

THE LIFE IN TEXT

The new book *The Change in the Life and in the Text* by Bogdan Bogdanov lays its strategies even through the paratexts by which it reveals itself (title, subtitle, and introduction). I. e., from the very beginning, the fact the rhetoric will be inquired into and talked of, and its being precisely is to be occurring, is explicitly and actively insisted on. ... Not that rhetorically as an act of theorizing, however, but as a practice, as a possibility everyday tongues to undergo metamorphosis in a variety of discourses, as an option the life itself to be seen as a discourse of multifarious intuitions and attitudes towards the world. Otherwise, even in this nearly visual brush, the rhetoric – typically in Austin’s vein, - is presenting itself in the twofoldedness of its being spoken indicating being done ... And Bogdan Bogdanov’s text delights in being brought into line with that type of twofoldedness.

The occurrence of life in text, as wording, requires the question (something done by many essays) of the differences between the essentially written and the secondary recorded, of the once verbal and in the sequel turned into record in remake ... or, the question is being imposed of which rhetoric strategy is better – things to be spoken of or to be passed over in silence, and silently to be “clauqued” ... This question was imposed by Bogdan Bogdanov more than once – not only by his texts – these, and the preceding ones, - but on seminars and conferences too. In the case it’s not the ill-framed, century-old opposition between the verbal and the written (and Derrida’s critiques), neither it’s their value hierarchy according which the verbal is closer to the essence, and the written one – throwing dust in eyes and putting on masks. Quite the contrary: the pair verbal-written is explicated by Bogdan Bogdanov as composed of two very different but of equal importance totalities, each with its operative and applied principles. Thus, the verbal wording, according Bogdan Bogdanov, presupposes rather the occurrence of a sort of “us”, while the written one is directed mainly to the affirmation of the “self”, to its fitting into some kind of self/identity. ..

The combination of these two divergent trends is reflected in an intriguing way by the strategies of *The Change in the Life and in the Text*. Their interweaving traces its self-movement – it starts with the essays scrutinizing the common/communal only to close with much more personal texts. In this sense the change and the problematics are looked over outside-inside, thought of as pulsating between “intrinsic to all” and “taken in themselves” in their own uniqueness ... Another boundary, that is to say, is crossed in Bogdan Bogdanov’s texts – between the personal and the social. For equal are the impulses setting them in motion, and seldom only are the consequences dissimilar ...

A move of this type inevitably changes the language, makes it elusive and dynamic. If at the outset it’s more distanced, more analytic and even more placid, I’d say; at the end it’s a bit more breathless, open, intimate ... Which in turn leads to vernacular zones multiplication, to piled up layers of various language territories, and comprises one of the great merits of the book. For it is not straightforwardly trying to project a “self” as its ideal or “selves” of high discursive freedom but it makes these “selves” happen and dissolves their languages. Thus the change turns out to be not only theme of the most of the essays – the change in the public life but the changes that befall all of us too - it turns into immanent characteristics of the modes it is spoken of and written about. Otherwise said, the language manages to fulfill what the book incessantly suggests – the proper discourse of the change is the one practicing the change in itself by incessantly changing and supplementing itself.

Whence is the occurrence of this language located; whence is it spoken to us? And how is it doing it? Which are, formulated in another way, Bogdan Bogdanov's discourse premises? Antiquity, I'd say. Plato's wording, Plato's passion to the live dialogue, to the oneness attained through bringing together multiple points of view. In general - ancient Greek vision on the vitality of the being, on its aptitude for self-expression. These premises, I guess, trail along after themselves juxtapositions, done by Bogdan Bogdanov with ease, with skill in setting the ancient against the contemporary, and by straining them, to reveal the constant, the typology ... Not that Bogdan Bogdanov's language blacks out the unique: just the opposite - the final texts of the book are its genuine apology; what's more, Bogdan Bogdanov is adept in nuancing, in building up layers after layers, in shading, in explicating how behind the unique, the general gaps; in trying out their comparability, consistency ... Quite naturally, therefore, questions are generated by his texts as follows: what am I; what in me is mine and what - assumed; what is the world I live in; does it differ from the one of my contemporaries born somewhere else; and from the one of the past? ... What was their world, what were the past worlds? And what do all of them share - worlds and people which were in the past, which are at the present? Which are the constant cultural particularities we can rely on? And what is the actuality in itself? Extract out of the constant? A layout in it? Or in the unique? Or a sort of a hybrid of all these ..

Of course, the actuality in Bogdan Bogdanov's essays has its specific "name" - in the context, as it has already been mentioned, of the concentration around the modus a change (in the case "the openness" to the democracy) is going through - by the society and by the individual. Though it's among the merits of the book too, Bogdan Bogdanov does not discriminate this change from the others, the inevitably occurring ones with every human being notwithstanding the time and the place we live in - here I envision the changes related to the body, the age, the status ...

Awareness of these changes by each and everyone could make us understand that the "self" is not something close and constant but a dynamic openness. I. e. it could make us comprehend "the adaptable identity" as presumably intrinsic to us. (Bogdan Bogdanov's texts problematize stereotype notions - either romantic of the man as a close structure and the society as alien, hostile, and resisting; either psychoanalytic of a person as a product of a mythic family drama that from a moment onwards predestined one's life plot.) For it is constituted by the virtue of the interexchange, of interexplication of the personal and the social, and it is laid as a free linkage of occurrences that "write" a multitude of multifarious narratives ... The layered "self" grows on the compilation of these narratives, on their interpenetration.

The matter in hand is to assume all these as normally given. Assumption that to a large extent would enhance the so-called social changes, would enhance the transition to the modern, open communication too. For democracy, as Ricoeur asserts, is a sphere of experiment. That is to say - of a denial of the ready-made formulae, of deviation and of search of optimal solutions for concrete situations. Otherwise, either it is a sphere, a condition, you can't achieve, but a condition you have constantly and persevering to strive for in the surmount fatigue of the incessant motion and search.

However, the personal and the social dynamics often are misbalanced; they are somehow asymmetrical, split, and this is finely sensed in Bogdan Bogdanov's book. Personal time - as it explicates, - always moves quicker and in a bit different direction than the political and the cultural one. They are always lagging behind, suspended ... And the gap between them grows, oppresses the person, dispirits it, and shakes its trust in the necessity the open/dynamic existence to be practiced. Meanwhile - the book goes on, - again it is the gap that drives the individuals to

try to step it over and to harmonize, to the extent it is possible, their “small” time with the “big” one ...

Ever on these lines, Bogdan Bogdanov’s texts try to incite to self-reflection, to living through a being of our own - set ajar and dynamic, - and to living through the skillful accentuation on, let’s say, delineations, the concepts in them acquire. Or, an attempt is made through the provided by the language opportunities, through the symbolic charge, the importance of the interpretation, the explanation to be explicated ... Freedom, for example, is thought of as a personal act with its inferior manifestations - everyday-life freedom, chance to choose belongings, the joy of details; the open existence, on the other hand, is seen as numerous group activities of inclusion in and exclusion from; and so on.

In its complexity this highly conceptual, thought over, fore-thought and excellently constructed book is genuinely European, and its discourse, by enacting many different options, demonstrates something almost in want in Bulgaria – the philosophical validation, political thinking, and behaviour in addition. It does not demonstrate a sort of pathetic publicism, neither discloses any political affiliations. The political in it is a result of a moral and intellectual responsibility and exactly it turns it into a discourse of another grade. Therefore, it is in its prerogatives to problematize and to weaken the value of the sound messages, of the exhausted sense and by itself to be turned into a warrant of a transfer of new spheres of narration, of an explicit statement that succeeds, however, to turn upside down the conventional norms.

Amelia Licheva