

REVIEW STATEMENT

on the monographic study

„THE JOKE ABOUT THE FATHER IN THE KONSTANTIN PAVLOV’S GROTESQUE
WORLD”

by

Marianna Dimitarovna Georgieva

candidate for a educational and scientific degree: “Doctor”
in the field of higher education 2. 1. Philology, doctoral program “Bulgarian literature” –
Bulgarian literature after 1989

by

Prof. Plamen Antov, DPhil

Institute for Literature – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

(Abstract)

1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1. **Formally speaking**, Marianna D. Georgieva’s dissertation has exactly 200 pages and consists of an Introduction, six chapters, an Epilogue-conclusion and a real Conclusion, plus a mandatory Bibliography and a short Appendix of two facsimiles. Between the Introduction and the Conclusion, as expected, there is a partial mirror repetition of the main theses. (They are set out even more essentially in the Abstract.)

On the substantive side, the dissertation has a rather non-linear, point-focused composition. This does not mean a lack of coherence, but this coherence is not external, formal, but essential, in particular methodological, possessing an internal correspondence with its subject. This alignment is an important part of the overall strategy. It is around him that I will develop my criticism.

2. Outlining the general “external” parameters of the dissertation, I omitted the title. I have omitted it because it does not belong to them, but sends us into the very heart, in medias res, inasmuch as it is not analytical, but contains a metaphor. (Such metaphors are also the titles of some of the chapters.) This largest, title metaphor unites the two discursive spheres that make up the dissertation narrative – the primary and the secondary, i.e. the subject and the methodological: poetic and theoretical-critical. But in its origin this metaphor is critical. But even more so, as we will gradually begin to understand in the process of reading – methodological, insofar as it comes from the operational jargon of a very specific division in modern psychoanalysis – Wilfred Bion’s group psychoanalysis.

Usually when I have to work in this genre of administrative science review, I ignore the biographical details in favor of a close reading of the dissertation itself. – But in the present case, a departure from this principle is necessary, because the previous life and professional experience of the author has a determining imprint on the very essence of the dissertation. As we know from the attached CV, she is, among other things, a practicing psychotherapist at the Bulgarian Society for Psychoanalysis and Group Analysis, of course – with the relevant theoretical training. This circumstance completely predetermined, at least in this case, her attitude to literature, to the literary sphere in general and to Konstantin Pavlov’s poetry in particular.

3. And with that, I have already named the first main feature of the dissertation – its **dual discursivism**, the dual subject. Its focus is simultaneously on the work of Konstantin Pavlov, but also on the methodological approach to it as the adequate key for his reading. Group psychoanalysis as a theory and practice here ceases to be just a passive operational toolkit, but enters into an active, equal dialogue with its subject. I would say that the attention between them, between object and method, is parity, and the relationship between them is complementary, and discoveries erupt when they meet, on the border of the two fields.

Even if sometimes it seems to us that at certain moments the method rapes its subject, in its entirety the approach undoubtedly proves its adequacy to Konstantin Pavlov's work and certainly wrests new meanings from it. At the same time – something I especially want to highlight – meanings of a very great depth. That is, which lie deeply beneath his easy reading through the prism of the dissident resistance in the era of Bulgarian totalitarianism, although they represent an important part of the argumentation of such a reading.

The thesis unfolds by interfering two discourses. But it does so in a very complex way, on different levels. – What do I mean? I'll just point out two things.

The first is that the approach itself assumes such interference and even identification (psychical rather than psychological, and hence verbal) between the poetic Self and the poet Konstantin Pavlov himself, the real, psycho-social (i.e. natural) and politically determined author. In this common joint sphere of interference operate category-forces such as Memory, Remembrance, Desire, Eroticism, Trauma; such as Catastrophe, Fear, Horror; as the realm of the rational/conscious and the realm of the irrational/unconscious, of Meaning and lack of Meaning... **The authorial, psycho-socially determined figure of K.P. stands between the “external” totalitarian, i.e. potestarily determined reality, repressive by its very nature, and “his” creativity. His double-mediator within the parameters of creativity is the poetic Self** (when I talk about K. Pavlov's poetry, I categorically refuse to use the generally accepted term “lyrical Self”). Thus, poetry itself as a corpus of texts, an object of research and analysis, appears as a materially fixed “voice” of a referential primary reality, in which “external”, political, and “internal”, psychic, layers are superimposed, which the second layer simultaneously appears, for its part, as an active recoding factor. (The three-phase mechanism outlined in this way is a part of the psychology of literary – and not only literary – creativity in general. But the truth is that precisely in the case of K.P., and even more so in the methodological-operational key chosen by the author, it works in an absolute way.)

On the other hand, the secondary metadiscourse to the thus outlined primary situation is internally split. First, the methodological-operational toolkit, nominally represented by a long list of names of psychoanalytic theory and practice (in the Contributions to the Autoreferate they are listed in the following order: Sigmund Freud, Melanie Klein, Wilfred Bion, Donald Meltzer; other shadows also hover here, like Lacan's).

Also key is the presence of other philosophical paradigms of the 20th century aimed at making sense of the late-modern catastrophism and collapse of humanism: Frankfurt neo-Marxists such as Benjamin and Adorno, Agamben, Deleuze/Guattari's schizo-theory, M. Foucault's theory of authorship. But along with this broad-spectrum and multi-layered toolkit, and a second sub-discourse introduced in the dissertation, where the K.P.'s work is typologically juxtaposed with that of Beckett and Kafka, there are occasional references to names such as Francis Bacon, Warhol, Tarkovsky...

4. All this tells us that the dissertation wants to include K. Pavlov's work in a broad context – In the synchronic context of the late, crisis modernity of the 20th century.

In this way, the dissertation is a continuation of **a central line in the critical reception** of this poetry after 1989, through which the aforementioned displacement from the narrow “Bulgarian”, “dissident” contexts and its projection into the broad scale of European

intellectual movements in the second half of the twentieth century. Insofar as this is a basic, leading, tendentiously asserted cause of my own studies of Konstantin Pavlov's poetry, it is understandable that it is through this key that I will read the present dissertation, here I will seek and discover its ambitions.

2. INTERPRETATION: INCLUSION IN A CENTRAL LINE OF READING. – THE LANGUAGE

5. So, in the outlined perspective, Marianna D. Georgieva's dissertation, in addition to demonstrating the possibilities of the psychoanalytical approach to "private" literary facts, represents a next step in a line of reading of Konstantin-Pavlov's poetry after 1989, which I personally I consider it central (including because of my own belonging to this line). Namely, the already mentioned move away from the purely political, "dissident" ("Bulgarian" itsown) approach, common around the divided year of 1989 (top text here are the "fragments" of Al. Kyosev, considering the poetry of K.P. as an allegory of the disintegration of the late socialist social/political body), at the expense of its inclusion in the pan-European context of late/crisis Modernity and the debate about the "reverse" counter-energies of the Enlightenment, about the dark shadows in the deep "unconscious" of the Enlightenment Logos. As the beginning of this second line, I consider a small but conceptually important "review" by Svetlozar Igov on the occasion of the belated publication in 1998 of the "lost" manuscript *Memory of Fear* from 1957: the poetry of K.P. as a collapse of Language in himself in the form of torment, of animal roaring, howling, screaming, snarling; or "wilding" of Language, according to Igov's strong critical metaphor.

In this second line, my own reading of K.P.'s poetry is placed, but projected in the global narrative of modernity, in the common sharing of the crisis experience in the second half of the twentieth century – as a mode of its articulation that can only be negative, outside the Logos, blocked, reduced to its own negative, to aglossia – collapsing into natural muteness. Projected on this scale, K.P.'s poetry (besides standing next to synchronous currents between the 50s and 80s such as existentialism and poststructuralism) is also a traumatic, highly inhibited articulation of the crashed enlightenment Logos. In particular, a radical negation of communicative reason, selflessly defended by Habermas. (Here I summarize my own thesis, developed in progress in a series of my articles.)

6. Generally sharing this approach, Marianna D.G. has found her own way. She makes her **own contribution** which is extremely productive. She has chosen to read K.P.'s work in typological proximity to **Kafka** and **Beckett**, emblematic figures of the late modern crisis (in the latter reaching catastrophism). This decision is bold, but it has its deep justification in the general existential situation in which the "inner self" of K.P. exists, forced and with disgust.

And here we come to the second, basic reason for such parallelism – the interference of poetry and biography. Poetry, understood in the broad sense of creativity as a specific "language" – as a self-articulation of the "inner" Self, as a reflection of one's own existential experience. This is very characteristic of K.P., but in a negative, upside-down way – in the form of a complex play **within the modes of Language**. (Existential loneliness in the middle of a broken society, which the dissertation calls "secondary", as loneliness in language, in contrast to primary, which is before language – "external", forced.) But the two plans – the forced "external" social loneliness and the "internal" voluntary loneliness in language – are not disconnected. The "outside," the hideous, is not simply named; it is depicted, represented performatively in the very structure of language, which has lost its two main functions – the

pictorial and the communicative: to refer to some “world” and to connect in society. Or more precisely, it implements them in a negative way.

The juxtaposition with the figures of Kafka and Beckett corresponds to these two lost functions of Language. It makes this transition from outside to inside – from “external” social loneliness as a regression to the animal (Kafka) to “internal” loneliness in a minimized Language (Beckett). This means sinking deeper and deeper into Language – reaching its absolute state, which is its negative state. The dissertation calls this the invention of a new, own language.

3. THE THREE-PHASE STRUCTURE OF THE MODEL

I will now return to the three-phase structure of the model that I sketched at the beginning to see how it demonstrates the possibilities of the psychoanalytic method.

7. This whole linguistic plot is only an essential expression, a reflection of the “external” biographical plot that the dissertation – through discursive interweaving – narrates, recalling vicissitudes surrounding the poet’s difficult, highly inhibited publicity before 1989. The connection flows on a deep, *own existential* level, through a basic concept of Jaspers – “border situation” (*Grenzsituation*): the late, radical existentialism of the 20th century, part of the general postmodern worldview, which brings K.P. closer to Beckett (through the Adorno’s reading).

But this personalistic, biographical plot, reflected in Language, has, in the opposite direction, its own “external” (even more external) projection in a sociopolitical reality, thus appearing as a kind of mediator, a carrier of meanings. This transference of meanings takes place on a psychic level, in the mode of an “inner” (psychic) Self, which is both psycho-biographical and “lyrical” (in the conventional sense of the term), placed in a common, highly relative field with a fuzzy boundary between the “external” psycho-biographically determined figure of the poet Konstantin Pavlov, residing in a certain sociopolitical reality, and his “internal”, properly poetic (linguistically determined) “I”, which ultimately, through a series of displacements, produces a *linguistic image* of this outermost reality.

In the long, intricately structured chain of reflections/displacements, this linguistic image will appear in an inverted, *negative way*.

8. I already noted the non-linear construction of the dissertation; we can also define it as collage under the “hat” of the chosen, unifying approach.

But this collage is insidiously teleologized precisely in the mode of **Language**, as an **interference of its two functions**, resp. as connecting/interfering the two plans in the sense highlighted above – the “external” (social, political in itself) and the “internal” (individual-psychic, before it becomes articulatory, linguistic in itself). In its compositional unfolding, the dissertation follows, more precisely constructs a theoretical plot, which is referential in itself: the stages of a naming are traced, the internal (linguistic, articulation) mechanics of this naming are investigated, which is not by adding, but by *taking away* meaning, in a negative way. It is in the act of this **negative naming** that the “outer” world, the totalitarian social-reality, connects/interferes with the “inner,” the individual-psychic. The own, newly created language-anti-language originates from the “external” reality (or “situation”) in order to distinguish itself from it.

This act in all its complexity is examined as mental, through the lens of the psychoanalytic approach, in particular through the group psychoanalysis of Bion (partially M. Klein as well), in which the personal psycho-biographical code is applied to poetry as a form of dialogue with the reality that is highly catastrophic.

In the chosen psychoanalytical approach, poetry is read as a transboundary sphere; in the specific case – transcendentalization of Horror from the sphere of personal psychic experience (where it “came” from outside, from a specific political reality).

Through it, in the act of reaction, the border situation (*Grenzsituation*) became immanent in Konstantin Pavlov (p. 47).

9. The chosen approach gives priority to the “inner” mental person in the poetry of Konstantin Pavlov, who tends to merge with the real author. This identification is carried out including through numerous references to the poet’s personal testimonies (notes, interviews, surveys), through which he, figuratively speaking, lies down on the psychoanalytic couch. This understanding is particularly intensively revealed in the two top chapters – fourth and fifth. In this psycho-biographical key, poetry is seen as a survival strategy in an unflattering, hostile environment. Thus, a **two-way co-relevance is achieved between subject and method**, which mutually presuppose and justify their relevance, without being able to distinguish any of them with primacy: the psychoanalytic method grew organically from the poetry of Konstantin Pavlov in all its inseparability from the “external” sociopolitical context, is contained in a hidden, implicit way as a *possibility* in it, and it itself, for its part, has its adequate – or at least *its possible* – “explanation” through this method.

Hence the fundamental relevance of the psychoanalytic approach, for example the quote from Bion about the “Darwinian” principle of “survival” of the fittest in a given group (p. 124). In which the “group,” if I understood correctly, is understood as some kind of a “laboratory” reduction of society, and more precisely of the totalitarian society with its repressiveness towards the individual, in the face of the Power.

10. This plot/model is **compositionally represented** as follows.

The main theoretical narrative is interrupted by periodic exits to the specific political situation in the era of “mature” socialism in Bulgaria between the end of the 1950s and the end of the 1980s, condensed through documentary evidence (including official party documents). This situation contextualizes a parallel, biographical-behavioral narrative, also based on documentary evidence: notes, interviews, statements of the poet, which supports and complements the main, literary-theoretical one. In its even more outer peripheries, the collage fabric integrates parallel and typologically similar behavioral stereotypes from the cultural history of the 20th century (especially in the Epilogue), and most often the connection between them is precisely on a collage, fragmentary-associative principle instead of a linear-causal one. The switching of the discourses is sharp, with a specific pulsation noticeable: after a highly concentrated “theoretical” section, usually separated by asterisks, there follows a small segment of concrete, empirical-factual inclusion – a detail from the biography of the poet and his books/manuscripts, and sometimes an opening to parallel, typologically similar events in European culture of a creative or psycho-medical nature. (Apart from everything else, this collage mode of structuring, the internal compositional-structural pulsation, has a refreshing effect on the reader.)

4. METHOD AND SUBJECT: CRITICISM

11. This functional cooperation of method and subject formats the broad parameters of the dissertation, but also its structure. K. Pavlov's poetry is paralleled with some psychoanalytic experiments (e.g. p. 50) in order to reveal through analogies the hidden mechanisms of its functioning, just as psychoanalytic etiology reveals deep structures and motives of behavior. The two spheres co-form a common research field, saturated with meaning. And even if it sometimes seems to us shrouded in nebulosity, it itself is part of the

deep ground of meaning in the above-explained *negative* mode of logos articulation, inherent in the debated problem (an important point that I will especially emphasize).

Of course, “retail” we can have our claims to one or another decision. For example, to the overly close, sometimes literalistic adherence to certain postulates and concepts in the theory of group psychoanalysis of W. Bion. Even allowing for my own incompetence in the details of the theory and practice of group psychoanalysis, the connection sometimes seems to me problematic, speculative. There is an automatic imposition of the theoretical paradigm on K.P.’s poetry in search of correspondences, and deviations are easily justified through dialectical gripes. For example, statements like this, in conjunction with Jaspers’ concept *Grenzsituation* – that K. Pavlov turns the concept upside down: in this way (as is Popper’s critique of the dialectical method) any object can be attached to any theoretical formulation.

The whole problem of belief in leadership, central to Bion, but somehow forcibly imposed on Constantine-Pavlov’s poetry (chapter two), also seems not entirely convincing to me. The issue of guilt, introduced through Bataille/Fadel (same chapter), is somewhat like that.

There are also some unnecessary references to psychoanalysts which can only be superficially and incidentally referred to the subject under consideration.

12. But I want to point out right away that these deviations do not distort the general perspective. (Every study, on closer inspection, has its minor flaws, even if we ignore the inevitable subjectivity of any criticism.)

Much more are the opposite cases, when such comparisons with psychoanalytic theory and practice really help to shed light on the basic inherent qualities of Konstantin-Pavlov’s poetry. I will give an example of such cooperation in an aspect close to my own understanding of it. After quoting the important observation of Sv. Igov about the growling, the moaning, the inhibited articulation and ultimately the silence in the poetry of K.P., the author cites a quote from Freud’s “Scherber Case,” where it is about the same phenomenon as a psycho-medical case (p. 121).

Also the attention given to the mirror, an important symbol-concept in Freud and a basic attribute in the method of psychodrama; viewed from such an angle, the particular frequency of this image in K.P.’s work suddenly turns out to be non-accidental, loaded with possible hidden meanings.

Another example of a productive “use of method” central to the main thesis is mimicry. Here the three plans – the strictly biological (in the case of insects), the psychic and the literary – mutually support each other. Thus, arguments are gradually accumulating for reading K. Pavlov’s poetry in its own “external,” socio-political environment (regardless of whether it will be called “group,” society or otherwise – “regime” for example).

13. In its three-level structure (as I tried to outline it above), the author's psychoanalytic approach seems to be focused on reading K.P.’s poetry as an expression, testimony, “document” of some individual psychological or psychopathic deviations (similar to the Artaud case brought through Blanchot). But in fact it is above all a “document” of historical time, which is the ultimate object of reference. Evidence of the “epoch” in the essential processing of the poet’s personal psychic and psycho-biographical experience. – This is the horizon of the chosen approach, in this plan I read the dissertation. It is into this broader, political horizon that I project its efforts, though all the while she remains in the shadow of internal traumatism and descriptive metalanguages that run the gamut from the psycho-biological and erotic to the mythological. We witness a highly complicated, polydiscursive weaving of a plot that ultimately stands on the stage of history. (A typical example of this complicated, multilingually intertwined articulation: “Thus, in Konstantin

Pavlov, the primary crisis is placed on the stage of history, but it confronts a biological and sensory being – it is introduced through its absence, through the marking of the multiple paths – In fact, all paths are possible, only one is forbidden and that is that of incest” – p. 138, with a footnote to Bataille’s *Eroticism*.)

14. At this point I will return to the **composition** that I defined as non-linear. It could also be defined as circular-concentric. The climax – or innermost circle – is Chapter Five, where the thesis sets out to establish its main idea. (This is where the plays of K. Pavlov are also included. But such a division, even more so in the chosen methodological key, is conditional, insofar as their figurative “inner world” and language are identical to those of poetry.) – The final paragraphs of this climactic chapter proceed to decipher the central, nominal metaphor for the *Father’s joke*. But this is done in a highly softened language that constantly postpones the final meaning, wrapping it in a veil of new and new metaphors.

Contrary to some easy expectations, the Father here is not a domineering figure, but a linguistic one (“the law of language, which appears as a paternal metaphor,” p. 130). The argument itself is super-condensed as a dizzying chain of ideas (in that order): Bataille – Lévi-Strauss – Darien Leader – Roger Caillois – Lacan – Foucault, all packed into a single paragraph of less than a page (129–130). This hyper-focused paragraph is key to understanding the central thesis of the dissertation. But the roots of this highly branched tree are still in Freud’s “family metaphor” (implicitly, before the parenthesis, is his presence in the top row).

Dis-identified with the paternal role-function in the sense of “classical” psychoanalysis from Freud to Lacan, Power is seen “as a messianic desire for a chief [leader P.A.] serving the psychotic needs of the group” (p. 200) – a requirement, the meaning of which, I confess, remained a mystery to me, although it is probably very important to the thesis, because it is brought out as a point of meaning, also stated in the title. And the poetic text itself in this situation turns out to be a creator charged with the function of separating its author from the group – a crowd and an “illegal tribunal”... But to avoid risking getting bogged down in the details of psychoanalytic metalanguage, I will simply say that the Father–Power connection is undone by the grip of negative dialectics (“The joke [of the poet K.P.] should be sought in its absence – power cannot be understood as a paternal metaphor, but as a messianic perversion of a chief [leader] who will satisfy the psychotic needs of his group,” p. 163).

15. The same metalanguage continues to work in the next peak Chapter Six (“Group reality vs. group unreality”), but in a lighter way – by opening into the real sociopolitical context of the 1960s, when Konstantin Pavlov’s frontal confrontation with the Power dates back. This opening was carried out including through long quotations from party documents (reports by N. Khrushchev and T. Zhivkov), as well as metacommentaries (B. Penchev, Pl. Doinov).

At this level, the discussion on “how to survive most effectively in totalitarian regimes” continued (p. 175).

It is in this last real chapter, at the same time peak and lightened, unloaded from the over-condensed psychoanalytic discursiveness of the previous one, that the fragmentary principle of structuring is most overexposed on a micro level, in the form of a collage of externally unrelated segments (sometimes separated with asterisks). – But the meaning focus (*punctum*) of this last chapter is the emptiness, the absence (of meaning). Here there is also a place for the important poem “Five Old Men”. It is precisely in this void that violence secretly reigns in its (linguistic, discursive) inexpressibility (or negative expressibility “through what cannot be expressed,” p. 183).

16. Why am I pointing this out? – To draw attention to a specific **discursive identity**, towards which I have been going all along in my criticism. This figure of the void, being an “internal” subject for the dissertation, is also integrated at the meta-linguistic level, postulating an essential inexpressibility. At its end, the dissertation commits a radical nihilistic act, renouncing any claim to an (ultimate, final) understanding of its own subject. – The opposite would mean that it “enters” itself into the debated plot, insofar as a final interpretation can be “robbing” of the work, similar to censorship, as it is said in the Epilogue (p. 196).

Further, in the last paragraphs of the Conclusion, the dissertation leaves one last alibi, namely *the right to the Secret of its own subject*, to unknowability. – Or of tendentious thwarted knowability, not reaching the “last,” clear Meaning. Conceptual abstinence from investment of meaning in the studied subject is declared. – An aporetic finale of the hermeneutic effort, which seems to enter into an initial contradiction, if it did not grow out of the nature of the object itself, as its negatively doubled form, a mirror double. (Thus, the mirror metaphor, central to K.P.’s poetry, turns out to be central to the study as well – in the operative toolkit of the method.)

If earlier, in the chapter of the same name third, the texts of K.P. are read “*from the outside*,” i.e. plot-wise, as a blocked, thwarted communication, insofar as they speak in an anti-language created by them, here, in these last pages, in the sphere of the same anti-linguistic the dissertation itself finds itself in its effort to read/decipher K.P.’s texts; it finds itself there meta-plotfully, “from within” itself.

The interpretation fades away into a sort of dots; it is set aside in a sort of enfilade of critical metaphors (Benjamin–Kafka). Implying is preferred to telling; it brings us closer to the truth.

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION

17. Thus, a global, spherical situation has been constructed, in which levels of different orders, mirror-reciprocally connected, work simultaneously.

This is done through the methodological metaphor of the “group” taken from a particular scientific jargon. Its operational applicability is based on its standing in the common zone of the collective and individual psychic, on the one hand, and the linguistic, on the other – where literature, especially poetry, is also located as the “voice”/self-articulation of the “deep” (inner) Self situated in the dark zone of the unconscious rather than in that of the logos.

Outlined in this way, in its full (spherical, as I have defined it) volume, the “situation” is highly *catastrophic*. And if on one level – or in its innermost circle – this is the psychic experience of an individual consciousness, for example that of Konstantin Pavlov, whose (difficult, blocked) articulation is his poetry, then on other levels and in the outermost in its circles, this is the “situation” of the global twentieth century, as told by Kafka, Beckett and Konstantin Pavlov.

18. And here I emphasize the **greatest contribution of the dissertation, which is methodological**. But the direct, nominal object leads us to the deep relevance of the method. And above all, that the line of writing the work of K.P. in the broadest context of the radical, collapsing Modernity of the 20th century, along with authors like Kafka and Beckett, has been continued. It is not from the outside, narratively, in the form of telling (and even less pictorially), but from the inside, in the very mode of Language, in the form of blocked articulation, that the collapse of the enlightened Logos is expressed. Pavlov’s poetry lies in the philosophical critique of the Enlightenment, revealing in a negative way that secretly

current that Horkheimer and Adorno define as hidden dialectics (1947). Dark energies slumbering in the wilds of the Enlightenment, which have been brutally laid bare, turned into a “living” reality by the political practices of the twentieth century. The poetry of K. Pavlov bears witness to one of them.

Testimony not only from the first person, but also from a very great depth – from the dark depths of nature, merging the personal unconscious (*Unbewusste*) with that of Hegel’s Reason of History (*Vernunft in der Geschichte*): the dream of historical reason that gives birth to monsters. It is these monsters that inhabit the poetry of K. Pavlov. And the connection with one of the first diagnoses of modern horror is direct (“Capriccio for Goya,” 1962; “Second Capriccio for Goya,” 1962).

A direct meeting was realized between the psychoanalytic method, which opened access to the dark unconscious of the modern historical mind crawled out at will in the 20th century, and the poetry of K. Pavlov, one of the strongest testimonies of this – testimony from the first person, from the depths. From the womb of the whale.

19. Continuing with the generalizations, before proceeding to the final formula, I am tempted to use the familiar figure of the cup to express nothing but the principled *relativism of any assessment*. – In this case, the liminal line of hesitation divides-and-connects the two components of the dissertation – the subject and the method.

In the one case, it could be said that at times the method dominates, i.e. absorbs, appropriates the object it is supposed to serve, and then the cup may seem half empty to us. But the cup is just as complete, insofar as the method – to some extent and precisely with its contestability (if it really exists), through it – reveals in a very strong way new, extremely productive perspectives for the interpretation of Constantine-Pavlov’s poetry. Possibilities this dissertation uncovers and leaves open for future research. – And this is precisely its own negative contribution – one of its most important contributions: that it works, generates potential even beyond itself, i.e. apart from all those own, positive contributions that it actually made. And they, as I tried to show, are by no means few.

After all that has been said so far, all that remains is for me to formalize my position by stating that I support the awarding of the educational and scientific degree “Doctor” to the candidate Marianna Dimitrovna Georgieva in professional direction 2.1. Philology, etc.

I do so with the conviction that my own conviction of the merits of the presented dissertation is shared by the mini-college of the Jury.

15.04.2024

Prof. **Plamen Antov**, DPhil