unofficial apartment carnivals, poetry readings, concerts, and exhibitions, and even produced their own amateur films in the 1980s. Raw confessional poetry also emerged within the circle that testified to the need of young people to communicate with the world, which would likely not have been possible to share through the official publishing channels at the time.

The desire for liberation from state-imposed discourses and dogmas as well as the desire for open self-expression are closely linked to the phenomenon of nonconformist youth subcultures. The punk subculture began to emerge in Bulgaria at the end of the 1970s as a nonconformist ideology, mostly concerned with individual freedom and anti-establishment views. New Wave music was an extremely popular faction of punk subculture in Bulgaria. One of the leading New Wave bands was New Generation, whose frontman and poet Dimitar Voev claimed in his diary notes in 1987:

They hardly ever play our songs on the radio and television. They fear our sincerity. Because it burns and makes you feel uncomfortable. When you are not pure. They say that our songs are dark because of the darkness in their minds due to the closed circle of stupidity and vanity in which they find themselves. They remind me of little people afraid of their lords.¹⁰

These subcultures, inspired by Western counterculture, proved to be expedient ways of shocking and unsettling the conservative society of late socialism, their protagonists often regarded themselves as the bearers of a sincere and authentic revolt against the system.

HUMAN DIGNITY VS. SOCIAL ENGINEERING

One of the key motifs of Dvoryanova's novel *Kashtata* is suicide as an externally materialized manifestation of inner mental pain, despair, and hopelessness. Suicide, as an ultimate act of arbitrariness, associated with the deprivation of the individual, was not limited only to literary fiction but became a broader social issue in the late socialist era in Bulgaria. Some suicides (or suicide attempts) in the 1980s were linked to the so-called Vazroditelen protses (Revival Process, 1984–1989) when Todor Zhivkov's regime launched a campaign of forced assimilation and the mass renaming of the Turkish population. One of the victims of the Revival Process was the poet Mehmed Karahyuseinov (1945–1990), author of the poem "Redaktori" (Editors) from 1976, which was not published until 1999:

Wherever you turn in this city,
editors spring up from everywhere.
They edit your walk, clothes,
speech, gestures, desires,
noses, legs, mouth,
they edit silences...
They'd edit even beauty,
edit humanity even,
and if they had just a little more power,
they'd edit eternity too...¹¹

On February 1, 1985, Mehmed Karahyuseinov attempted to set himself on fire. He did not do so on a busy street or crowded square but rather in the suburban Vladaya district on the outskirts of Sofia. By sheer chance, Karahyuseinov survived his attempt to self-immolate but died in pain from the consequences of his desperate act five years later in 1990 after the failure of the Revival Process and the fall of Todor Zhivkov's regime. In the foreword of Karahyuseinov's posthumously published poetry collection in 1999, Konstantin Pavlov wrote:

Dear reader, the author of this poetry book is no longer alive. He is a precious victim of the Revival Process. He set himself on fire. These poems are the offspring of the agony that lasted for several years. I perceive his suicide as the noblest form of the instinct for self-preservation – you destroy the body to save your soul. [...] He did it quietly without heroic poses. In this time of false heroes and ostentatious gestures, he proves to us that human dignity is greater than a well-calculated bravery. His suicide is not pathology, but the ultimate negation of pathology. Because we lived in a system where the laws for physical survival dictated that you must give up not only your name and heritage but also your own personality. Some welcomed it, others found it torturous, and others yet ... (1999, n.p.)

Karahyuseinov's notebooks represented poetic diaries in which the author articulated through lyrical expression not only spiritual suffering arising from the severe trials of his personal life and from the collective trauma caused by the social engineering of the regime, but also tormenting physical pain, following his suicide attempt. These poetic diaries appear to have served their author with a certain therapeutic function as well, as the lyrical subject of some of the poems stands

exposed before his own conscience in a state of complete vulnerability (1999, 79). Elsewhere, he addresses God directly, as in the poem “Sadba” (Fate) from 1989, written shortly before his death: “Why am I dying so, so slowly? / Stop my heart, Lord, so that I do not suffer!”¹²

CONCLUSION

Under the rule of the one-party state and the existence of censorship mechanisms, Bulgarian literature was confined to a system in which the sincerity of dissenting and unwanted voices could only be allowed if they did not challenge the prevailing political status quo. Many authors and readers increasingly considered the official literature space as insincere (hypocritical) and an integral part of party propaganda. This situation led some authors to believe that authentic writing can only be performed at an unofficial (underground) level during the Communist regime in Bulgaria.¹³

In literature, the rhetoric of sincerity is articulated as the representation of the inner psychological state of mind presented as an inner voice liberated from external (sociocultural and ideological) filters. The desire to express the inner state of mind is manifested on two levels: (1) in lyric poetry, as the voice of the speaker, which often coincides with the alter ego and thus assumes the form of a poetic confession and (2) in prose, where sincerity is ascribed to fictional characters whose authentic volition and conduct bring them into sharp conflict with society, which is conceived as inherently insincere, hypocritical, and even inhuman. The rhetoric of sincerity is also linked to the adoption of countercultural patterns, containing an ideological, aesthetic, and value-based revolt against the existing status quo; during the late Bulgarian socialism, it was the case of the youth subcultures based on punk movement and its derivatives, or in the production of closed artistic groups whose activities took place within the relatively safe milieu of private apartments, far from the watchful eyes of official regime criticism and the rigid creative unions of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria.

NOTES

- ¹ The use of the term state censorship is relevant in the Bulgarian case, as throughout almost the entire existence of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria, there were central institutions with supervisory and censorship functions, although their role and names changed over time. Even though a large part of the censorship competences was transferred to the editorial offices of individual publishing houses after 1956, these publishing houses remained state-owned and controlled by the party and state institutions. See Chichovska 1991.
- ² A large proportion of Bulgarian unofficial literary texts did not get to the readers in samizdat form and remained in the form of unpublished manuscripts or typescripts. These “drawer” texts had to wait until more politically favorable times for publication, that is, for the most part until the fall of the Communist regime. In Russian, Czech, Slovak, and Bulgarian contexts the idiom was common (“нucамъ в cмoxъ”, “psát do šuplíku”, “písať do šuplíka”, “лyчeпaмyпa oм чeкмeгжeмo”).
- ³ Tamizdat was a marginal phenomenon in the Bulgarian context too. By the term tamizdat, I understand a text (manuscript or samizdat) that is carried to the West where it is published and then part of the print run travels back to the country of origin, where it is distributed, read, and possibly

reproduced. I consider that the systematic distribution of exile (or tamizdat) publications was not a widespread phenomenon in Bulgaria during the Cold War, but it existed.

- ⁴ In the Bulgarian literary context, this is particularly evident in connection with the theme of the forced collectivization of agriculture; for instance, in 1986, Ivaylo Petrov published his famous novel *Hayka za valtsi*, the novel has been translated into English by Angela Rodel (*Wolf Hunt*, 2017), and into Slovak by Ján Koška (*Poľovačka na vlky*, 1989). The Czech language translation by Ludmila Nováková was never published in book form and remains in typescript form.
- ⁵ Homosexuality was de jure decriminalized in Bulgaria in 1968; nevertheless, repressive measures targeting individuals of non-heterosexual orientation persisted in alternative forms, most notably through their forced relocation from major urban centers (mainly Sofia) and, in certain cases, compulsory confinement in psychiatric institutions. For further details about this phenomenon, see Dimitrova 2021.
- ⁶ “И тишина. Блажена. / И само ти и аз. / Прегръдка от лазур / и светлина. И няма аз и ти. // Лесът се скри във нас, / да няма никоѝ. / Далече от сганта. / И няма аз и ти. // Лазурът ни венча!” (Mitskov 2002, 98) All translations from Bulgarian are by the author of this study, who did not pursue artistic aims; the translations seek to preserve the semantics of the quoted texts. None of the cited works has yet been translated into English.
- ⁷ “От борове те лъха черен вятър, / подгонил облаци, луна и сенки, / те бяха моите пазачи някога / и ме предпазваха от лошите очи, / когато упорито ме преследваха / и искаха за мен да знаят всичко, / дори с кого ще се обичам...” (Mitskov 1990, 19)
- ⁸ “Какво сме всъщност ние, / реалност или фикция, / какъв модел на Битието, / захвърлени от спяна сила, / която си играе с нашата съдба? / Какъв е моя бал маскиран, / танцуваме, играем и живеем / и всеки ден се блъскаме и мачкаме, / и всеки ден се ритаме и хапем / като коне в авгийските обори, / а нищичко за себе си не знаем? / Какви нещастни маски сме, уви, / и вечно ни се иска да живеем / в неразгаданата гатанка на света!” (Mitskov 1990, 8–9)
- ⁹ In this context, I understand the apparatus as an omnipotent bureaucratic behemoth within which human individuality is lost, and the individual is absorbed by the apparatus, fully subjected to it, and deprived of authenticity. The negative aspects of the apparatus were articulated by Karl Jaspers in *The Spiritual Situation of the Age* (2008). Arbitrariness is linked to a revolt against the apparatus and represents an expression of the sincerity of being and creative freedom.
- ¹⁰ “По рагуото и телевизията почти не ни пускат. Страхувам се от нашата искреност. Защото тя изгаря и те кара да се чувстваш неудобно. Когато не си чист. Казвам, че нашите песни са мрачни, защото на тях им е мрачно в главите от затворения кръг на глупостта и сметата, в който се намират. Те ми приличат на малки човечета, които се страхуват от господарите си” (Voev 2012, 9).
- ¹¹ “Накъдето се обърнеш в този град, / отвсякъде редактори извират. / Похогката ти, облеклото редактират, / говор, жестове, желания, / носове, крака, уста, / редактират мълчания... / Те биха редактирали и красотата, / биха редактирали човечността, / а ако имаха и още малко власт, / те биха редактирали и вечността...” (Karayuseinov 1999, 11)
- ¹² “Защо толкова, толкова бавно умирам? / Спри сърцето ми, Господи, за да не се мъча!” (Karayuseinov 1999, 80)
- ¹³ See my monograph on unofficial Bulgarian literature before 1989, published in both Czech and Bulgarian (Mikulecký 2021, 2025).

REFERENCES

- Chichovska, Vesela. 1991. “Glavlit (1952–1956). Izgrazhdane na edinna tsenzurna sistema v Balgariya.” *Istoricheski pregled* 10: 38–69.
- Dimitrova, Veronika. 2021. “Nakazatelni praktiki spryamo homoseksualnite v Balgariya prez 50-te i 60-te godini na XX v.” In *Balgarskiyat sotsializam: ideologiya, vsekidnevnie, pamet*, ed. by Ana Luleva, Ivanka Petrova, and Petar Petrov, 132–147. Sofia: BAN.

- Dvoryanova, Emiliya. 1994. *Kashtata*. Sofiya: IK "Areta".
- Foucault, Michel. *Fearless Speech*. Ed. by Joseph Pearson. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Hristov, Boris. 1990. *Slyapoto kuche. Dolinata na obuvkite*. Varna: Georgi Bakalov.
- Jaspers, Karl. [1931] 2008. *Duchovní situace doby* [Die geistige Situation der Zeit]. Trans. by Milan Váňa. Praha: Academia.
- Karahyuseinov, Mehmed. 1999. *Ne po noti*. Sofiya: Stigmati.
- Marcuse, Herbert. [1964] 1991. *Jednorozměrný člověk* [One-dimensional Man]. Trans. by Miroslav Rýdl. Praha: Naše vojsko.
- Mikulecký, Jakub. 2021. *Mezi disentem, undergroundem a šedou zónou: Neoficiální bulharská literatura 1944–1989*. Praha: Academia and Slovanský ústav AV ČR.
- Mikulecký, Jakub. 2025. *Mezdu disidentstvoto, andargraunda i sivata zona: Neofitsialnata balgarska literatura 1944 – 1989 g.* Trans. by Zhorzheta Cholakova. Plovdiv: Plovdivsko universitetsko izdatelstvo.
- Mitskov, Georgi. 1990. *Syankata na sadbata* [stihotvoreniya]. Sofiya: samizdat.
- Mitskov, Georgi. 2002. *Otchayan peshehodetso*. Sofiya: Petko i Pencho Slaveykovi.
- NLO. 1979. "Neobhodimo poyasnenie." *NLO* 2, 5: 3–6.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. 1999. "Dragi chitatelyu... (Predgovor)." In *Ne po noti*, Mehmed Karahyuseinov, n.p. Sofiya: Stigmati.
- Petrov, Ivajlo. 1989. *Pol'ovačka na vlky*. Trans. by Ján Koška. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ.
- Petrov, Ivailo. 2017. *Wolf Hunt*. Trans. by Angela Rodel. New York: Archipelago Books.
- Rutten, Ellen. 2017. *Sincerity after Communism: A Cultural History*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Trilling, Lionel. 1972. *Sincerity and Authenticity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Voev, Dimitar. 2012. *Pozdravi ot men bogovete*. Sofiya: Litavra.
- Znepolski, Ivaylo, ed. 2009. *Istoriya na Narodnata republika Balgariya: Rezhimat i obshtestvoto*. Sofiya: Institut za izsledvane na blizkoto minalo.