

ANNOTATIONS OF MATERIALS

submitted by Assoc.Prof. PhD Svetlana Temelkova Sabeva

in applying for a competition for the academic position of Professor in sphere of higher education 3 *Social, economic and legal sciences*, professional field 3.1 *Sociology, anthropology and sciences of culture*, scientific speciality *History of sociology – phenomenological sociology and socioanalysis*

- 1. Sabeva, S. (2023). *Overlivings. Phenomenology and socioanalysis of generative time*. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad. 272 pp. ISBN 978-619-01-1163-4**

Behind the word ‘overlivings’ that is present in the title (and allows a multitude of semantic variations with regard to lived time), there is a multilayered theoretical problem that the monograph is studying from the perspectives of genetic phenomenology, socioanalysis, and critical sociology of biopower. This is the problem of generative time viewed as a specific form of historicity that acquires concreteness with regard to the era of supermodernity (up to our ‘today’ of pandemics and war). In each of these three perspectives generative time acquires a characteristic definiteness that explicitates, displaces, and throws a new light on dimensions that stay implicit with the other two approaches.

The book is constructed in analytic spirals to which the following thematic parts correspond: ‘The time of life and the suffering from society: socioanalysis of generativity’; ‘The generative world: perspectives of genetic phenomenology’; ‘Reification of generative time: toward the phenomenological critique of capitalism’. Each of the eight chapters ends with a conclusion that sums up its specific approach to the problem. The epilogue ‘War and the politics of death’ is an attempt to elucidate the living present of pandemic and war (the transition to the second decade of the 21st c.) partly historically, by an encounter with motives from Max Weber and Martin Heidegger concerning the meaning of death. The lines of the three main problematizations are kept in unity by a set of phenomenological methods which reveal – in the spirit of the late Husserl – a hidden, inner, living historicity of the life-world (*Lebenswelt*). The formula ‘hidden, inner, living historicity’ functions as an emblematic designation of the problematic of generative time.

On the eidetic plane, generative time can be defined as a specific mode of time, the intersection of three ontological axes of human existence – birth-and-death, aging, and gender differentiation. It is a dimension that functions through a concretion between meaning-constitutive and biophysical (natural) formations, i.e. a phenomenalization of human life itself ‘before’ the cleavage between culture and nature, ‘before’ the mental and practical dualisms of modernity (thus the phenomenology of the life-world is a basic methodological framework). The study is focused on the structures of time unfolding along the birth-and-death axis. They are defined by a formal-indicative intuition as a simultaneous experiencing of the un-simultaneity of lives. This is an intuitive given in the world of living, operating with such equally formal-indicative aspects of time as ‘before’, ‘after’, ‘simultaneously with’. In a natural attitude, we can stay with the fact that every singular time of life between birth and death is objectively datable – it is simultaneously with or localized before and after other lifetimes by origin and succession, say, in the sequence of generations. But if we take a phenomenological stance, we should ask where the temporal in-between is, where are those ‘before’, ‘after’ or ‘simultaneously’ of lives, is there anyone who lives them as a stream of experience, or are they a nobody’s time out-there, i.e. does generative temporalization only happen as a biologically and socio-culturally objective time? In his late transcendental phenomenology, Husserl discovered something paradoxical to the natural intuition: first, that this multiplicity of life times is lived by myself as a stream of experience; and second, that the ‘before’, ‘after’ and ‘simultaneously’ of the natural intuition are transformations of a hidden ‘with’, so that the multitude of times permeating my own time of life is the manifestation of a universal co-existence. Husserl calls this multitude in creating a term that is hard to translate – *historische Allzeitlichkeit*, historical co-temporality. But the enigma of generative time doesn’t end here. For my singular time of life too has the form of co-existence of the present Ego and the past Egos, i.e. I myself am intentionally one-in-another and I have my personal co-temporality. Thus generative time flows along two fundamental axes. It is the temporalization of the intersection itself of these two spheres of co-existence, of the inter-subjective and the intra-subjective in-between. In other words, inheritance and self-inheritance unfold through one another.

This phenomenological conceptualization of generative time is exposed in the study’s second part which is the meaning center of the whole. In this part, motives of the late transcendental phenomenology of Husserl are extracted and reworked (related to lived corporeality, intermonadic time, historical co-temporaneity, passive synthesis and the time-

constituting stream) that are united into an integral notion of generative world. ‘World’ is conceived here in the strict sense of horizon structure (functioning through a correlation between a region of meaning pre-givenness and an ‘empty horizon’) regarding which Husserl follows the principle ‘The primordial horizon, the hereditary mass, in its primordial meaning is an empty horizon. [...] The living wake up the lifeless.’ Thanks to a strategy that doesn’t stay at the reconstruction of these motives but relies on thinking through and beyond Husserl, this part proposes a relatively strict phenomenological concept of generative time around which its derivatives are organized such as generative experience, generative subject, generative style and generative matrix of experience, passive repeating. On the reflexive plane, the field of genetic phenomenology is renovated by making explicit the three-layered architectonic structure of the generative horizon (apperceptive pre-givenness, pre-giving hyletic passivity, and meontic structures) that provides landmarks for intentional-historical studies; while the analytic of lived time is enriched by problematizing the fractalizations of the form of the stream of experience, the affective self-structuration of the stream, and the function of pre-temporality with regard to the so-called pathos phenomena (phenomena of befalling).

This phenomenological conceptualization of generative time is the result not so much of a mental strategy immanent to constitutive phenomenology than of a certain ‘shifting reading’ of Husserl’s genetic phenomenology as well as of the ‘socioanalysis of self-inheritance’ as conceptualized by Deyan Deyanov. In fact, the monograph unfolds by thinking of borders and attempting to establish borderline concepts of generative time – between the socioanalysis of the suffering from society and the analytic of biopower that are phenomenologically funded, and genetic phenomenology that is socioanalytically centered. From this integral perspective, generative time emerges as the inseparable unity between existential and political phenomena whose interweaving can be viewed as the ‘substratum’ of the contemporary politics of life and death. The first and the third parts of the study are dedicated to arguing and deploying of this precise thesis. The formal-indicative definition of the simultaneous experiencing of the un-simultaneity of lives acquires a socioanalytical and biopolitical concreteness: in expecting together the impossible simultaneity of the meeting at death (Derrida), we overlive one another, in giving or taking time from one another, we exert the power of disposing with the time of others, says Bourdieu, and Judith Butler feels this power today as a cancellation of grief, as a ‘biopolitical management of the ungrievable’. The power structuring of generative time is revealed as a condition of possibility of practices of

care within the confines of life but also of the work of a biopower unconscious that incessantly valorizes lives and (de-)legitimizes the social desire of recognition of the existence. The monograph's third part is a reified transformation of generative time in the era of supermodernity – the so-called 'biologically gained time' (Petra Gehring) whose extraction, accumulation and redistribution stands in the basis of biocapitalism. The 'turn' concerns not only the cognitive but also the onti dimension as far as the answer is sought to the question how precisely the generative horizon exists in the grasp of historically variable symbolic-power and bio-power politics of life.

The particularities of the analytic of time in this monograph can be understood in the context of the so-called pathos turn in the phenomenological concept of experience. It also provides the most general framework within whose confines socioanalysis is conceived here – as is substantiated in the first part – as an analytic of the 'sphere of vulnerability' (a concept that reformulates phenomenologically Bourdieu's concept of 'positional suffering'). A sphere of vulnerability has its intuitive givenness in the sensory completeness of the formula 'it happens to me'; and the zero point of its constitution are the lived corporeality and intercorporeality that are, in their turn, embedded in a generative horizon. The thesis that the sphere of vulnerability has its architectonic foundation in generative time, is also the basis of the designation of 'socioanalysis of generativity'.

The analytic of time in this context relies on descriptions of pathos phenomena – as phenomena of befalling – in a phenomenological concreteness marked by the categorical use of the preposition 'at', i.e. time at. As far as the pathos phenomena emerge not so much by an apperceptive grasping of something, be it definite or indefinite, than by affective force, i.e. by the insistence and vitality of the affection, the 'at' formulates an attachment to the foreign, to what surpasses the habitualized experience. But this is also the moment of the primordial impression – both inestablishable by grasping and irrefutable as embodied presence – from which the living present flows. This temporal constitution is described not only by formal structures but also by paradigmatic intuitions – both 'naïve' and reflexive – that are related to life situations and are introduced with a phenomenological and socioanalytical concreteness in each problem circle. In other words, the formal *a priori* is inseparable from a material *a priori* of analyses.

2. Sabeva, S. (2014). The world of bodies and the era of biopower. The paradigm of immunity. *Sociological Problems*, 3-4, 167-178. ISSN 0324-1572

The article considers the world of bodies in the era of supermodernity by tracing the effects of the encounter of two dispositifs: a) the dispositif of supermodern biosciences and biotechnologies that establish a new correlation between *physis* and *techné*, expressed in ‘technization of life and biologization of technology’ (Waldenfels); and b) the dispositif of neoliberal biopolitics and bioeconomies that establish a new correlation between singular and species human body, expressed in the proliferation of species bioidentities (genetic, gender-related, nutritive etc.), of rhizomatic bodies conjoined with foreign biological substances and technical implants, of hybrid existences between life and death (non-dead, embryos etc.), that require from everyone a reflexive appropriation under the form of struggles for ‘one’s own’ body. Against the background of this historical conjuncture, the necessity is argued of three substantial shifts in the notion of biopower in relation to Foucault’s views: the substratum of biopower today is not so much the positively multiplied life than the exposed life in the sense of collectively lived corporeality vulnerable before the ‘elements’ of the world; the power over life is exerted not so much by a spatial distribution of bodies than through the time of bodies and the cleavage of the lived unity between habitual, actual, and future body; the exercise of biopower redefines bodily identity, i.e. the possibility of a body to distinguish itself from another’s body, as well as to have a temporal duration, through immunity as a universal functional category of life. The proposed post-Foucauldian notion of biopower contains both an analytic and a normative (critical) potential, as far as it requires a return to the ontology of the life-world, an analysis of the body and of life as radical phenomena, and discovering the ‘germ’ of the politics of life and death within the confines of the life-world itself. (Thus in this context the concepts of ‘biopower’ and ‘politics of life and death’ do not coincide.) This ‘germ’ lies in the relations of primary representability between lived bodies (including non-human ones, viewed as ‘physiological subjects’) which are neither one besides the other nor one in the other nor one instead of the other but they bear responsibility one-for-another.

- 3. Sabeva, S. (2021). “Life with the Virus”. A Phenomenology of Infectious Sociality. *Phainomena. Journal of Phenomenology and Hermeneutics*. 30| 116-117| April, The Covid-19 Crisis, 41-60. DOI: 10.32022| PHI 30.2021.116-117.3 p-ISSN 1318-3362 e-ISSN 2232-6650**

In correspondence with the issue theme, the article demonstrates the capacities of a specific phenomenological approach (combining responsive and generative phenomenology) of reflection on the structural transformations of the life-world in the conditions of the Covid-19 pandemic. The text was produced during the first six months of the pandemic and it bears the specificity of this temporal and affective perspective on the events. The meaning transformations of the life-world are traced in the following main themes: the conflict between the ‘senses of reality’ of the pandemic, analysed by the concept of perceptive faith, and the temporal structure of ‘life without pause’; the pandemic as an intercorporeal configuration presupposing the formation of a reflexive relation between personally lived life (as an Ego-experienced body) and anonymously lived life (as an organism interwoven into a rhizome with other human and inhuman organisms); the atmospheric nature of the contagion in the biophysical sense that coincides with the affective atmospherization of the world; the horizon revelation of the ecological turn in the medical crisis, regarding the conditions of biological life, and the possibilities to conceptualize it through the notion of ecological intentionality. The overall ‘infectious’ transformation of the life-world is viewed as a borderline situation – of a ‘throwing ahead’ to the possibility of death, pandemic mass death – and the structures of generative time related to the intersubjective expectation of the ‘meeting at death’. The problem is outlined of transgenerative synthesis of lived corporeality as the pre-narrative layer of the collective memory of pandemics.

- 4. Sabeva, S. (2022). Biosocial fragmentations: bodies, intellect, and caring female labour. In: Georgiev, D.& Nencheva, D. (eds.). *Gender. Between human, social, and legal sciences*. 191-202. Scribens. ISBN 978-619-7467-38-3**

During the Covid-19 pandemic, the idea of collective immunity, coupled with that of collective intellect, turned into a dominating figure – both an appeal and a refusal, a promise and a disappointment, possibility and impossibility – into a search of a safety exit for all

those caught in the regimes of some political affiliation. What is the enigma of this impossible possibility that is so painfully experienced, especially in Bulgaria? The article problematizes the process of biosocial fragmentation that can be seen as the effect of investments into double refusals – to be refused and to give up – eternalized by the subject as bodily engravings (somatizations). This thesis is deployed on the example of a disturbing encounter between a refusal of vaccine and caring female labour, which looks more than fortuitously related to the gender distinction and the pandemic transformation of the home as a ‘total institution’. In the light of the socioanalytic perspective that is determinative to this text, the sociogenesis of such somatically invested refusals is sought in ‘particular worlds of caring’ and their disparate strategies of security.

5. Sabeva, S. (2021). Reification of Life-Time: Towards a Phenomenological Critique of Biocapitalism. *Metodo. International Studies in Phenomenology and Philosophy*. Vol. 9, n. 2, 447-468. DOI: 10.19079 | metodo. 9.2.469 ISSN 2281-9177

The article discusses the specific reification of lived bodiliness in the dispositif of supermodern biopolitics, biotechnologies, and bio-economies. The foundations of this reification are searched for in the separation of the classical modern unity of life and labour, i.e. in directing capital investment not so much towards the productivity of human labour than towards the productivity of biological life itself and the potentiality to extract so-called “biologically gained time” (Petra Gehring). Against this background, three main critical-theoretical theses are argued: a) biologically gained time as a specific value added (whose genesis can be found as early as in the correlation between time of labour and time of life, not clarified by Marx) allows us to define strictly the concept of biocapitalism; b) biocapitalism modalizes biological life not between the poles of life and death but between the poles of life and survival; therefore biopower today is exerted in the modality of making someone survive or let them live; c) behind the back of biotechnological entrepreneurs, in the region of living nature, a ‘de-temporization of natural processes that are not socialized but are a condition of the processing of the socialized ones’ (Deyan Deyanov) comes in, so that ‘quanta of life’ asymmetrically multiply the ‘quanta of death’.

But whose is this life that incorporates biologically gained time? The answer to this question is sought explicitly along the boundaries of the thinkable for Marx and Husserl, who are involved in a paradigm encounter regarding their common problem of ‘living lived corporeality’ and its ‘organs, but also implicitly, through a background problematization of the non-reifiable generative time, stemming from the fundamental fact of the simultaneous lived experience of non-simultaneous lives and the reciprocal exchange of gifts of time.

6. Sabeva, S. (2021). The sublimity of the rational: approaches to Weber’s thesis of the disenchantment of the world (a comment to the article of Johannes Weiss). *Sociological Problems*, 1, 346-361. ISSN 0324-1572

The article discusses approaches to Weber’s thesis of the disenchantment of the world in following the reflexive strategy that Weber calls ‘critique’ (in Kant’s sense) of the concepts that opens them to their historically variable diagnostic potential. In the center of attention, there is the ‘archaeology’ of Weber’s thesis as proposed by Johannes Weiss, an archaeology making explicit the meaning antagonisms between the rationalism of modern science, the ethical rationalism of the religions of salvation, and the magical image of the world. In the spirit of the privative definition of modernity, discerned by Weiss, as ‘a time foreign to god and devoid of prophets’, the discussion moves from the interest in the antinomies of modern disenchantment as a demoralization of the world, which becomes a condition of possibility of the naturalistic projects of modernity. With reference to basic theses of the contemporary theoretical debate in Bulgaria, the two aspects of Weber’s thesis are put to reconstruction and interpretation: the disenchantment of the world as a cultural-historical process, on the one hand, and as a meaning-genetic dynamic, on the other. Beyond the theme of disenchantment and rationalization of life orders, the study introduced an additional research line related to the concepts of ‘image of the world’ and ‘relation to the world’ where Weber’s and Husserl’s critiques of modern naturalism meet.

7. Sabeva, S. (2011). Violence and language. Notes on the socioanalysis of the documents of the former State Security. *Sociological problems*, special issue, 20-37. ISSN 0324-1572.

The article discusses the interpenetration between violence and language – through the figure of ‘language of violence’ – as far as violence can be viewed as an essential trait of the ‘regime of truth’ (in the Foucauldian sense) of every police archive. The text is the protocol of a rather experimental and theoretical reflection that *accompanies* the work in the archives of the State Security. In the first section, the so-called ‘opening of the files’ of the former State Security is thematized as a discursive event revealing the ineliminable excessivity and the ineliminable privation of the official declassification discourse, and hence the danger of it being a repetition of the former ‘regime of truth’. The second section outlines an analytic of the language *of* violence as defined by the specific swapping of places between violence and language in the signifying function through which a singular ‘sphere of vulnerability’ is invented. The third section deals with the specificity of the police language as an ‘extraordinary’ language (a correlate of the constant ‘state of emergency’ in the meaning of Benjamin and Agamben) that locates meanings in the grey zone between law and violence. The concluding section tries to approach the problem of ‘living on the life of the others’ (chiasm) as a structural trait of being a police informer.

8. Nikolova, N. & Sabeva, S. (2005). The authorized body: a politesthetic of cutting in weekly newsreels. *Sociological problems*, 1-2, 7-33. ISSN 0324-1572

In using a visual archive of weekly newsreels of the 1947–1971 period, this study raises the problem of legitimization of power in the classical phase of the Bulgarian ‘socialist society’. It makes an attempt to decipher the symbolic alchemy of this power, the secret of its penetration into the capillaries of the *socium* at a time when it is no longer violence and is not affirmed by a right over the enemy, i.e. by negative mechanisms of depriving, purging etc., but in inventing its own positivity, working – in Havel’s world – in ‘ideological gloves’. The analysis focuses on the visual and discursive enactment of official political spaces in cinema chronicles. They are viewed as the ‘sacred places’ where rituals of institution of the social body are played and there respectively emerge symbolic effects of integration and totalization that weave into one social times, spaces, bodies and actions. The core of the empirical

material is the constructed research series ‘The leaders of socialism 1947–1971’, and the case put to exemplary analysis is the ‘apparatus charisma’ of Todor Zhivkov. The interest in visual data is dictated by the fact that despite its ideological over-determination, the newsreel witnesses even without the intention of witnessing – bequeathing manifested and latent meanings that are open to a boundless multitude of generative syntheses of visibility.