

OPINION

by Prof. PhD Svetlana Sabeva

Chair of Sociology and Human Sciences at the Paissiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv

as to the materials submitted for participation in a contest

for the academic position of Associate Professor

in the Paissiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv

on professional field 2.3. Philosophy (Formal and practical logic)

In the competition for the position of ‘Associate Professor’ as announced in the State Gazette, No. As of November 11, 202, there is one candidate applying: PhD Martina Stoilova Mineva-Nikolova of the Chair of Philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy and History of the Paissiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv. To the application documents for the competition, she has attached 15 scientific works published after her acquiring the educational and scientific degree of ‘doctor’ (PhD) in 2015. These include: two monographs, one of which, *Groundbreakings. Abduction, induction, transduction in the logic of practice*, Sofia: Iztok-Zapad, 2025, is her habilitation work, and the other, *Ludwig Wittgenstein: the problematization of philosophy (Praxeological turn, limits, legitimation)*, Sofia: Heterodoksia, 2021, is a monograph produced on the basis of her dissertation; as well as eleven studies and two articles published in prestigious scientific peer-reviewed periodicals. Dr. Mineva’s works have a total of 15 documented citations. The statement of scientometric data shows that these works, together with her participation in scientific research projects, considerably surpass the minimal national requirements for occupying the academic position of Associate Professor. To these data, one must add: the many presentations on scientific venues in the University of Plovdiv and the Institute for Critical Theories of Supermodernity (numbering 35 for the decade after defending her thesis); the creative publishing activity of Dr. Mineva as editor-in-chief of the *Kairos* philosophical journal, as a member of the editorial board of the *Heterodoksia* journal, and participant in the editing of thematic issues of other scientific journals and collections; as well as her intense communication with undergraduate and doctoral students in Philosophy and in Sociology and Human Sciences in the University of Plovdiv, which includes, beside the usual teaching activities, also her work as mentor in the Sector

of Philosophical Logic and in the Student Philosophical Seminar. As a teacher in the Chair of Sociology and Human Sciences, I would like to especially point out at the formidable research and didactic achievements of Martina as the supervisor of the project for students and young scientists *I Have Nobody to Turn To: sociological dimensions of vulnerability* which demonstrates the rare skills of mediation between generations, between philosophical, logical and sociological disciplines, between strict theory and empirical sense for the social world.

I know Dr. Mineva precisely as a scientist who, since the earliest years of her academic biography, has taken a creative part in the development of the polyparadigmatic theoretical and empirical research typical of the Sector of Philosophical Logic and the Chairs of Philosophy and of Sociology and Human Sciences at the University of Plovdiv. This is probably the manifestation of a ‘post-Wittgensteinian sensitivity’, formed intuitively as well as reflexively and finding its theoretical realization in her dissertation and the ensuing monograph, *Ludwig Wittgenstein: the problematization of philosophy (Praxeological turn, limits, legitimation)*. In Dr. Mineva’s research habitus as a philosopher and a logician with a wide ‘theoretical momentum’ under the sign of the praxeological turn in logic – a habitus that we will see splendidly realized in her habilitation work – I find not merely productive influences but mutually induced discoveries both in the direction of logical theory and analytic methods and that of sociology and the socioanalysis of ‘innovation practices’. An emblematic example of this is the way in which she articulates the logical analysis of abductive inferences, the unfolding of intentional history and the socioanalytic reconstruction of the discovery of the elliptic orbit of Mars by Johannes Kepler, in demonstrating how logical data related to negation as privation, to surprising affectations, prepredicative contradictions within the object and the subject, clusters of anomalies etc., can function also as socioanalytic data of the so-called suffered success (‘Renovating inferences and the practical logical problematization of socioanalytic symptoms’, *Heterodoksia*). I would like to stress the difficulty – and risk – of this approach that requires the data of the same ‘factual history’ to be disposed in different paradigms of making explicit and interpreting, to be transposed from one paradigm to another but in such a way as to let them retain their formal-indicative nature and respectively their ‘unformalizable residue’. I would even allow myself to recommend to Martina to continue to develop this technique of reflexive switching across different research Gestalts towards ‘factual history’.

The decisive contributions in Dr. Mineva's habilitation work fall, of course, into the specialized area of Logic as the architectonic field of thought practices after the praxeological turn of the mid-20th century. Taking up the insight of C. S. Peirce of abduction as 'the sole logical operation that can present any new idea' (*Groundbreakings*, p. 9), and focusing on the microscopical analyses of innovative practices in science, she succeeds in defending convincingly the following basic vision of the 'ecstatic' nature of the logical: '[...] logic comes out to be not a completed system but a practical multidimensional field. On the one hand, it is related to spontaneous novelties, expansions, of work with unpre-given forms. It changes in following the very course of practices and requires much theoretical effort to retain the *endogeneity* of the practical logical – that dimension of it, rooted in practices, in which it appears as nascent, living, although uncertain. And on the other hand, it is a field that also requires much effort to retain the *exogeneity* of the practical logical – that dimension of it, equally deeply rooted in practices, in which it appears as stabilizing, regulating, sometimes even inert and – due to all that – certain presence' (*Groundbreakings*, p. 11-12). The research field of *Groundbreakings* is polyphonic and intricately orchestrated. In it, the author thinks 'with one thinker against another', testing the limits of the logical for each of them, connects their intuitions and theories, constructs fascinating logical intrigues, as early as from the very beginning of the exposition in which the central figure of C. S. Peirce is accompanied by the equally profound discussion of the ideas of Norwood Hanson, Thomas Kuhn, Vladimir Bibler etc. This field is complexly differentiated not only along the axis of endogeneity/exogeneity of practical logic but also along the axes of classical transcendentalism / nonclassical transcendental logic, exogenous theoretical logic of the dialectical / practical logic of the dialectical, formal analysis / intentional analysis. The multidimensionality and polyphony of the notion of the ecstatic nature of the logical, however, is retained with a remarkable consistency by the central problematization that reads: '*how, in reality, a given nondeductive inference has come to be possible in the innovative practice of science, shifting the focus from the rigorous formal logical structures to events in the thought and the dynamic practices in which they are generated*' (*Groundbreakings*, p. 237). The leading analytic instrument in deploying this problematization, within which also the many practical logical discoveries of Dr. Mineva fall, is 'non-classically conceived *a priori* synthesis' as a multipolar process concerning *ego, cogitatum*, and world. It is in this immanent geneticization and historicization of the logical, defended by a complex network of nonclassical logical concepts – such as will to form, inductive quantum,

enthymematic analogy, theoretical momentum, the operators *eo ipso* and *in fact* etc. that I see the main contribution of the habilitation work.

Concluding my reading of *Groundbreakings* and in answering Martina's invitation to think this remarkable study as an open problematic in a dialogic mode, I would permit myself the following reflection. It is a comment and a question at once. It is not formulated as a properly logical question but it can be related to the temporal analytic of the so-called 'ecstatic moment of the logical' in Chapter Two ('Practical logic and groundbreakings: will time, analogizing') of the Second Part of the monograph. Deploying the analysis of the 'will to form' as a 'form of practical differentiation of attunement', Martina comes to her main thesis as to the *intra*-subjective temporality of the nondeductive practices of inferring – the thesis of the 'moment of discovery', conceived through Heidegger's resoluteness of will, not, however, through the temporal ecstasis of 'throwing forward into a future' but through that of a 'long authentic present'. The thesis is: 'while the *intra*-subjective affirmation of a discovery (the scientist for himself) happens momentarily, the *inter*-subjective affirmation, i.e. the recognition of the discovery by other scientists and the community, requires a time interval that is different in the different cases' (*Groundbreakings*, p. 179). It seems to me, however, that this notion of *intra*-subjective temporality does not take into account the constitutive part of the *temporal horizon* of attunement, and with it, the whole layer of the pre-affective field of 'possible awakening' that is carried by a transcendental past (or 'having been' in Heidegger). And that is the place of the 'sleeping', empty Gestalts of experience. It could be said that this is the undefinable horizon of a 'transcendental childhood' (so unambiguously indicated in Kepler's intentional trajectory) that takes part not just in the 'moment' of resoluteness but also in the relentless efforts of will in the 'theoretical momentum'; and they are all connected into a *paradoxical simultaneity* of the temporal horizons of nondeductive inference. This is undoubtedly a figure of passive-associative temporalization rather than of an active and reflexive one, but my question to Martina is how it could be retained in the logical analysis. Or, rather, how it could be indicated as a place of indefiniteness in the intentional trajectory of innovatorship.

To conclude: : after becoming acquainted with the materials and scientific works submitted for the context, analyzing their importance and the scientific contributions they contain, I have all reasons to give, with full conviction, my positive evaluation to the respected Scientific Jury and

propose PhD Martina Stoilova Mineva-Nikolova to be elected to the academic position of Associate Professor in professional field 2.3. Philosophy (Formal and practical logic) in the Paissiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv.

March 04, 2026.

Prof. PhD Svetlana Sabeva