



SOFIA UNIVERSITY "ST.
KLIMENT OHRIDSKI" Faculty of
Slavic Philology Department of
Bulgarian Literature

Abstract of dissertation

for the purpose of acquiring the educational and science degree
“Doctor” in the field of 2.1 Philology,
Scientific specialty “Bulgarian Literature” – Bulgarian Literature
after 1989”

THE JOKE ABOUT THE FATHER IN THE GROTESQUE WORLD OF KONSTANTIN PAVLOV

Doctoral student:
Marianna Dimiturovna
Georgieva

Research supervisor:
Associate Professor Anni Ilkov
Asenov

Sofia, 2023

The dissertation was discussed and proposed for public defense at a meeting of the Department of Bulgarian Literature at the Faculty of Slavic Philology of Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski" held on 23.01.2024

The dissertation consists of six chapters, introduction, epilogue, conclusion, bibliography, appendices with a total volume of 214 pages.

Scientific jury:

Prof. Ivan Ivanov
Assoc. Prof. Nadezhda Stoyanova
Assoc. Prof. Elka Traikova
Prof. Plamen Antov
Assoc. Prof. Maurice Fadell

The defense materials are available on paper in the Department of Bulgarian Literature.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Chapter 1. Intrusion | 6 |
| Chapter 2. Doubling. Multiplication | 42 |
| Chapter 3. The non-applicable communication | 71 |
| Chapter 3. The Catastrophe. Naming | 94 |
| Chapter 4. The joke about the father | 123 |
| Chapter 5. Group reality vs group unreality | 164 |
| Epilogue | 188 |
| Conclusion | 198 |
| Bibliography | 201 |
| Applications | 210 |

Introduction

In the context of the Bulgarian literary scene, Konstantin Pavlov stands out as a distinctive and enigmatic figure. His works frequently inhabit the realm of communist restrictions and censorship, yet paradoxically thrive within these confines. His narrative terrain, imbued with absurdist undertones, draws comparisons to the existential ponderings of Samuel Beckett and the nightmarish realms of Franz Kafka. This examination seeks to delve into Pavlov's body of work within this contextual framework, exploring the interplay between literature, violence, and the post-war anxieties pervasive in European literary modernism.

"He who endures much endures little."

Samuel Beckett, Waiting for Godot

I. Intrusion

Viewed as a whole, Konstantin Pavlov's work can be seen as a special poetic and existential space for the experiments not only of the mind, but also of what the author himself calls "state": "A person tells about himself best when he reproduces events and states, and when he begins to evaluate a state of affairs, he is almost always wrong."¹

This concept that the human being cannot be defined, but can be described through a certain condition, through a certain scene ("incident") sets the background of all his work and represents a specific focus of honesty that brings his poetry to the existential perspectives of the unfinished genius. In this sense, his poetry shifts the point of view on what we can call an "internal poetic scene", which is subjected to dramatic and harsh trials, it is formed as a result of another, external event, a space that carries its historicity, factuality, but also deep manic

¹Pavlov, Konstantin. Zapiski, Plovdiv: Janet 45, 2000, p. 83

defenses against the appearance of otherness, in the Bulgarian case – precisely against Konstantin Pavlov as an emanation of the voice of the inexpressible.

This inner poetic realm, though demanding in a negative sense, implies a loss of certain certainties—challenging fixed notions of the absurd, the grotesque, and our understanding of violence's perpetual relevance. Another necessary yet painful aspect of this negativity emerges—beyond enduring censorship and persecution, the author should not be subject to mythologizing readings; his writings ought to be seen as an experience transcending mere verbal expression, an existential condition resistant to rational paths. His comprehension lies beyond memory, recollection, and desire. This poetic domain rests on an ambivalent foundation—it cannot be fully grasped, crafted precisely to evade comprehension; yet, simultaneously, it remains unknowable. This state of uncertainty instills a fear of emotionally or purely rational-conjunctural engagement with the poetry of Konstantin Pavlov.

The very first appearance of Konstantin Pavlov sets the bet for a poetry that will push away from its receptive aesthetics. The multitude of addresses ("Dear nightingale", "Predear reader"...) seem to subject her to a similar vectority, but this is only one of the attributes that the author uses to create the poetic field, which does not convey a dubious and meaningless factuality. Deprived of meaning in the case of this poetry, means to be freed from the "event" that the author himself refers to.

His poetry demonstrates an openness, a resilience capable of containing a nightmarish reality and presenting it within its enclosed, solipsistic boundaries. This doesn't render his poetry devoid of what Bataille would term "eroticism"; quite the opposite, it is hyper-open to the prospect of losing oneself in order to find oneself—meaning, its libido isn't merely rudimentary, but rather rudimentary-intrapsychic. In it, historicity isn't stored as a fact or memory, but rather as a fluidity of creative significance.

Konstantin Pavlov appears to write from a space of emptiness—a realm beyond mere inspiration, distant and isolated enough for him to tap into numerous scenes brought to the brink of absurdity in poetry. However, in reality, these are more like "documents," often dedicated to disguised personas, portraying grotesque scenarios of a collectivized psyche that

operates and marches onward as if dead, despite calling itself by other names. The place of this void is marked not only by the poetry, but also by the silence, which is imposed by force, but arrived at like this:

"Cron-jig!"

Creative nature.

Then Cron-jig begins to spin

in a circle of oil.

She cannot cross this circle of oil –

it disgusts her to touch oil.

She does not like oil.

- Who drew the circle of oil!

She draws it herself.

Even the oil is her own.

- Why does she do it when she is disgusted!

I'll tell you:

She

consciously

limits

herself.

("Why", 1991)

A circle of "oil" encircles the poetic space, delineating it as solipsistic, yet it remains ambivalently superpermeable, drawing its adversaries in an intrapsychic, erotic, sadistic manner. Similarly, the author's reemergence after a prolonged silence seems to search for the proper boundary, that demarcation line capable of safely allowing fragments of reality to pass through.

This approach and retreat, evoking a sinister dance of disillusionment, a shift in perspective as if its possessor had inadvertently glimpsed something repulsive, something unnameable, is a characteristic pattern not only of Konstantin Pavlov's literary and social presence, but also of his poetry itself. Frequently, beginnings emerge to unveil the earliest absurdity in the chronicles of a primordial scene from which the self must subsequently withdraw—due to fear, death ("But every resurrection is terrible"), realization of truth, betrayal, and so forth.

If the poetic space is indeed exceptionally vulnerable, admitting precisely the most intolerable sights and experiences—those from which its own author, in a social context, retreats—then autobiographical experience introduces yet another paradox. This sensitivity, vulnerability, and hyper-permeability to the terrifying on the poetic stage historically sometimes manifests as enthusiasm, as overconfidence, potentially verging on idealization of the world close to the author. It was likely with this enthusiasm that he embarked on his journey as a poet barely upon reaching the age of majority. However, just before the publication of his first collection of poems, "Satires," in 1960, something significant occurred:

Decisive for me was 1955. I don't know how it happened, I decided that I shouldn't write the way it is written. I had to find my authenticity and let go of any rules, write whatever came. The years between 1955 and 1956 were an experimental search for oneself and a rejection of academic or school rules on how to make literature (...). It was absolutely clear to me what I had to do. Reason resisted, did not listen to me because of the previous centuries of education. The habits of art prevented me a lot from finding myself. Then came an ease, rather spiritual (the mechanics of the creative process remained as difficult as before), not as a moral

prescription, but as a clear conscience - that I write poems without forcing myself, that I am a poet, because I gave up my ideas for a poet.²

Historically, this withdrawal coincides with Konstantin Pavlov assuming an active and pivotal role in shaping the literary (later also alternative) landscape. This distancing unfolds within the poet's poetic realm but evolves in parallel with his real-life circumstances, serving as a shield against the intrusive oversight of literature by totalitarian power.

In this externally intense environment, a future lyrical self begins to take shape. Konstantin Pavlov has not yet relinquished; this act will unfold systematically and gradually, transforming this withdrawal into a constant state.

In 1960, "Satires" was published, followed by "Poems" in 1965, after which both the publication ban and Konstantin Pavlov's withdrawal took place. The seventh chapter of this work, titled "Group Reality vs. Group Unreality," will delve into the historical context and the significance of these books within the collective reality.

However, this theme became the focus of Konstantin Pavlov's poetry itself, even before he faced a publishing ban. A lyrical self begins to take shape, one that will find no belonging in its own world; its purpose will be withdrawal. External connections with what is conveyed will be severed, devoid of what Bataille terms "erotism" and Freud calls "libido". The trajectory of poetry will unfold like threads dropped by spiders, mapping out this refusal—what the poetic scene will encapsulate won't even be autoerotic or narcissistic, but will be presented in multidimensionality to the point of fragmentation. The traces of withdrawal will be discernible only in the depiction of states.

We witness how the glimpses of an intense inner world exist, but they are beyond the "written" poetic case - this is the three-dimensionality of this poetry - its first plane is historical-political, the second - is on the explicit poetic stage and the third - existential, which carries the ambivalent potency of the first two. In the final plane, we can reach through the

²Pavlov, Konstantin. Interviews. Sofia: Torch, 1995, pp. 101-102.

fragments of dreams, fantasies, desires, images, scenes, indicated in poetry rather by their absence, with the sign “–“ (minus).

The activity in the second plane is almost mechanical - this is the territory of the absurd, of the grotesque, in which "evil presents itself"³– in the words of Mihail Nedelchev:

Today I would be categorical: in the strongest grotesque poetic short texts of Konstantin Pavlov, evil is given directly, it presents itself without the mediation of the lyrical self, without the mitigating sharpness of perception, exposing suggestion and attitude. Evil seems to go unpunished.

The lack of sanctions is one of the bets that must be paid to write about evil. But this lack is represented precisely by the withdrawal - between the second (abdurdist-grotesque) and the third (existential) plan there is no animation, the scene is offered mechanically, not even frozen, but waiting for the occurrence of some catastrophic event (see Chapter 5) , it is demonstrated beyond the affective scope of personality.

This schizoid withdrawal represents a phenomenon in postmodern existentialism, where its manifestations are often identified as absurdism. Samuel Beckett was similarly interpreted, but according to Theodor Adorno, the apparent absurdity should be viewed as a new, previously unknown category of existentialism, as it unfolds through something referred to as a "situation." This perspective positions the subject as inexpressible, transformed by form itself, reaching a language beyond language—a regressive language.

This language, contained in the situation of a specific, grotesque form, we also see in Konstantin Pavlov - his "situation" is a permanent "state" of his entire work, which under various regressive absurdist forms is played out on the poetic stage.

Konstantin Pavlov's inscription in the upper echelons of European modernism occurs through the construction of this poetic stage, where numerous primal states are illuminated. Their remnants appear to communicate with an anti-language that does not articulate presence but rather signifies the absence of potential witnesses; even the lyrical

³Nedelchev, Mikhail. Quote same, p. 21

self is ambivalently subjected to this withdrawal. In this regard, Plamen Antov interprets Konstantin Pavlov's passage as the initial footprint in Bulgarian postmodernism.”

In his work, no more, no less, the collapse of the Cartesian Cogito is ascertained - a collapse that means the reduction of the Normal and the Reasonable to the Pathological and the Unconscious, of Culture to Nature. A particularly essential part of this travesty (on average, say, with Foucault) will be the expulsion of the Hegelian Vernunft in der Geschichte (reason in History) and its replacement by the dark power of the atavistic-libidinal; it - History - will be postulated as a function of the drive, the body, the unconscious, the irrational (the poem "Documentary Narrative of the Voivodship Betsa" 1981).⁴

II. Doubling. Multiplication

To grasp the concept of doubling in Konstantin Pavlov's work, let's begin with some fundamental concepts in psychoanalysis and etiology. By examining various animal species and insects, Roger Caillois concluded that the ability to mimic is not essential for evolution. Mimicry does not serve as a defense mechanism because creatures' ability to mimic or blend into their surroundings doesn't necessarily protect them from harm. In fact, it can sometimes appear as a curious whim of the species, a form of "collective masochism," which may actually create perilous and hostile conditions for survival. So, where does this inclination to merge come from, this desire of species to become part of the world, not of living matter, but of dead matter? As Caillois points out, leaf beetles have no practical use for mimicry because they often consume each other, mistakenly identifying their counterparts as real leaves. Thus, does the environment—whether living matter or dead matter—or individual beings motivate this peculiar desire to merge? In 1946 Melanie Klein's article was published⁵ "Notes on some schizoid mechanisms". It first coined the term "projective identification," which both Klein and Wilfred Bion would later use to describe a particular psychic phenomenon—one in which feelings that are not only imputed, but directed toward a particular a person and he begins to feel as if these experiences are his reality. It is an inextricable and almost unmanageable relationship in which the places of victims and perpetrators can be swapped, similar to the

⁴Antov, Plamen. Quote *ibid.*, p. 135

⁵Klein, Melanie. *Envy and gratitude, and other works, 1946 – 1963*. Free Press ed edition, 2002, pp. 19 et seq.

horizontal reversal of the image in a mirror ("You possess as you would possess a mirror", K. Pavlov). The possession of a mirror can point to narcissism, in which the subject has closed the libido within himself - feelings cannot be invested in another being, because the experience is that such communication does not exist, and in the worse case - that other/s do not exist. However, "Second Loneliness" speaks to something for which narcissism is the starting point. The poetic topicality is in the last verse of the poem - "Ooo...", which sounds a cry, a howl, but at the same time graphically resembles a mouth⁶, similarly depicted in the picture of Fr. Bacon "Study for the Nurse from the Battleship Potemkin" that will consume both its enemies and its loved ones, a cycle, an eternity that will never surrender and relax one end of the tail of the ouroboros. Like a dream dreamed by itself, the lyrical self is captured in this scheme, one might even say that it is captured by a mirror surface.

The real actuality, which the story does not measure, remains in the title itself, because loneliness is "second", as if before it there is another, primary loneliness, for which there is no language to describe it, and this suggestion is outside the bibliographic chronology and the writing of "the first" "Loneliness". In this sense, Konstantin Pavlov deals with the decorations of a wild mirror reflection, but what the text points to is elsewhere, left in the very ellipsis of the poem. This is a recurring motif - it is the last sign, the last verse in Konstantin Pavlov's poems that lead out of this closed circle, this is probably his memory of the future.

Loneliness as "second," however, also unlocks an image of doubling, as if the self has moved into someone else, that it is stuck in an image or reality that is doubled ad infinitum through mimicry, and the attainment of wholeness is impossible. Wholeness is unattainable, it is distributed between doppelgängers who appear in the doubled solitude, in the two little pigs who steal the dead artifact of their mother, in the lookalikes who can seize and possess the self and destroy it. We also see such deliberate doubling in "Alchemists", "Goya's Capriccio", "Paradox", "Exit Always Exists", "My Right Foot", "Before Sunrise" and others.

⁶Bacon, Francis. Study for the Nurse from the Battleship Potemkin (1957). – [online].[accessed 3/12/2023]
<<https://www.artsy.net/artwork/francis-bacon-study-for-the-nurse-from-the-battleship-potemkin>>

Konstantin Pavlov discusses a double, but also a doubled image, which seizes existence and even takes its place. This subject is sometimes called "horror" by Konstantin Pavlov

He is always described as an outsider, as an Other who is the 'traitor double'. It is not just an adversary, but a condition that can force a replacement of the true self and lead only to destruction - thus victims and murderers find themselves laid in the same grave, and the danger of which "Exit Always Exists" suggests that the grave has the outline of a common human body.

Konstantin Pavlov's explicit (written) poetic scene depicts a regressed world - in it the images are anthropomorphic, fragmented, dismembered into separate parts, camouflaged and often brought to the edge of absurdity. The objects of this poetry speak regressively, but they themselves, as it were, mimic themselves to a degree of flamboyance, ostentatiousness, which, however, subordinates the entire camouflaged exterior. The feeling is often one of poetic ventriloquism, which, however, is not concerned with showing off or smiling, but with something much more serious – and that is the paranoid fear that the self may suffer a similar fate, be replaced. Sometimes even such an authority can be deceived - perhaps it speaks with its belly and from there the voices of the swallowed are heard, but still the whale is sometimes forced three decades later to spit farts. In a strange way, things are doubled in the poetic space - it is inhabited by doubles, by couples, by two brothers, by one and the other, by two little pigs, by ambivalent and bipolar compounds and structures, only the old men are five, but their collective image finds its repetition in the five strong types in "Toad". In this world of repetition, doubling has its own specific function – it is done by the author intentionally in the sense of charged with something beyond the compulsive introduction of the same or similar. The latter, as a construction, would be laden with a desire that cannot even break through the poetic structure, then we would have a poetry of guilt and shame perhaps, but not of the absurd. Here, repetition and doubling do not have this value, they are proposed as derivatives of reality, with the ambivalent task of forever depriving the same of the ability to be mirrored in the poetic text. Alexander Kyosev sees this as the opposite of the utopian desire for unity – “...now something contrary to desire is scattering them around the world. This is disgust - that

spasm with which you want to expel from yourself the unbearable. Only to find that it is part of yourself, that it is you, that it is an a-bject, neither subject nor object, neither fish nor leg - something you want to throw away, but maybe it wants to throw you out.⁷

To dwell on the border between what must be discarded and what seeks expulsion (where? within the poetic realm? within the realm of nothingness?) is a precarious endeavor—it challenges poetic language to decay almost to the point of aligning with the state it portrays. This births a verbalization that defies its hostile official audience—it is external yet internal to the poetic stage, teeming with traitors, informers, anthropomorphic murderers, and the like. Even within its self-contained optics, this language must evoke both fear and repulsion, if not outright revulsion. The abominable are not merely named; they are vividly depicted, doubled across numerous texts to the extent that they usurp the self's existence. Language becomes detached from its mythological origins, and power is granted to the one who wields it as sacred. Words themselves become hermits to be scrutinized. It is a language that transcends grammar, surpasses lexical folklore richness, and takes root in the soil of its foundation as a power structure that must reign over the conquered text—it is a language of repetition, yet it is nonetheless transhistorical ("Crash of mythology," "Documentary account of the Voivodeship Betsa").

The materiality of this poetry can collapse at any moment, but it is a tower of Babel in which life is petrified, so we are not talking about the failure of evil here - it duplicates itself, like the amoeba it multiplies and again like it has its false legs⁸. This materiality is presented richly, through the sense of possible touch - these are the kisses of the voluptuous babies with mustaches and beards, of the amoeba that envelops its victim, of the feral decorative fish that turn out to be able to swallow, like a black hole, the matter that contains them surrounds, along

⁷Kyosev, Alexander, "Fragments about Konstantin Pavlov" - In: Konstantin Pavlov in Bulgarian literature and culture. Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 2009, p. 66.

⁸Amoeba (Amoeba, Greek: amoeba, "change") are a genus of unicellular organisms of the subphylum Sarcodina. They have an irregular, constantly changing shape. They move by means of pseudopods (false steps) or flagellum. Pseudopods can be: lobopods, filopodia, axopods or rhizopods. It also captures its food with them, then places it in its cytoplasm to digest it.

with the informer, who is also part of this interior of enacted horror. Thus aesthetic formalism collapses with mythology – madness has gone beyond its shores in the words of Kafka.⁹ However, the doubling of evil operates according to a different principle—it occurs precisely at a formal level. Under its dictate, evil proliferates, dividing and multiplying to the extent of three million Jesusovians. Yet, this is merely its parade uniform; it is susceptible to description, possessing the "biological" ability to mutate. It is the event itself, not matter, that Konstantin Pavlov speaks of. The "Grenzsituation," Jaspers' border situation, has here become immanent, splashing beyond its confines a madness that is repeatedly projected, yet formally projected. Its function is not to afford existence a chance to emerge, but to radicalize its own repeatability.

In this way, doubling in Konstantin Pavlov's poetry fulfills the function of Kafka's schizophrenic mixture of language. The Great Swimmer illustrates this figure of the foreigner in his own language.¹⁰

Leaving the territory of one's own language means inventing a new one, creating one's own words to frame both identity and non-identity, a fused state of belonging. This is the differentiation, the opposition to the otherwise created mimesis in the poetic field.

By 1967, Konstantin Pavlov's poetry collections "Satires" (1960) and "Poems" (1965) had already appeared - the first was purposefully labeled by genre to justify its appearance¹¹, while the second one has already been published with an editorial note that comes to signify the publishing house's "doubt" in the right to its existence. In 1967, when a new book by Konstantin Pavlov was deposited in the publishing house "Bulgarian Writer" - "Singing", it is

⁹"I am mentally ill, tuberculosis is nothing but an escape of my madness beyond its shores," wrote Kafka in one of his letters to Milena - see in Kafka, Franz. "Letters to Milena". Sofia: Siela, 2013.

¹¹"As we have already noted, in 1960 K. Pavlov published his first independent book. It was named by its editor Nikola Furnadjiev "Satires" in order to "pass" under the watchful eye of the censor its actively critical tone for criticism in the spirit of the so-called. then "constructiveness". This is how, out of nowhere, K. Pavlov was classified as a satirist, and this still creates inconvenience in establishing the critical prism through which his work can be adequately examined..." - See. Ilkov, Ani. The Imperfect Genius. Sofia: Polis, 2010, p. 48.

defined as "pasquill". The same was returned by Petar Karaangov. At the time when he was the editor-in-chief of Plamuk magazine (1976), an excerpt of the poem was published, but its complete printing became possible only in 2001.

For Karl Jaspers, a situation can be marked topographically in space – it possesses a perspective attributed to the subject in such a way that he always has a stake in it, whether he is limited or has agency relative to other subjects in the same situation. It manifests itself both sensory and psychologically. The borderline situations in which the subject cannot live without suffering, cannot avoid the guilt of having to die, are both at the same time - a wall we run into and a wall we lean against.¹²

Konstantin Pavlov, however, subverts this notion of existence. In "Singing," the scene is multiplied numerous times, and even the act of multiplication itself is executed in what appears to be a grotesque manner—repetition scarcely exists. Many images are drawn away from themselves, depicted not by their presence in a situation but by their absence from it. We find ourselves contemplating nothingness far more than what unfolds on the fictitious poetic stage.

Parodying a play within a play, insisting that it was multi-voiced, with the llama having several (three) voices to support at once ("the white flame was tenor, the blue-green held iso, and the red held bass or baritone"), resembling the national tribagrenik that Chairman Georgi would decapitate, the village area later mutating into the possession of the entire territory of Bulgaria ("111 or 113 thousand square kilometers"), the self-identification of the work as "Pasqueville"—all of this serves to dismember a jovial spirit, the poet's laughter and serenity, for something that, although sublimated, will ultimately lead him—the author, and us—the audience, to an unclouded joy of life, something different and even opposed to the last thing he wrote about freeing himself from the "tower of Babel of blackness." However, the text of "Singing" reveals the corpus of an illegitimate and totalitarian judicial process, in which the concepts of law and fatherhood are seen in their true, yet inverted reality.

¹²Jaspers, Karl. *Philosophy*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1970, II, pp. 177-179.

III. The non-applicable communication

In *Memoirs of the Future*, Bion, when asked whether there is any scientific proof of what a given human reaction actually brings, replies as follows:

This is a guess; but I am not sure that this is a "pure" assumption, any more than I consider "pure" truth to be accessible simply to human beings like us. Psychoanalysts must be cautious about their claims of scientific truth. The closest a psychoanalytic couple gets to a fact is when one or the other of them has some feeling. Communicating this fact to someone else is a task that has baffled scientists, saints, poets and philosophers for as long as the human race has existed. "Nymphs and shepherds weep no more," "Weep no more, sad springs"—could there be any simpler statements, any simpler grammar or vocabulary? Yet these words had a powerful effect on generations of people.¹³

In *The Idea of Language I*¹⁴ Agamben notes that: "Speech itself connects us with silent things. If nature and animals are always already caught in language and - even when they are silent - do not stop speaking and responding to signals, then only man manages to interrupt - in speech - the endless language of nature and for a moment stand face to face with the mute things. Only for man exists the unexperienced rose—the idea of a rose."

I plant a potato -

budding rose –

they kill me like a witch.

(Drawings. 1989)

In the marginalization to which literature was subjected in the 1960s, when Konstantin Pavlov's first two collections of poems "Satires" (1960) and "Poems" (1965) were published, his poetry seems like a language deliberately addressed to its addressee as something, deprived of life. The satirical does not exist, the claim that it does is actually an attempt to cover up the fact that what is written is a deliberate mimicry of what is swirling in the closed group reality of this age. That is why the meaningful messages are presented as mixed - they are similar to

¹³Bion, Wilfred. *Attention and Interpretation*, London: Tavistock Publications, 1970, p. 288.

¹⁴Agamben, Giorgio. *The idea of prose*. Sofia: Criticism and Humanism, 2020, p. 155.

slogans or cries against the enemies, which, like images, find their fate in the collision, which Konstantin Pavlov will repeatedly call a mirror - in poetry, however, it has the ability not only to convey the horizontally turned image, but also the inverted sound.

Language endeavors to recreate a scene, an event wherein its self-generation is ensnared within the realm of duality—the significance carried by reality is questionable, as it may not only prove false but also transform into lifeless matter that it engulfs. Messages emanating from the external world are contradictory and incomprehensible, primarily serving as instruments of play and seduction with a victim ("Again for the Nightingale," "The Curious"). Interestingly, the escalation of emotion to the point of grotesqueness conveys a sense of mortal indeterminacy. It is predominantly the unnamed "they" who remain as subjects; in their subjectlessness, the self is lost, subjected to acquaintance, invasion, robbery, and killing—events it cannot resist or personify. Hence, it resorts to deconstructing the visible, metaphorizing it with animal, almost primal substance. Consequently, the only apparent escape is through self-inflicted death—it represents not only power but also a concrete, personal contribution to a reality that primarily collects facts in their sense as emotions.

This is how poetry transforms into a space crafted specifically to become something—it is neither mere jest nor grotesquery, as its intention is not to perform unbearable images. Perhaps precisely because of this, it bears the mark of consistency, irrespective of the prolonged period of silence following the publication of Verses. It engages with a reality devoid of meaning, and the aim of poetic language is not to fill the void but rather to distance itself from it. Hence, we can speak of an anti-language that responds to the extreme efforts of group reality to suppress its most vital voices.

In the texts of Konstantin Pavlov, we observe something akin to the invention of inapplicable communication. Its true purpose is to craft a language that safeguards both its author and its reader, creating a specific domain that is secure for those who engage with it, even as it remains representative. When it comes to poetic texts, the function of language can be related to what Melanie Klein calls the paranoid-schizoid position, i.e. the state of mind in which the world is perceived as partial, largely robbed of its possibility of "goodness." What Melanie Klein calls "position" poetry conveys as a fact, but it is precisely this fact that Wilfred

Bion talks about. Knowledge as absolutely attainable is not possible, only parts of it can be transmitted, and Konstantin Pavlov's poetry creates this field, this specific poetic position that transmits ahistorical, not for what should be articulated biographically, but the condition that it cannot be thought at all. In this sense, following the example of Agamben, this poetry is matured much more in the primitive state of mind. According to Bion¹⁵ one of the weaknesses of articulate speech we can observe in the use of the term "omnipotence" because this fact cannot be described. In fact, Bion clarifies, behind the concept of "omnipotence" we must inevitably look for the meaning of "helplessness" or something close to its reciprocity, as Jesus calls out to His Father (Matthew 27:46), but here, Bion adds, if we introduce the concept of "God", we must also introduce "devil". Such "satanism" was demonstrated by Konstantin Pavlov, building his texts from numerous ambivalent pairs of images or entire poems that mirror each other¹⁶. According to Ani Ilkov, the poems "It was the 20th century" and "Freedom March" have such a mirror meaning. Sometimes we have to bear in mind that the images of doubles and imitators do not have a reflective function, however, they often accumulate around an existential meaning so as to take away from its meaning, to codify it as devoid of life. This is the negative topology in Konstantin Pavlov's writing.

Neither the political nor even the religious connotation would help in the reading of this text. Here Konstantin Pavlov introduces this duality, similar to the bipolar couple, in which, however, there is no relation of "plus" or "minus", here the relation is of "plus" - an overinvestment of manic, not messianic confidence, in a collective and collectivized antium. The characteristic "they" is replaced by "we" in order to achieve a state of real crisis - in this situation the text is devoid of polarity, it is closed, there is a complete amalgam in which not only can there be no question of individuality, it cannot be a question of a group either – it is the march of three billion Jesuses who can walk side by side but can never meet. Such is the narcissistic consummation of cannibalism, where the squealing dog, overcome with both happiness and pain, bites its own tail.

¹⁵Bion, Wilfred. *Cogitations*. London: Karnac, 1992.

¹⁶Ilkov, Ani. *Violence and freedom. Between two poems by Konstantin Pavlov - "Walk of Freedom" and "It was the 20th century"*. – In: *Konstantin Pavlov in Bulgarian literature and culture. Studies, articles, essays*. Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 2009, 57 et seq.

Hence, Bion observes that basic words are not singular entities but always exist in pairs. However, Konstantin Pavlov's poetry invents what we've termed anti-language to demonstrate the absence of such duality—three billion Jesus walking corresponds to three billion Jesus walking. The image in the mirror remains unaltered—it is precisely the same. The "mirror" imagery actually embodies the concept of ultimate repetition in which language becomes entrapped.***

The expectation of catastrophe is embedded in every doubling characteristic of this poetry - it is not the self that is doubled, but the all-pervading antagonism that sometimes succeeds in capturing the decisive bipolarity of poetic aesthetics ("Mass Miracle", "Incident"). This catastrophe, even if impossible, should be evoked in the scene as described by Konstantin Pavlov – it is a situation in which the doubles mimic each other and there follows a kind of endless doubling of the doubling, in which there is no primary image. What can be extinguished is the mind itself, placed in the script of a utilitarianism. The solution that can be sought is only in causing a catastrophe, an event that will end the establishment of a paranoid reality where persecuted and persecutors are equally alienated from the self. In this situation, the possibilities, even after the catastrophic event has occurred, are still doubles to "remind many". This is death on one side, where cruelty is played out through non-existent, multiplied and repeated images. The other side of this death is this:

Nobody prints my poems.

Nobody reads them.

They are dangerous –

awaken baser instincts,

corrupt the spirit.

(As he says,

which will appear at the end.)

(The Beautiful in Poetry or the Sacrifice of Ornamental Fish, 1965)

It is a self-imposed death by the upper stage—one where the mind and poetry are left with only the option of lingering behind the scenes, and everything transpiring on stage will bear that cost. This presents the genuine prospect of remaining solely within the realm of hypothesis, as poetry lacks provisions for broadcasting, thus any broadcasting must occur from within, somewhat behind the scenes. What Konstantin Pavlov cautions against is the group situation within literature, which often tends to marginalize or negate the existence of authentic voices..

IV. The Catastrophe. Naming.

As stated above, Konstantin Pavlov's poetry is concerned with constantly pointing out the possible doubling, multiplication, which paradoxically takes away from, rather than adds to, meaning. Rather, the self may be exposed to the danger of a rhythmically occurring external intrusion, to the extent that its actions appear to be substituted, as performed by someone else, as composed of the illegitimate actions of a straw man.

In this sense, what Konstantin Pavlov does is to create his own language, a creative field, which, on the one hand, generates the facts (in Bion's sense) of historical time and the repressiveness characteristic of it, and on the other hand - carries out refusal. The refusal, of course, is of identification and mimicry not simply of the literary canon, but of merging with this external anti-existence, which he begins to describe already in his first collection of poems. The difficulty of this undertaking comes from the fact that he must share the same language with those who exercise a monopoly over the literary form, and moreover, language, like the sun, shines on all equally¹⁷. Thus, placed in the common reality of his group, Konstantin Pavlov not only shared its language, but also formed his own, a derivative, which came precisely from totalitarianism, in order to distinguish himself from it. His poetic language is not only a reaction to the environment, not only the voice of a sociometric group, but also caused by it, insofar as a being outside the context of its group reality cannot exist. Here is how he himself recognizes this phenomenon in relation to his own place:

¹⁷An example of the reverse hypothesis is Samuel Beckett, who began writing in French to free himself, in his own words, from the dictatorship of his native language. However, his work developed bilingually - "Krapp's Last Tape" was written in English, while "Waiting for Godot" - in French.

There was a time when my poems were considered dangerous, and in a direct political sense, although I never intended to criticize a specific political idea. Rather, I made confessions. I am suspected of agitation. The weather was stupid and this was stupid. It will sound impudent, but my poems are dangerous to the untalented, who exist as colleagues only because there were no criteria for comparison. And it was not profitable for them to be compared.¹⁸

Criticizing the political idea would undoubtedly put the poet in a much more risky situation, to a mirror paranoia, from which, however, he is protected, and the proof of this is his own modest idea that poetry is rather a way to register and make sense of reality, than a means of its destruction. In fact, the idea is not so modest in its process of realization - in the words of the poet, it is more a means of adding something to reality, not taking away, taking away is in favor of the meaning, but not the experience, not the state .

As we indicated above, this is about the one-way "we" - the group that strives to maintain its coherence, and such a state is achieved by superimposing the group reality on all its phenomena - from legislation to culture and the language that serves it . In this sense, the group needs its individuals and charges some of them with the tasks of being its messiahs. When the group is in a state of dependence, as already stated, according to Bion, it emits as its leader (messiah) the most unstable and the most psychotic subject, and in this sense, according to the psychic reality in which it exists, the group can be favorable or unfavorable for a given individual. The mystic meets the needs of the group, projecting into him either positive or negative identification with the need for what is to be achieved. The imperfection of genius comes from the very idea of time – every need is met in development, but it is also the anticipation of what is needed or what may bring danger. To accept that Konstantin Pavlov's poetry can be charged with such a role contradicts the position he himself insists on occupying - not that of a messiah, he confines messianism in its psychotic manifestation to poetic texts, this is how: "I do not write "political poetry". At least as an intention – never. As a result - I don't know. But I am horrified that my "pure" poems, written more than 30 years ago, are only now, in a democratic society, beginning to sound "political." Its terrible..."

¹⁸Pavlov, Konstantin. Notes. Plovdiv: 2000, p. 100 et seq.

But the messianic role of this poetry lies in the place it occupies and the manner in which it occurs. Its symbols are extremely powerful – they are designed to both hold the state of catastrophism and, on the other hand, to resist, not succumb to what the group would recognize as its messianic ideology – in the 1960s until the 1980s with a negative sign, then with a positive one. This is how, even in "Poems", Konstantin Pavlov created this catastrophic field, saturated with predatory nightingales, with babies with mustaches and beards, with self-eating dogs. However, this poetic field has, in the words of its own author, a completely different function:

I was excluded from life (and I was the action type), the pain turned me into a contemplator, and - paradoxically - then I saw life, so I saw it, that those who excluded me should regret that an innocent doer became a contemplator-accuser. Taking out two eyes, they create four.¹⁹

Exclusion from life presupposes the poetic representation of Konstantin Pavlov's texts to be in their ability to communicate reality - they are not an action against it, but an opportunity to create a symbolic border. Without this demarcation, literature, and its author himself, would be consumed by his own chimeras. Thus, extreme passivity, the creation of self-enclosed poetic figures and pseudo-questions are a form of acting out reality, a form of real dialogue with it. It is this that can be described as communication much more than endless attempts to impulsively, spontaneously make gestures of rejection of group reality. It is a specific aesthetic focus, an achievement of the mind that Aristotle describes as the moment of catastrophe - when, after long suffering, the hero understands why what happens to him happens.

V. The joke about the father

Konstantin Pavlov's poetry is a counterpoint to an imported deity, its intention is to overcome the merging of the mind with the quasi-mystical presence of totalitarian power. Thus, if the poetic text is the experience of creating multiple symbols to create a space not so much of a "certainty" as of an endurance, we can also think about what the framework of time itself is actually, without claiming that this framework somehow she has changed.

¹⁹Pavlov, Konstantin. Notes. Plovdiv: 2000, p. 100 et seq.

“A symbol, as commonly understood, represents a relationship which is recognized by the group as permanent; in psychosis it represents a relationship between the patient and his deity which the patient feels as permanent.”²⁰

The deity, as explained above, can be one with a reversed sign – ie. the lack of such a deity and the filling of this lack with a certain other foundation or belief - power, belonging to a certain totalitarian system, the ideologizing of a person or policies. Thus, the established relationship with such a monument is constituted as a primitive symbol, which at the same time is doubly charged - through it the group controls its own pursuers, enemies, murderers, but even the control itself is realized negatively - in the form of subordination.

None of this can be attributed to the function that Konstantin Pavlov's poetry has, because at the cost of desacralization, it leads us to the ability not to fantasize, but to withstand reality.

The survival of a poet and poetry in the person of Konstantin Pavlov in itself is already a symbol of extraordinary mental strength. In retrospect, our ability to hallucinate and mimic is not useful, but set at a primary level as a protective ability in group conditions, and the "human animal" is found only in such conditions, even if this means complete isolation, it is again isolation in within some group reality. If these abilities are not deployed according to the needs of the group, then the one who does not possess them is at risk of stimulated self-destruction, because the group's most primal instinct is to preserve itself, even if it goes through contradictory and cannibalistic behaviors: "Everybody wants me to kill myself to make sense of something that was their idea - fear."

Often Konstantin Pavlov's texts sound like a modernist translation of an Old Testament punishment. Can we speak of integration or of a deliberate "dismemberment" of meaning so that its digestion is possible? Because what is "set" from the outside is actually "from within", its destructiveness and menacingness drawn with hyphens is unnamable, despite the strong provocation of associations. This field, which turns out to be empty of meaningful words, can

²⁰Bion, Wilfred. *Attention and Interpretation*, London: Tavistock Publications, 1970, p. 65.

be filled with vulgarities, but instead there are things that should not be born even by naming them. So wide is the range of this poetic thinking that it has the power to contain and indicate the primitive experiences of the mind.

When Freud talks about the death drive, he contrasts it with the life, unity, and knowledge drives. This is the cradle in which the human being is rocked by his desires and instincts, but like the impossibility of the perpetuum mobile, this cradle is destined to stop.

The same phenomenon can be analogously reduced to the human mind and what happens to us while we are still called alive. There is a language of poetry that is "loose"—so broad that it contains within itself not only a prelude to the action, but the action itself²¹. In this sense, hatred is also a part of this action as a primary inherent in the human being, such a language must represent a refuge of stupor, sexualization, meaninglessness, in order to be called a language-action. This, in the case of Konstantin Pavlov, also becomes a problem of the aesthetic and its limits, which here turn out to be the limits not just of poetry, but of oneself²². The aesthetic range is widened to embrace cruelty, catastrophe, and reach absurdity as the limit of the tolerable, beyond which the very flesh of poetry must be subjected to distortion, to deprivation of meaning. It is no coincidence that these are precisely the arguments of criticism against Konstantin Pavlov in the 1960s - "We ask ourselves: are human fantasy allowed such bold limits of cynicism and does not irony, brought to the point of perversion, appear to be an accomplice of vulgarities, which he invents?"²³

Let's look at this criticism in a mirror. She attacks precisely the breadth of fantasy, the fact that themes of perversion are brought up in a cynical or ironic way. In fact, what Konstantin Pavlov is attacked for is the democracy of his language, which becomes a document for the time, on the one hand, but on the other - the poetic world is combined with

²¹Bion, Wilfred. *Attention and Interpretation*, London: Tavistock Publications, 1970, pp. 124-126.

²²This is what Ani Ilkov writes in "The Imperfect Genius. Book about Konstantin Pavlov", p. 87: "Now we must advance in the direction of the aesthetic. Anyone who is even partially familiar with K. Pavlov's work knows that it is here that we will most likely encounter extraordinary difficulties. Because we have in front of us a creator who, in addition to being the author of his artistic work, is, as we have already established, also the author of himself. He, as he himself claims, dreams "on his own script."

²³Petrov, Zdravko. *Satirist's Saturday*. – Flame, 1996, vol. 4, 1996, p. 99.

a reality of censorship, bans, checks and denunciations - externally and internally they are forced to function in a symbiosis in which there is no ambivalence but unity. Poetry is transformed from an act of contemplation to a gesture of accusation because it photographs, mimics in an analog way a perversion. However, the boundaries between mimicry and identification are very complex, so the author himself is cautious.

Now we will digress for a moment and return to the labeling of Konstantin Pavlov's poetry so that it can find some justification for publication - it is declared "satire", he - a "satirist". Behind the insistence on constructive humor is actually laughter, which over the years will regress in its sonority to moaning, to snarling, to monkey talk - clowning, which then suffocates the idea of real speech, to voice the disability in speaking because it happened as lustful suggestion of a monkey mind.

But let's return to Kafka again. For Deleuze and Guattari, here we cannot talk about mimicry, but about the way out of it, because imitation is only apparent, because we do not have repetition in images, a non-parallel and asymmetrical evolution is produced, in which the animal becomes no less human than man, who becomes an animal. We cite this example in order to distinguish what we think is happening with Konstantin Pavlov - the evolution that began in "Satires", in "Memory of Fear" will be constituted even more surely not as a mirror, but as the opposite. With it, the intensities will be decomposed into their constituent parts, we will have to look not for conceptual experiences, but for primitive fragments. If for Kafka becoming an animal is an opportunity to deterritorialize oneself, to differentiate oneself, then for Konstantin Pavlov this becoming an animal will come to mean incest - the ever-greater conquest of the environment by its objects will unfold, the horror will be framed by the image, that nature is actually everywhere - it is not alive or dead, but contained in everything and everything is covered by it. However, we should rely on this possession in its mirroring - if there is any mirroring at all in Konstantin Pavlov's work, it is here. It is poetry that is subject to many prohibitions, it is monitored, edited, censored and labeled as if it contains within itself this irresistible, very strong feeling that all of human history has had to curb through the prohibition of incest - fetishism is practiced externally, historically, it frames the screen of this happening, but behind it we see the poetic scene - it has two properties - to be a container of

this unnameable feeling, but also to keep it separate, to remain only a memory of a primitive fear.

Time in Konstantin Pavlov's poetry unfolds and shrinks in the same way that the allegory to the historical framework now appears, then disappears - this feature can be traced from his first collections of poems ("Do you hear the echo? / - It's close, it's close, it's close/ close! - / a hundred years of the dreamed peak of Communism!") to the later ones ("It's time for a rabbit to fuck./ It's time./ It's time!"). In this caesura between historical and suprahistorical time is also contained the rejection of the semantic function of language - it is stripped down to the expression of gesture, because it must get rid of mimesis - this resistance is the driving force of the verse, in which meanings are detached from each other, to make reference as difficult as possible.

The deprivation of appointment that Agamben presents in *The Idea of Politics* can also be seen in the poetry of Konstantin Pavlov, outside or above the historical coincidence in which he is deprived of the right to be published, but also of the right to work. Limbo in this poetry can be read in two ways - on the one hand, it is the radical decision to forget everything that can be known and find "one's own script". In reality, Limbo can be partially represented as a territory of madness, as an overt or "white" psychosis, a creative discovery of some promised land in which the benefit is that God is "always already forgotten". In poetry, Limbo exists as a condition that, although presented as total, occurs gradually, it is the differentiation, the dismemberment of poetic language to the bareness of a gesture, to the ability to stand at a dangerously close distance to the absence of any reference. In this sense, poetry is not a form of communication any more than language is a form of communication. We will see further on how it is rather a way for the creature to be separated rather than connected in a common situation. Likewise, the language of this poetry should not be understood as communicative, although the absurdity of speaking comes precisely from realism, it develops from there, but its path is the opposite - it comes to show how reason gradually retreats to illuminate the propositional and the preconscious path of fear.

The crazy filling of space with the language of art is usually born in the manic state that the environment in which each moment happens will prove so fertile that it will give birth to a messiah, a leader who will lead it into a new, salvific state. In other words, it is the expectation of a savior who does not exist, but who may never have existed, nor will ever exist again, because his appearance will destroy the expectation. It is interesting how pre-war existential literature and post-war existential literature interpret this expectation differently. For Kafka, as Benjamin points out, this will be a literature that must contain the horror of destruction, this is the horror of an environment ready to self-disintegrate, but defending something it calls "law". For Beckett, and we would add for Konstantin Pavlov, it is the post-war terror of the arrival of some new hope, of leaving the territory of destruction and entering the expectation of salvation. Literature should always be seen as innocent.²⁴

With Konstantin Pavlov, the language is violent from the standpoint of socialist realism and the left avant-garde, but it is also the entirety of a common ideology - the ideology is the fanatical expectation of salvation, either up to and through self-annihilation.

This is the Limbo of language - in it the predecessor is subject to oblivion, the same is contained in the text, in the conditions not of the images themselves, but of the tensions between the images, of the principle of totality, of withdrawal from the content. "Memory of Fear" becomes a response to what is forbidden in the evening hour of schizophrenia, a kind of parapraxis of what should be withheld. Deliberate withdrawal from meaning should not confuse us—in Freud's words, "all our experiences have meaning," which should once again overturn the fears devoid of meaning in the Limbaugh situation.

In the poetry of Konstantin Pavlov, we can find many mirror images, which, however, are apparent - they are repeated and constructed in a contrasting way, not plots or images, but intensities. For us, such is the dichotomous relationship between the poems "Grain" ("Memory of Fear. 1963") and "The Beautiful in Poetry or the Sacrifice of Decorative Fish" ("Poems", 1965). Before considering the stated ambivalence between the two, we will return again to

²⁴Bataille, Georges. *Literature and evil*. Sofia: IK Arges, 1998, p. 15.

"On the Construction of the Great Wall of China." There exists a law that cannot be named, it is in itself the basis for building the wall, but not with the desire, but with the hope that it can be built. Between these intensities there are fragments - voids - this is how the wall was built, in which many breaches could be seen. During construction, the workers became discouraged and began to feel despair, but when they were moved to a new fragment, they began to live again with hope, infected with enthusiasm, that everything begins anew. These discontinuities, discontinuities of meaning, are the only places where the negative theology of law appears—hope turned inward, to the idea of protection, and therefore to the idea of violence, can turn out to be a resource of power. For Deleuze and Guattari²⁵ the intensity along the border forms the "body without organs of literature itself" - however, all reproducibility is attacked from its borders, and it is there - between the border and the image, which is always external, that we should look for the understanding subject, beyond the generalizations and synchronizations of possible experience.

With Konstantin Pavlov, this is the limit beyond which the inner intensity becomes an image with an animal ("The beautiful in poetry...") or vegetable character ("Grain").

What is placed at the limit should find its own function, but it is a function of opposition to the absurd, even though in the text the meanings are driven by it. The animal world, as an instinctive receptor, enters the very body of poetry, but if we follow Deleuze and Guattari, we must see this vector as external to the "body without organs", in any case crossing some border. In "Grain" this border is crossed vertically, as if to show some transcendent function - something that Konstantin Pavlov would not repeat for more than two decades, until the appearance of "Mutual Trial".

Both the transformation of the work into a predatory fish and its growth into a bean that can bear much fruit (or the transformation into a tale) all point to ways of moving away from or passing beyond this boundary of the body of poetry which is delineated by a law, as well as from a canon. These are two texts that are opposite in intensity, delineating two images beyond the border that Konstantin Pavlov warns that we must expect around every corner, in the gaps where the wall cracks - one is that of cruelty that is self-generated and can come out

²⁵Gilles, Deleuze, Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. - University of Minnesota Press, 1987, p. 232.

beyond the body of the text, and the other is of the anxiety that can return as a cry or as a fruitful rain for any "red, black, yellow people". One turns out to be a foundation that Konstantin Pavlov's literature will expand, on which it will plant the roots of its rhizomaticity, while the second will turn out to be a children's tale, one of the empty spaces in which the self is briefly hopeful, only to be already forever forgotten about this feeling within the poetic scene. In "Grain" "the tossed baby stayed with me / because everyone said / that it was my luck" - this baby will see through from time to time, but its image will be mirrored and distant - in the crooked distances of poetry it will say "boo- boo-boo' or 'woo-woo-woo' ('Singing', 'Adaptation') equivalent to the mooing of a happy cow. In "Grain" it is perhaps the only time in which the abandoned children will not be eaten, but will be fed, sheltered in the fragments of the fairy tale - moreover, in this text, in which anxiety grows to a plant, predation and cruelty are placed somewhere far away, where the reproduction of the borderline is cruel enough to refuse to give life to its objects, only in this text it is the opposite. Something female is marked here, a nipple from which anxiety grows, but we must not be confused, for Melanie Klein the female nipple represents the penis and it can be very dangerous, piercing and tearing like predatory piranhas the flesh of those to whom is targeted. In "Grain" the poetic scene is of the anxiety of the abandoned baby who finds a way to feed himself - it is more like that place in the vegetable market in Rome (Forum Holitorium) known as the Columna Lactaria - the Milk Column - where the poor parents could to find milk for their babies, but also where children were abandoned, in the hope that they would be sheltered and fed. However, near this place is also the Church of Pieta, where the painting Caritas Romana ("Roman Charity") was exhibited, which shows a young woman nursing an old man. At the end of the 18th century, Goya will recreate this plot as part of Capriccios - Ni asi la distingue - Capriccio 7, the graphic will depict the following (as specified in the note to it) - "lewd men are so blind that even with glasses they cannot to recognize that the lady they are giving themselves to is a prostitute." "Grain" is probably the only text by Konstantin Pavlov, which preserves without fragmenting a fairy-tale plot. In the very next local text - "Tsar Trajan", the mother will be poisoned, her place with the self - if not exchanged, then at least displaced, and in the market for abandoned babies there will already be a king - an animal.

The last text of the cycle "Remembrance of Fear" is the poem "Tsar Trajan". It contains the legend of the goat-eared king and the boy who, seeing him, must bury his secret in the ground. Now we will return again to the novella "On the Construction of the Great Wall of China" - the metaphor of the wall, which is built permeable, with empty spaces between them, because it operates on the hope and despair that alternate during its construction. Its vectority, however, points inward, its reproductiveness is attacked by its own limit, so that it returns back and forth and finds no opportunity to go outside itself - this bleak secret that can be whispered dying by the dying emperor, we can only imagine in the evening with the window open. Such is the vectority, but with the opposite sign and with Konstantin Pavlov, there, however, the secret is equated with nature, with the environment that absorbs its subjects, forcing them with seduction or pressure to become part of the irrevocable mimesis, of denunciation. The secret is written in the anxiety that rises like a plant or in the socially dangerous poem that incarnates in a predator. However, the process is the same and it requires the overcoming of some power. In Konstantin Pavlov, this power is presented as paranoid - a "Huge /---/ is looming", which in retrospect can be found even in the abductions of the predatory nightingales in "Satires". But this construction of beginning and interruption is more like an intensity of all the poetry of Konstantin Pavlov - a fragment appears and disappears constantly and it is constantly related to the idea of power and origin - begun in "Tsar Trajan", these are the returns of the self to the environment in which he externalizes the following will:

I found my trapdoor with the buried secret
and with wild admiration I turned
the poisonous mushrooms that have sprung up during the night.
I had my mom make me some soup.

But I didn't eat.

She eats.

/For the first time

I was afraid of my own poison./

(Tsar Trajan, 1998)

Whenever the self crosses this line, we question the boundaries of poetry itself—it becomes something permeable and unstable, stripped of meaning in places, and we should not metaphorize the rest.²⁶ Thus, it turns out that, in its overall form, Konstantin Pavlov's poetry functions in a state of epistemological uncertainty - it constantly unsettles the boundaries that can be crossed - from the sensory boundaries of the body ("Paradox", "My right leg") to the boundaries of genealogy itself—that place in which the child kills its parent, the work eats its author, to the extent that the limit is the affective culmination of reproduction—it attempts not so much to delineate the body of poetry as to topologize the existence of its origins.

In 2002, "Zhanet 45" publishing house published a collection of plays by Konstantin Pavlov, which includes - "Birds" (1968), "Sunday Rebellion" (1968), "Daytime Tragedy" (1969), "Old Things" (1969) and "Persephedron" (1993). At the very end of the collection, there is also a notarized statement dated 22.11.2001, in which the author explicitly states that he does not allow the publication of his plays in which "the author's intention is not followed or any textual and other changes'.

VI. Group reality vs group unreality

Nikita Khrushchev's speech "High idealism and artistic mastery - the great strength of Soviet literature and art" from March 8, 1963, speaks of abstractionism, formalism and modernism in general, calling these currents in art terrible and ugly, an ugliness against which

²⁶Valery Stefanov makes a similar clarification in a review of K. Pavlov's book "Emergence": "Two reactions, seemingly diametrically opposed in terms of value orientation, but basically quite similar, usually accompany communication with such poetry. Their common parent is the grounding literalist-allegorical reading. "The boat has been breached" - reads the reader and understandably admires the courage - this is, by all accounts, an allusion to the state. "The boatman is rude" - reads the empowered Torbalanian and is understandably indignant - isn't this one of our chiefs. [...] No one can cancel such a reading, however, it seems to me that K. Pavlov's poetry does not need much of it. She can produce it in her periphery, but it remains far from her meaning center." See. Stefanov, Valery. From lands near and far. – In: Literary Front, 1990.

the Communist Party must be fought by all means. Art, in his words, should be bright and life-affirming, properly reflect the world and bring people "joy and enjoyment." Music, painting, literature, cinema - all together and separately are permissible only by fulfilling this task - they are presented as limbs of the body of the party, which must articulate and present some beautiful reality that is now precisely being built, and in relation to the ugly, equated to the abstract representation of the world "in reverse", should act with rhetorical edification. Khrushchev reminds that, unlike the Stalin period, now this change must be done by peaceful means, but firmly - the will of each person must be in absolute agreement and continuation of the will of the Communist Party. "Without an organizational, guiding principle, not only socialist society, but also no society, no social system, not even the smallest collective of people, can exist"²⁷. In this context, Khrushchev points out that the deviation from this rule cannot affect anyone - if such a violation is present, then we can only talk about either an enemy attitude towards the party or insanity - but even for the insane, he adds, and today there are straitjackets that are put on them to keep them from raging.

Alumni of the party are called to fight against "formalist perversions". Finally, Khrushchev promised that henceforth the party would hold meetings with literary and artistic figures to instruct and criticize deviations from the party line, which should be distinguished from the cult of Stalin's personality and rule.

Khrushchev's speech, as already indicated above, was delivered on March 8, 1963, and in it should appear anxiety and concern about the direction in which Soviet art might take, but at the same time make a clear request that deviations from the new path of the party and its ideology will not be forgiven even by the "insane". This deep concern for the fate of literature in particular was preceded by the awarding of the Nobel Prize for Literature to Boris Pasternak in 1958. It was proposed by the previous laureate – Albert Camus, and the international committee in defense of the Soviet writer included writers such as Jean- Paul Sartre, Bertrand Russell, Ernest Hemingway. Jawaharlal Nehru and Albert Camus personally maintained contact with Khrushchev in defense of Pasternak. He received the Nobel Prize for Literature, but the pressure of the Soviet Party forced him to refuse it with the following short telegram:

²⁷Khrushchev, Nikita. There again.

"Because of the importance that the Nobel Prize awarded to me has acquired in the society to which I belong, I must refuse it. Do not take my voluntary refusal as an insult.'

The awarding of the prize led to organized attacks on Pasternak in the pages of the Soviet press, leading to his expulsion from the Union of Writers of the USSR, and all this was accompanied by a campaign of insulting articles against him in the pages of Soviet newspapers and at meetings of the workers. The Moscow organization of the Union of Writers of the USSR, following the Governing Council of the Union of Writers, demanded the expulsion of Pasternak from the Soviet Union and the deprivation of his Soviet citizenship. A negative attitude towards the novel "Doctor Zhivago" was also expressed by some Russian writers in the West, including V. V. Nabokov, who even forbade his publisher to mention him and Pasternak in the same context. In 1960, Pasternak died of lung cancer.

After Khrushchev's speech, Todor Zhivkov's speech, titled almost in the same way - "Communist idealism - a supreme principle of our literature and art" is not late²⁸. Without calling it the smell of waste places, T. Zhivkov nevertheless declares himself against abstractionism, although it is not clear what exactly he means by this concept. It was understood, however, that one should think about a return from the deviation of Bulgarian art and, in particular, of Bulgarian literature, so that the same can testify faithfully to the party body, whose articulation organ it is.

What happens to Konstantin Pavlov at the same time? In 1962, he submitted the manuscript "Memory of Fear" to the "Bulgarian Writer" publishing house. It includes the poem "White Death" with the "degenerate" (in Zhivkov's words) verses: "On hardened veins/ an icy passion gushes.../ Cut your veins!".

In the speech, Zhivkov sought an account not only of the authors who dared to have such a decadent "sense of the world", but also of the newspapers on whose pages they appeared, as well as their editors, who did not help them enough. For example, Boris Delchev was

²⁸Zhivkov, Todor. Communist idealism - a supreme principle of our literature and art. BKP Publishing House, 1963, p. 4

criticized, who initially told Georgi Jagarov that he would not become a poet, but after the latter started writing "confused, pessimistic poems", Delchev encouraged him.

Recreated through the two key speeches about the socialist society, it looks like 1963. This is also the year in which "Memory of Fear" should be published, but after T. Zhivkov's speech, the proposed collection of poems was forgotten with a silent refusal.

In 1965, Konstantin Pavlov presented a new collection of poems - "Poems" - to the "Bulgarian Writer" publishing house. It happened in the background and after the quoted two speeches and the policy undertaken to strengthen the socialist canon. From now on, Konstantin Pavlov's work is finally separated from the "society to which he belongs". He becomes what in other places of the world, in other groups, Kafka, Beckett, Tarkovsky, Andy Warhol, Francis Bacon will become - a voice from the frontier. This border is the territory of the liminal situation in which scene after scene (it is no coincidence that in Kafka the castle is at the edge of the city, in Beckett the happening is often placed in nothingness and is extratemporal) to peel back the meaning of time in order to introduce not his history, but his anthropology. This will be the kind of knowledge that will remind one of the premonitions one has in tribal reality—of a primitiveness that pushes toward consonance or dissonance with group trepidation. Whatever it is, it asserts itself and possesses everyone, but in different ways.

As early as 1921, in his book Group Psychology and Ego Analysis (banned at various times in most socialist countries), Freud postulated the following:

If today intolerance no longer manifests itself as cruelly and brutally as in past centuries, we can hardly conclude that human nature has softened. Rather, the reason must be sought in the indisputable weakening of religious feelings and the libidinal connections dependent on them. If another group bond takes the place of the religious one - and the socialist one seems to be succeeding in doing so - then there will be the same intolerance of foreigners as in the age of the religious wars²⁹

²⁹Freud, Z. Group Psychology and the Analysis of the EGO. – In: The Norton library, N 770, p. 30.

Such territories of intolerance often arise on the shores of violence that swirls unregulated. Benjamin speaks of its different movements when it is performed as a legal necessity, including as a right of war, and the difference in its articulation when it is by itself. Such is military violence, which directs itself immediately and rapaciously to its goals, but at the same time carries the demand for ceremonial peace, especially when we look at the primitive relations in which state-legal peace is unknown, i.e. violence needs a correlative procedure in which to examine its derivatives, including the situation of peace imposed in one way or another.

Around the same time as Benjamin was writing *Towards a Critique of Violence*, Tseko Torbov began to build his arguments, moving beyond legal positivism to a philosophy of law, interpreting Kant's ideas about the ethical construct of law in general. He explores Marxist determinism to overcome the idea of the economic genealogy of statehood³⁰. In this sense, Tseko Torbov discusses violence, similar to Benjamin, as fulfilling the foundations of the group, but through a Kantian grid - the rule of law cannot be formed as a correlation of power and violence and postulate law as its goal, and vice versa - it should accommodate itself in the idea of law so as to secure the justice of universal laws having their basis in the metaphysical mind. After the September 9 coup, Tseko Torbov lectured at the Military Academy on the theory of the state without censoring his understanding of the development of modern statehood.

Tseko Torbov's state remains only in his teaching - it is the hope for a different group reality, which, above all, should seek its genealogy beyond the authority of the law, but in its foundation. According to Tseko Torbov, it cannot be found in the empty place where the messianic hallucination unfolds - either as one that came from the past, or as a future revelation that has not yet materialized.

With Konstantin Pavlov, as with Beckett, the form of the didactic play and speech is modified - the author sacrifices himself for his work, which has the task of sacrificing himself to messianism - in order to be able to express the cruelty, it must first be absorbed by her. It is

³⁰Torbov, Tseko. *Teaching about the state*. Sofia: LIK, 1995, p. 21.

the expressed, however, that does its Oedipal work – it already elevates the work to the level of separateness, to a state of disassociation from that of human existence in a group where madness is a necessity for survival and a post-war reaction to anxiety. This is how and why messianism is also represented by a "-" sign, but not as the religiosity-atheism opposition - we have already specified that negative theology presents the same belief of an empty space from which salvation will be born. In this situation, however, the self is placed in a state of starvation - it is malnourished by an environment in which everything drains to the hallucination of this salvation, which is particularly prominent in Beckett. In Konstantin Pavlov this empty space, or as Deleuze and Guattari would define it - a body without organs, is filled with multiplicity - the messianic hallucination is represented by a multiple subject that comes to correspond to the "multiple personality", the schizophrenic personality that swarms, but it is more correct to say, divides like an amoeba, because as if only the splitting of multiple images can bear the cruelty, aggregated, it collectivizes the self itself: so the old men are five, and their visions are in themselves mirror images of each other, the fifth old man is devoid of any existential valence.

It is a poetic procedure that presents messianism without a messiah, hunger is not represented here through naturalistic allegories, but through erasing the treatises of existentialism - individual existence will not find itself in an immanent relationship with the universal, the universal will multiply or rather divided like the amoeba so as to lose its Cartesian pathos for good.

The last scene of Goya's Caprichos cycle, the eightieth in a row, entitled "It's Time" ("Ya es hora"), presents four men dressed in ecclesiastical vestments who are caught in a state of some kind of affect - one stretching his arms upwards, and the other three, as if limbs of the same body, have their faces cracked into grotesque grimaces. This final sketch is dedicated to the clergy, which follows to introduce the clerics as part of the hallucination that spawns monsters. It's not said what it's time for - whether to realize the nightmare or to punish the crimes that have already been committed.

With Konstantin Pavlov, there is no such interference in the desires of a hope for justice - the sun is a hundred years old, time is reduced to its absurd insignificance, because monsters were born in its matter. In the poem, all the fragments look at each other, the author quotes himself in order to abdicate the idea of authorship and thus make the idea of some possible paternity a messianic fragment that mutates in its multitude of hypotheses. This is a step beyond existentialism, because the regressive absurdist language should finally destroy the hope of a garden of paradise growing in man himself. Here the work functions beyond itself as an apophatic affirmation of its own value – paternity is beyond the text, it cannot be named because it is the text itself that gives birth to its author.

Bibliography:

- Agamben, Dzhordzho. Ideyata za proza. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2020.
- Adorno, Teodor. Minima Moralia. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2021.
- Antov, Plamen. Mezhdur Ezika i nemotata: Konstantin Pavlov v konteksta na edin politicheski debat – Literaturen vestnik, br. 24, 20 – 26.06.2007.
- Arto, Antonen. Teatarat i negovia dvoynik. Sofia: Sonm, 1999.
- Bart, Dzhon. Himera. Sofia: List, 2017.
- Batay, Zhorzh. Erotizmat. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 1998.
- Batay, Zhorzh. Literaturata i zloto. Sofia: IK Arges, 1998.
- Bahtin, Mihail. Tvorchestvoto na Fransoa Rable i narodnata kultura na Srednovekovieto i Renesansa. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1978.
- Beket, Samyual. V ochakvane na Godo. Sofia: Fama, 2017.
- Benyamin, Valter. Kayros. Sofia: Izd. Kritika i humanizam, 2014.
- Benyamin, Valter. Kam kritika na nasiliето. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2022.
- Benyamin, Valter. Ozarenia. Sofia: Izd. Kritika i humanizam, 2000.
- Blansho, Moris. Predstoyashtata kniga. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2007.
- Bion, Uilfred . Opit v grupi. Sofia: Balgarska psihiatrichna asotsiatsia, 1999.

Ganev, Venelin, Karaneshev, D. Rolyata na darzhavnata organizatsia v obshtestvenia progres i demokraticното upravlenie. – Demokratichen pregled, 1905 g. № 5–6.

Gradev, Vladimir. Prochiti na Dante, Ad. Sofia: Fondatsia „Komunitas“, 2023.

Delyoz, Zhil. „Razlichie i povtorenie“, Sofia, IK „Kritika i humanizam“, 1999.

Delyoz, Zhil, Gatari, Feliks. Kafka. Za edna malka literatura. Sofia: SONM, 2009.

Delyoz, Zhil, Gatari, Feliks. Shto e filosofia. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 1995.

Dzhagarov, Georgi. V zashtita na poeziyata – Septemvri, kn. 8/ 1957, s. 150–151.

Dimitrova, Irma. Sebesahranenieto v alhimichnia kazan – Literaturen vestnik, br. 12, 29.03 – 4.04.1993.

Doynov, Plamen. Alternativniyat kanon: Poetite. Sofia: Nov balgarski universitet, 2012.

Doynov, Plamen. „Sluchayat „Stihove“. Ot patosa na razmrazyavaneto kam postmodernata poezia (1962-1966)“. - V: Literatura na sluchaite. Ot „Tyutyun“ do „Hayka za valtsi“. Sofia: Siela, 2017.

Dudevski, Hristo. Eksperiment ili... - V: Narodna armia, br. 5283, 10.10.1965.

Zhivkov, Todor. Komunisticheskata ideynost – vissh printsip na nashata literatura i izkustvo. Izdatelstvo BKP, 1963.

Zarev, Panteley. Aktualni vaprosi na savremennata literatura. – V: Novo vreme, 1966, kn. 5.

Ivanov, Vyacheslav. Anketa. V: Dialog, karnaval, hronotop. Zhurnal nauchnykh izyskaniy o biografii, teoreticheskom nasledii i epohе Bahtina, 1997, br. 1

Igov, Svetlozar. Dve pisma. – V: Prilep, 1990.

Igov, Svetlozar, Spomen za straha ot Konstantin Pavlov. – V: Konstantin Pavlov v balgarskata literatura i kultura. Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 2009.

Ieroham, David. Zigmund Froyd. Stsenichno i prezhivelishtno. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2023.

Iliev, Stoyan, V: Prilep, 1990, br. 2, s. 5.

Ilkov, Ani. Nesavarsheniyat geniy. Kniga za Konstantin Pavlov. Sofia: Polis, 2010.

Ilkov, Ani. Konstantin Pavlov i negovata poezia – V: Pavlov, Konstantin. Persifedron, S., 2001, s. 9–19.

Ilkov, Ani. Hyubrisat na moralnata pamet – Literaturen vestnik, br. 5, 6 – 12.02.2002.

- Kafka, Frants. „Pisma do Milena“. Sofia: Siela, 2013.
- Kafka, Frants. „Izbrano“, Sofia: Fama, 2007.
- Kyosev, Aleksandar, „Fragmenti za Konstantin Pavlov“ - V: Konstantin Pavlov v balgarskata literatura i kultura. Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 2009.
- Lametri, Zhulien. „Chovekat-mashina“. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1981.
- Levi-Stros, Klod, Divoto mislene. Pleven: EA – Evrazia Abagar, 1994.
- Levi-Stros, Klod, Struktura na mita. Sofia: SA, 1994.
- Liotar, Zhan-Fransoa. Postmodernata situatsia. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1996.
- Luman, Niklas. Vavedenie v sistemna teoria. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2008.
- Manin, Yu. I. Matematika kak metafora. Moskva: MTsNMO, 2008. [onlayn].[poseten 19.12.2023] <<https://math.ru/lib/files/pdf/manin.pdf>>
- Markov, Georgi. Zadochni reportazhi za Bulgaria. Sofia: Profizdat, 1990.
- Энафф, Marsely Chelovek-mashina: Marsely Энафф. Markiz de Sad: Izobrenie tela libertena (ec-dejavu.ru).
- Nedelchev, Mihail. Belezhki za sotsioliteraturnoto bitie ot 70-te i 80-te godini na Konstantin Pavlov – V: Konstantin Pavlov v balgarskata literatura i kultura. Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 2009.
- Nedelchev, Mihail. Slovo na vecherta v chest na petdesetgodishninata ot rozhdenieto na poeta Konstantin Pavlov – Pernik, 19 may 1983 g. – Prilep, br. 2/1990, s. 33–48.
- Penchev, Boyko. Progresisti i konservatori. Sofia: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, 2023.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Satiri. Sofia: Balgarski pisatel, 1960.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Stihove. Sofia: Balgarski pisatel, 1965.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Stari neshta. Izbrani stihove i kinostsenarii. Sofia: Balgarski pisatel, 1983.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Poyavyavane. Sofia: Profizdat, 1989.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Agonio sladka. Sofia: Fakel, 1991.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Ubiystvo na spyasht chovek. Sofia: Ingraf, 1992.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Elegichen optimizam. Sofia: Fakel, 1993.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Repetitsia za gala tants. Sofia: Literaturen forum, Biblioteka „Balgarska sbirka“, 1995.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Otdavna.... Plovdiv: Zhanet 45, 1998.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Spomen za straha. Pleven: EA, 1998.

- Pavlov, Konstantin. Nadpyavane. Sofia: Anubis, 2001.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Piesi. Plovdiv: Zhanet 45, 2002.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Zapiski 1970 – 1993. Plovdiv: Zhanet 45, 2000.
- Pavlov, Konstantin. Intervyuta. Sofia: Fakel, 1995.
- Sugarev, Edvin. Konstantin Pavlov, urungelite i ururungelite. V: Konstantin Pavlov v balgarskata literatura i kultura. Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 2009.
- Traykova, Elka. Opit za portret na edno pokolenie. – Vek 21, № 4, g. 3.
- Torbov, Tseko. Osnovniyat printsip na pravoto. Pravo i spravedlivost. Sofia: Vek 22, 1992.
- Torbov, Tseko. Uchenie za darzhavata. Sofia: LIK, 1995.
- Unikat, Donald. „Igra i realnost“, Izd. Lik, Sofia, 1999.
- Fadel, Moris. Izkustvo i zlo – V: Konstantin Pavlov v balgarskata literatura i kultura. Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 2009, str. 165 – 170.
- Flober, Gyustav. Izbrani tvorbi v chetiri toma. T. 3. Salambo. Izkushenieto na sveti Antoniy. Sofia: Narodna kultura, 1984.
- Fuko, Mishel, Genealogia na modernostta (Antologia ot tekstove), UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, Sofia, 1992.
- Froyd, Zigmund. Malkiyat Hans - Analiza na fobiyata na edno petgodishno momche. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2011.
- Froyd, Zigmund. Traur i melanholia. – V: Chetiri osnovni teksta. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2018.
- Froyd, Zigmund. 5-te sluchaya: Predsedatelyat Shreber. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2012.
- Froyd, Zigmund, Chetiri osnovni teksta. Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2018 g.
- Froyd, Zigmund, Otvad printsipa na udovolstviето, Sofia: Izd. Nauka i Izkustvo, 1992.
- Froyd, Zigmund. Estetika, izkustvo, literatura. Sofia: UI „Sveti Kliment ohridski“, 1991.
- Hitler, Adolf. Moyata borba. Sofia: Izd. Vesi. 2016.

Khrushchyov-nikita-vysokaya-idejnost-i-khudozhestvennoe-masterstvo-velikaya-sila-sovetskoy-literatury-i-iskusstva-sp-novyj-mir-br-3-1963-g.

Adorno, Theodor, Notes to Literature, Columbia University Press, 2019. Adorno, Theodor. Trying to understand Endgame. – [online].[accessed 11/27/2023]https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/4946900/mod_resource/content/1/TRYING%20TO%20UNDERSTAND%20ENDGAME%20-%20ADORNO.pdf

Agamben, Georgo. Infancy and History: On the Destruction of Experience. Verso. 2007.

Amir, Danna. Cleft Tongue: The Language of Psychic Structures, Routledge, 2014.

Benjamin, Walter, Illuminations: Essays and Reflections, Schocken Books, 1969.

Benjamin, Walter , Scholem, Gershom. The Correspondence of Walter Benjamin and Gershom Scholem, 1932–1940. Harvard University Press, 1992.

Bion, Wilfred. Attention and Interpretation, London: Tavistock Publications, 1970.

Bion, Wilfred. Two Papers: The Grid and Caesura. Rio de Janeiro: Imago Editora. 1977b.

Bion, Wilfred. Cogitations. London: Karnac, 1992.

Caper, Robert. Bion and Thoughts Too Deep for Words: Psychoanalysis, Suggestion, and the Language of the Unconscious. Routledge, 2020.

Caillois, Roger. Mimicry and Legendary psychastenia, JStore, October Vol. 31 (Winter, 1984).

Condon, William, Sander, Louis. Synchrony demonstrated between movements of the neonate and adult speech. Child Development. – In: Jstor, 1974, Vol. 45, p. 456–462.

Dubuffet, Jean, Asphyxiating Culture and other Writings. New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 1986.

Edelman, Gerald. Second Nature Brain Science and Human Knowledge. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006.

Feldman, Matthew, Mamdami, Karim (edit.). Beckett. Philosophy. Sofia: University Press “St. Kliment Ohridski”, 2012.

Gilles, Deleuze, Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation. University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

- Gilles, Deleuze, Guattari, Felix. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- Guntrip, Harry. *Schizoid Phenomena, Object-Relations, and the Self*. Karnac Books. 1968.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Theory and Practice*. Beacon Press. 1988.
- Isaacs, Susane, *The Nature and Function of Phantasy*, *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 29, 1986, 73-97.
- Jaspers, Karl. *Philosophy*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Klein, Melanie. *Envy and gratitude, and other works, 1946 – 1963*. Free Press ed edition, 2002.
- Labatut, Benjamín . *La Ville Morte*. – In: *Granta*. [посетен 19.12.2023] <<https://granta.com/la-ville-morte/>>
- Malinowski, Bronislaw, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* – Routledge, 2001.
- Meltzer, Donald, Williams, Meg Harris. *The Apprehension of Beauty: The Role of Aesthetic Conflict in Development, Art and Violence*. 2008.
- Miller, Ian. *On Minding and Being Minded: Experiencing Bion and Beckett*. Routledge, 2019.
- Moreno, Jacob. *Therapeutic Vehicles and the Concept of Surplus Reality*. *Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama and Sociometry*, 1965 18(4).
- Oakes, John, „In the realism of the unreal: insane writings“, *Four Walls Eight Windows*,
- Reiner, Annie. *Bion and Being: Passion and the Creative Mind*. Routledge. 2012.
- Sechehaye, Marguerite. *A New Psychotherapy of Schizophrenia*. New York: Grune&Stratton, 1956.
- Shaw, Brent D. (February 2001). *Raising and Killing Children: Two Roman Myths*. *Mnemosyne: A Journal of Classical Studies*. Fourth Series. Brill. 54
- Warhol, Andy, Hackett, Pat. *The Andy Warhol Diaries*. 1989.

Publications on the topic of the dissertation:

1. Georgieva, Marianna. *Hudozhestvenata fantazia i fantaziyata na ludostta – vazmozni dialozi*. – V: Noemi Stoichkova, Maria Ruseva (sast.). *Literaturni formi na granitsata mezhdu dokumentalno i hudozhestveno*. Sofia: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, 2022, s. 305 –310.

2. Georgieva, Marianna. Poeziyata na ludostta i endokrinnata mrežha na chuvstvata. V: Noemi Stoichkova, Yanitsa Radeva, Martin Kolev (sast.). Glasove na drugostta. Sbornik s dokladi ot nauchna konferentsia s mezhdunarodno uchastie, provedena v Sofiyskia universitet „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, 2–3 noemvri 2022 g., s. 378 – 382.
3. Georgieva, Marianna. Za modela kato lipsa, okolo koyato se govori. V: "Mezhdunaroden filologicheski forum", tom 12, Sofia: Fakultet po slavyanski filologii, 2023, ISSN 2535-1354 <https://philol-forum.uni-sofia.bg/on-the-model-as-an-absence/>
4. Georgieva, Marianna. Navremenniyat otkaz ot smartta. V: sp. LIK, april 2023, str. 14 – 19.

Contributions of the dissertation:

1. This dissertation contains a synthesis of Wilfred Bion's ideas about group reality, which aim to present Konstantin Pavlov's work in the context of post-war literature as the voice of a certain group.
2. The work attempts to read Konstantin Pavlov in the context of European modernism and, in particular, the work of Franz Kafka and Samuel Beckett.
3. The work offers the first attempt at a detailed and in-depth analysis of Konstantin Pavlov's poetry through the prism of the conceptual psychoanalytic apparatus of Sigmund Freud, Melanie Klein, Wilfred Bion, Donald Meltzer.
4. The paper analyzes the work of Konstantin Pavlov and through the suprahistorical notion of catastrophism and repetition proposed by Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, Giorgio Agamben.
5. The work examines the poetry of Konstantin Pavlov and through the conceptual and philosophical prism of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari.
6. The paper examines in depth the topic of authorship in the sense of Michel Foucault's text "What is an Author" and presents a new reading of Konstantin Pavlov's poetic discursiveness.