

РОЗДІЛ 1

ТЕОРЕТИКО-МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ СОЦІОЛОГІЇ

УДК 316.1

DOI: 10.26565/2227-6521-2020-45-01

THE PROBLEM OF THEORIZING ON / OF SOCIOLOGY AND
PROBLEMATIZATION OF SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

Golikov Alexander – Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Sociology Department of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 4 Svobody Sq., Kharkiv 61022, Ukraine, e-mail: a.s.golikov@gmail.com ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>

У статті аналізуються проблеми теоретизування в сучасній соціології, обмеження і проблеми, з якими стикаються соціологи при побудові соціологічної теорії в сучасних умовах. Автор досліджує різні модуси практикування і відтворення теорії в академічній соціології. Аналізується проблема статусу теорії в сучасній соціології, її академічних, дидактичних і соціальних репрезентаціях. Підкреслюється, що службове, підпорядковане, обмежене становище фундаментального осмислення в структурі сучасної соціології є небезпечним для (від)творення самої соціології. Наводяться і аналізуються типові практики і структури використання та (від)творення фундаментальної теорії в сучасній соціологічній науці. Окремий акцент зроблено на дослідженні дидактичних аспектів теоретизування як в аудиторії, так і за її межами. Тут найважливішим сюжетом виявляється зв'язок університетської освіти як виробництва універсального образу людини, з одного боку, і теоретичного, узагальнюючого, абстрагуючого мислення. Крім того, важливим аспектом є проблема соціальної та дисциплінарної ідентичності соціології, використання нею концептуального, категоріального і методологічного арсеналу в аргументації своєї автономності та епістемологічної легітимності. Досліджуються можливості розвитку теоретичного інструментарію соціології з позицій виробництва множинності як умови системного розвитку. Окремий акцент зроблено на ідеологічній, виховній, соціалізаційній, комунікативній функції фундаментальної теорії. Формулюється висновок про можливості та обмеження фундаментального теоретизування в соціології в сучасних соціальних і епістемологічних умовах.

Ключові слова: соціологія, теорія, соціологічна теорія, викладання, евристика.

ПРОБЛЕМА ТЕОРЕТИЗУВАННЯ ПРО / В СОЦІОЛОГІЇ ТА ПРОБЛЕМАТИЗАЦІЯ
СОЦІОЛОГІЧНОЇ ТЕОРІЇ

Голіков Олександр Сергійович – доктор соціологічних наук, доцент кафедри соціології Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна, майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна, e-mail: a.s.golikov@gmail.com ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>

The article analyzes the problems of theorizing in modern sociology, limitations and problems that sociologists face when building a sociological theory in modern conditions. Author explores the different modes of practice and reproduction of theory in academic sociology. Problems of the status of theory in modern sociology, its academic, didactic and social representations are analyzed. It is emphasized that the service, subordinate, limited position of fundamental interpretations in the modern sociology's structure is dangerous for the (re)production of sociology as it is. Author classifies and analyses typical practices and structures of the use and (re)production of fundamental theory in modern sociological science. A special emphasis is made on the study of the didactic aspects of theorizing both in the classroom and outside it. Here, the most important plot is the connection between university education as the production of a universal human image, on the one hand, and theoretical, generalizing, abstractive thinking – on the other. In addition, an important aspect is the problem of social and disciplinary identity of sociology, its use of conceptual, categorical and methodological arsenal in arguing its autonomy and epistemological legitimacy. The possibilities of developing the theoretical tools of sociology from the standpoint of the production of plurality as a condition of its systemic development are investigated. Ideological, educational, socialization, communicative functions of the fundamental theory are underlined. The conclusion about the possibilities and limitations of fundamental theorizing in sociology in modern social and epistemological conditions is formulated.

Keywords: sociology, theory, sociological theory, teaching, heuristics.

There is nothing more practical than a good theory.
(either K. Levin, or A. Einstein, or N. Bohr, or E. Fermi ...)

Es gibt nichts Praktischeres als eine gute Theorie.
(attributed to I. Kant)

(Self)understanding of sociology itself, its place in society, its (mission? Function? Responsibility? Possibility?) position historically always been in contact with the problems of the theory in general, and fundamental, in particular. Sociology drifted between the poles of total denial of fundamental theory, on the one hand, and complete submission of sociological activities' empirical aspects to it, up to the Hegelian «um so schlimmer für die Fakten», – on the other. The classics (such as A. Giddens [1], R. Collins [2], Charles W. Mills [3], P. Bourdieu [4]) and novice sociologists with their often comical attempts to describe the elephant after research of one trunk only [5]. However, it is worth noting that in modern sociology there are reflections of the «exit from the state of pre-science» [6]. This problem indirectly was affected both by the modern developments like J. Elster [7], Nicholas Christakis [8], V. Dobrenkov and Kravchenko [9], I. Devyatko [10], and in the classical works of XIX – XX centuries.

This issue in sociology is considered from the point of view of teaching sociological theory [11] and the relationship between post- and academic science [12]; from the point of view of the structure of sociological theory [13; 14; 15] and the problem of developing a general methodology [14; 15]; from the standpoint of metatheoretization [16; 17; 18] and the latest theoretical perspectives at the beginning of the XXI century [19; 20; 21]; taking into account the aspects of consistency and levels of science about the social [13; 22; 23; 24] and even with meta-scientific (pan)optics [25; 26; 27; 28].

However, all these (and not only these) studies turn out to be either extrasociological¹, or didactic, or polemical, or more or less publicistic. In addition, many transformations and problems, faced by sociology at the moment, are implied in such studies as primarily situational, «secondary», unimportant, «unworthy» of the attention of the «sublime subject of theorizing». Meanwhile, they may turn out to have an essential effect on the conditions for (re)production of social theory, and this, of course, should be studied and discussed separately.

To such factors and problems, we include (of course, not claiming to propose an exhaustive list) the next:

- the formation of a marketed and commodified culture of (re)production of scientific knowledge. As has already been repeatedly pointed out at different levels of sociological discourse (monographs, articles, conference discussions, public scientific discussions, etc.), in recent years there has been a radical, fundamentally important change in the culture of scientific (self)(re)production, in which large texts (primarily monographs, as well as dissertations, research reports, etc.) are increasingly giving way to «small» ones not only in the «consumption» of scientific texts, but also in «production». The frankly imbalanced system of evaluating scientific achievements, that has reigned in recent years, provides, from our point of view, enormous (if we weigh the cost of labor, attention, effort) privileges to authors of articles (especially articles in specific² editions with specific requirements) compared with the authors of «large texts» produced in long-term periods, in extensive discussions with the deep excursions into theoretical and paradigmatic background, etc.;

- the formation of a marketed and commodified culture of applying scientific knowledge in academic (in general) and educational (in particular) activities. The constant emphasis on the «applied aspects» of educational courses, paranoid attention to «avoidance of excessive theoretical load», often demagogic demands «to be expressed in simple words» (how ridiculous such a requirement is for a professor of quantum physics or high-energy plasma chemistry!), intrusion of «modern educational techniques» (coaching, trainings, webinars, master classes, mediation techniques, facilitation, etc.) into traditional academic fields – all this becomes a powerful factor of pressure on theoretical thinking. Complex, system-related, hardly separable to «easily digestible» quanta, cumulative in its logic, non-obviously connected with the experience and the «body techniques» (M. Moss, P. Bourdieu) theory according the parameter of effectiveness and spectacularity clearly lose situational, craftily workable concretics of actions, which, however, are dead-end in their perspective. The sign of meaning turns out to be more seductive than the meaning itself, and the market mechanisms that legitimize this spectacular seductiveness as unconditionally, ultimately and ultimately domineering, organize competition in such a way that the «chamber orchestra» strategy is almost the only way to (self)preserve the theory;

- digitalization, distancing, virtualization of education with its parallel industrialization increases the heteronomy of the educational field in the modern world. The mechanisms of «promotion», homologous to the mechanisms of promotion in social networks («likes», «reposts», «comments» as ways of hyperrealization of what was once produced) obey the laws of fields that are fundamentally alien to the field of education. The «Temple of Science» loiters in the

¹ For example, focused more on the methodology of science, on the theory of theory, on general philosophical issues, on the problems of the historical-sociological process.

² Where we use the adjective «specific» in two senses - in the universally significant, everyday, and in the scientific, as, for example, P. Bourdieu does [29].

direction of the «educational services supermarket», and if the exit from the supermarket is at least somewhat complicated (spatially, merchandisely, institutionally, by material artifacts of the supermarket), then education in this light turns out to be an online store, liquidated only by «cross» in the upper right corner of the screen. This leads to the fact that the «entertainmentization» of the media becomes an essential process for education, and the fundamental theory as an unattractive, «poorly packaged» product is facing increasing neglect;

- formal interdisciplinarization of the academic space, which turns out to be more harmful than useful. Reproducing the formal patterns of interdisciplinarity, many agents of the academic field actually do not essentially overcome interdisciplinary boundaries (evidence of which, for example, is the low number of emerging and entrenched new areas «on the border» of sciences during last decades, and those that have emerged and entrenched, in many ways are not products interdisciplinary synthesis, and the intervention of a more «academically powerful» (primarily academically autonomous) discipline into the space of a less «powerful» one). At the same time, fundamental theories find themselves in a losing position: as the pillars and guardians of the academic autonomy of each of the «synthesized» academic fields, on the one hand, they find themselves under constant attacks of interdisciplinarity, and on the other, – under the irradiating influence of profanation and flattening;

- the transformation of time into a universal currency. The emergence of the «attention economy» [30], which sociologists and economists write about primarily from applied and empirical positions, in the academic space is fraught with a redistribution of attention, and not just that, but a redistribution with a deep transformation of the mechanisms themselves. Of course, the phenomenon of «attention investments» and the struggle for them has long been seen in relation to chains of interactive rituals science production [31], for example, but so far it was rather a «sign political economy of attention» (if synthesize concepts of Jean Baudrillard and R. Collins). Now we can say with confidence that it is being replaced by the «microeconomics of attention», where colleagues and employees are replaced by competitors, and the workshop is replaced by a bazaar. In such conditions, the (co)production of a fundamental theory – a product of an something unquestionably collective, product of a long historical tradition and a vast open academic space – turns out to be problematic. Refusal to invest in the «collective good» (one of them is a complex, differentiated, deeply argued and developed theory) in the short term looks like a more preferable and winning strategy, but in the long term, being a parasite on the already created collective goods (it is hardly necessary to explain, that even implied and latent theory remains a theory; it is impossible a priori, without a theoretical and methodological presumptions, study of social reality; that concepts, categories, operating schemes, regardless of the explicit acceptance are being shared collective good, etc.), erode them, without producing any replacement or erecting anything new on its foundation;

- redistribution of priorities for the activities of academic agents. Frequently presented in a loyalist, servile manner in relation to the prevailing discourses, this redistribution actually turn out to be neither an essential improvement in the activities of universities or institutions in the life of communities, nor a fundamental advance on the path of academic responsibility (in every sense of this phrase), nor a transformation of the relationship between universities and business-environment / political agents. But – completely in the logic of the political economy of time and attention – the classical areas of the functioning of the academic field are problematized. And one of the first victims of this problematization is a fundamental science in general and the fundamental theory, in particular. The consequence of this is a decrease in the methodological and ideological reflexivity of the subjects of the academic process, an unproblematic and naturalizing acceptance of the dominant ideologemes (including mass media, stereotypical, group, etc.) and mythologemes and, accordingly, a drop in the methodological nature of scientific activity, an increase in its heteronomy in relation to political, economic, everyday, ideological discourses.

It is because of all this that we consider it necessary to comprehend the transformations taking place with fundamental theory at the present time in Ukrainian sociology (in particular and by example), and the **purpose of our article** will be to identify and analyze the threats generated by the above mentioned transformations for the very existence of fundamental theory in sociology precisely as a) fundamental b) theory c) in sociology.

Those who practice without knowledge are like a sailor who sets off on the road without a rudder and a compass ... Practice should always be based on a good knowledge of theory.

(Leonardo da Vinci)

The fundamental theory, as we have already indicated above, in an implicit form exists as an ideological framework for thinking. Regardless of how saturated the particular thinking of an individual researcher with fundamental theoretical concepts is, regardless of his (un)willingness to open them, fill in and systematize them, the fundamental theory fundamentally limits (does not determines, but limits) the structures and practices of thinking. Moreover, the non-reflexivity of this theory dialectically enhances its influence and power: the chance of a theory to be reflexive lies precisely in the explicitness of the theory. Theory becomes essentially unreflected, if it is implied. It is with this that the constant efforts of any science are connected to explicate even the most seemingly obvious, intuitive and tangibly comprehensible categories (in this sense, it is very indicative how, under strict formalization, even school-trained concepts like a point, semi line or unit acquire the most complex mathematical explications).

Sociology on the beginning of the XXI century, having gone through the difficult preliminary path of (self)formalization, the construction of metatheoretical constructions, attempts to produce a metalanguage (according to R. Barthes [32]) (through which it would be possible to describe not only reality itself, but also other ways of its description), seems to make the opposite turn. This alarming signal consists in the rejection of the «too sophisticated» (literal quotation of the opinion of one of the professors of an American university) P. Bourdieu's speculations about the nature of sociological methodologies and the interests of sociological methodologists [4]; from powerful systemic theories regardless of the design of the systems (from Y. Yakuba [33] to N. Luhmann) in favor of particularistic, and therefore inevitably subservient to ideologems and the «topically relevances», agendas and themes; from post-structuralist suspicion (generated by the kaleidoscopic combination of suspicion of *Marx*, Freud and Nietzsche) in relation to every structure and practice, scheme of thought and action, fact and «fact». Not being completely liquidated, this entire ensemble of sociological autonomy is replaced by purely ritual, overviewal and quotational, heuristically meaningless practices of «mutual admiration», as the sarcastic P. Bourdieu would put it, with a co-polluting³ mutual increase of the citation indexes.

*To know and note the living, you'll find it
Best to first dispense with the spirit:
Then with the pieces in your hand,
Ah! You've only lost the spiritual bond⁴.*

(I. W. Goethe «Faust»)

This gives rise to fundamentally different typical practices and structures for the use and (re)production of fundamental theory in modern sociological science. The fundamental theory, immersed in a profane heteronomous environment:

- is being vulgarized, a typical manifestation of which is the division into separate theorems and concepts, used independently of each other, without connection with their contexts and genesis. Concepts (like separate notes without melody) do not mean anything by themselves, but their use outside contexts and genesis destroys, eliminates, weakens the long-cultivated and nurtured «sense of theory», «intuition of thought», *au sens d'investissement dans le jeu*⁵. The structure is again more important than the substrate of this structure;

- is being servilized: the production of a fundamental theory becomes a service task, subordinated and limited in relation to the entire structure of modern sociology. This danger threatens to the (re)production of sociology itself: outside the fundamental theory concrete data, specific research results, data banks turn out not to be the basis for verification and falsification of scientific models, but the tools for breaking its autonomy, intellectual independence and conceptual rigor. The very same fundamental theory in combination with the process of vulgarization appears as a set of loosely connected concepts, categories, methods, chaotically offered for sale in the open space not of a forum, but of a bazaar;

- is being de-didacticized: the fundamental theory ceases to play an integrating, sacralizing (including (in the sense of) the production of the academic community, the academic world, etc.), solidarizing role. The very communication of the fundamental theory turns into irony over theorizing, the constant rejection of a theory in ontology, its (post)deconstruction. And if all of the above is not problematic in itself, however, devoid of its own fundamental foundation, this complex turns into a frankly toxic, acidic environment in which it becomes impossible (first of all, common and joint, but also individual) production of complexly coordinated systemically organized conceptual structures. Such «formal vacuum», the absence of explicit fundamental theoretical and philosophical foundation does not mean the ability to absolute skeptical and careful research suspicion. They much more often mean selective blindness, a selective vision of one's own blindness, which is terminally dangerous for the social sciences;

- is being desocialized: the fundamental theory in sociology, in the history of science, starts unexpectedly for itself (although T. Adorno and M. Horkheimer probably would have found their own remarks about this surprise) to perform socializing and educational functions, at the turn of the century it distances itself from this a historically established function. And if for the (re)production of academic identity and academic communities, the fundamental theory's socializing function continues to be carried out (apparently, primarily due to the fact that the objective structures produced in a ritual and symbolic way turn out to be more stable than the structures of thought and perception associated with these objective structures), then there are already doubts and questions about the broader implementation of this function. That is why we increasingly often observe texts that are extremely problematic from the point of view of conceptual rigor and scientific socialization, that is why the fundamental theory, losing its «priestly» role, ceases to attract potentially strong producers;

³ We are not sure if the next scientific joke is correct, but we have to say it: above-mentioned co-polluting mutual increase is too similar to copulation.

⁴ In Russian: «Во всем подслушать жизнь стремясь, / Спешат явления обездушить, / Забыв, что если в них нарушить / Одушевляющую связь, / То больше нечего и слушать».

⁵ Feeling of the involvement in the game (fr.).

- is being dereflexed: operating with theoretical concepts becomes an aim in itself. Metatheorizing is becoming extremely deficit (especially in Ukrainian sociology), even to the point of being forbidden or tabooed. Reflexivity is increasingly stigmatized as «alarmism», «tendency to intimidate», «epistemological pessimism», «sociological disbelief». This leads, on the one hand, to a fetishization of fundamental theorizing (with the fall of criticality, with the disintegration of the tradition of analytical suspicion, with the rejection of the study of «invaluable» theories – it does not matter, due to rejection in the mass academic discourse or the explicit disagreement of the researcher himself), on the other – to devastation and formalization of this theorizing, reduction to the reproduction of empty forms. One of the scientific theory roots – critical, dissenting, polemical thinking – is chopped down and dries up, and the overregulated nature of scientific texts leads to the intensification of this process. Critical and analytical reviews are replaced by complimentary compilation and compilational compliments, the independent synthesis of one's own (mini-)theories is replaced by mechanical reception of other people's theoretical developments as applied to a specific case or problem, and research-tasks are replaced by research-exercises.

- *What are you going to do?*

- *I planned to listen to your theories, ridicule them and then come up with my own.*

(«House M.D.», s3e10)

Everything described above cannot be solved in a particular, private, individual way in the order of a single opposition to systemic phenomena. The very system of organizing modern (in particular social) science effectively prevents the emergence and development of theorizing nodes in modern sociology. Certain sociologists, applies to the construction of sociological theory in the current conditions, do it like «excusing», often with intentional clumsiness and schematizations that in any case not be stigmatized as «theoretically ambitious». Disconceptual, theoretically «deaf», but possessing social, political, publicational «resonance» and attractiveness researches are encouraged and promoted by publications and statuses.

This, in turn, is constantly reproduced in generations of academic sociologists removed from sociological theory, from a penchant for generalizing, bold, breakthrough hypotheses, but closed to linearly programmed (which does not exclude «social acuteness», «political relevance», «cultural sensitivity» etc. modern characteristics of work) and mechanically implemented research and scientific projects and texts. Sociology itself, precisely as a science, as a structure and practice of generalization, puts itself in a subordinate role to specific empirical and technical spheres of activity and life (PR, advertising, marketing, polling, data analysis, SMM, management, media expertise, etc.). This, in turn, induces «public sociologists» to present and represent themselves precisely as «carriers of knowledge about numbers», as a «living diagram», as a «talking graph»: on the one hand, such a willingness to hide behind mechanically mathematically averaged (and only in this, but not in the sociological or philosophical sense, generalized) data is politically safe and calm. On the other hand, it turns the sociologist from a subject into an object, his speaking – into a subordinate task, his interpretation – into his particular point of view (quite comparable with the point of view of everyday figures, journalists, politicians, etc.). On the third, it plunges him into an almost total dependence on (potential) sources of empirical data, and ultimately on the customers of this data. The only legitimate weapon of a sociologist in public space – a powerful, autonomous, coherent, holistic, axiomatically based and theoretically constructed theory – is thrown aside by the sociologist himself.

This, in its turn, generates sociology academic representations as secondary. We observe how sociological courses and specialties per se all over Ukraine are reborn into low sociological or extrasociological ones, and sociology itself loses its identity, ability to self-reproduction and self-argumentation. Not only the disciplinary but also the social identity of sociology itself is under attack. This is manifested, for example, in a deep deconstruction of the autonomy of sociology in relation to the conceptual, categorical and methodological arsenal, and ultimately to its epistemological legitimacy. Discussion of the topic of economic sociology will increasingly demand competence (at least formally recorded) in economics, the topic of sociology of music – in the field of art and music, in particular, etc. The actual sociological aspect in such topics (and this, we note, is not at all due to the insistence of interdisciplinarity!) turns out to be delegitimized, incompetent, non-epistemological. Autonomous views on philosophy, as suggested by R. Collins [31] (whose book, according to the apt remark of one of the commentators, is good, except for one flaw: it is similar to a fundamental work about an opera written by a deaf), or on the right, as it is made N. Luhmann [34], become more and more attacked and discredited. But it is not sociologists who are replacing the interdisciplinary, sociologically synthesizing view: this epistemological void is filled by representatives of other sciences, from the standpoint of other sciences and in their methodology.

Another consequence of such a degeneration of the sociological fundamental theory is the destruction of the connection between university education as the production of a universal human image, on the one hand, and theoretical, generalizing, abstractive thinking, on the other. The education involves the production of knowledge of the subject according to the image, even if the imagery is diverse and seemingly redundant. Whereas the rejection of fundamental generalization and theoretical abstraction erodes and probably completely destroys the chance for

education in the above sense. Education becomes a situational production of market-demanded «blanks» of craft-relevant, technically adequate machine-bodies, using the metaphor of J. Deleuze and F. Guattari.

In a paradoxical (or, more precisely, purely dialectical) way, it is the totality of the theory that turns out to be a chance for the production of conceptual, epistemological, and even ontological plurality as a fundamental condition for the systemic development of both science and society. The totality of the theory is pretentious, for it seeks to be told to everyone about everything and everyone. The totality of the theory is ambitious, for it seeks ways to eliminate opponents and rivals. The totality of the theory is tendentious, for it generalizes within the limits of its theorem and axiomatics. The totality of the theory is official, for it claims a monopoly of the vision of the described world and a description of a monopoly vision of the world. The totality of the theory is sententious, for it seeks to describe succinctly and aphoristically systems that significantly surpass their own description in complexity. However, with all this, it is the totality of the theory with its model gracefulness that makes it possible to produce mutually intelligible scientific communication, and within the framework of this communication – an ever-increasing contingency.

Those doubts that theory does not resolve, practice will resolve for you.
(L. Feuerbach)

Everything we have described needs theoretical schematization and modeling. In this sense, we believe that it is impossible not to relate in any way to the (fundamental) theory. Any – even ignoring – relationship can be described precisely as a relationship. And here we offer the above-described modes of attitude to the fundamental theory in a generalized form (see Table 1), depending on the involvement (objective and subjective) in the operation of the theory.

Table 1

Four ways to relate to history and theory of sociology

	<i>Objective involvement</i>	<i>Subjective involvement</i>
Syntagma ⁶	+	+
Dogma	-	+
Pragma	+	-
Digma ⁷	-	-

As is clear from this table, we spoke above primarily about the P-modus and Di-modus of production of sociology. Although the Do-modus is perhaps no less dangerous for the fundamental theory in sociology than the first two, the Do-modus is a separate subject for research. Note that, of course, we touched upon some aspects of its practice (in particular, when we talked about the defunctionalizing dismemberment and desystematization of theory, turning it into comfortable and weak-willed scraps), but this phenomenon needs special research.

In general, the scheme proposed by us, of course, resembles R.K. Merton's one (as well as the typology of irrational actions according to V.F. Pareto). Do-modus is quite homologous to ritualism, Di-modus – to retreatism, P-mode – to innovation. This view reminds us that the phenomena we have described (with certain, of course, assumptions) can be viewed from a completely different angle: the P-mode is an important source of new approaches and views, conformism is not only conformism, but also the co-order of the syntagma, etc.

For us, it is more important that it is precisely from the angle of such a study becomes clear, for example, the phenomenon of the unity of the historical-sociological process. It turns out that «cumulativeness» of historical and theoretical-sociological knowledge is somewhat different from the cumulativeness of classic «normal science». If in the case of the «normal sciences» this cumulativeness is the linear cumulativeness of a holistic architectural form, then in the case of sociology this cumulativeness is not only rhizomatic (using the metaphor of J. Deleuze and F. Guattari), but also oscillatory, probabilistic, indeterminate. That is why vulgar counterarguments to social theories (with indications of individual specificities, for example; with constructions of alternative fermatisms; with physicalist or biologizing reductionisms), being effective and often logically flawless, are irrelevant from the point of view of the internal logic of sociology.

This unity of history and theory, objective and subjective involvement in syntagma, constitutes, in fact, a disciplinary and disciplinizing identity, or, as sociologists themselves say, «sociology is what sociologists do». That is why, in fact, a person who is not involved in sociology, trying to comprehend society outside of sociology, remains a nonsociologist: a mathematician remains a mathematician (primarily in epistemology, although his direct empirical subject is a society and its epiphenomenality), a biologist – a biologist, etc.

⁶ From Old Greek. σύνταγμα, lit. «Order», from ancient Greek. σύν – «with», «co-» and τάγμα – «order», that is, the order of objectivity and subjectivity in our case.

⁷ Let us remind you that Old Greek. παρά «near» + δείγμα «shown, sample, sample», from δείκνυμι «showing, indicating». In this sense, a «paradigm» is «somewhere near what is shown» that is, «around a specific central sample». That is why «digma» is a «sample for itself», «a sample without a region around it», a sample that is neither subjectively nor objectively involved in scientific paradigmatics and methodology.

Theories are nets: only the one who casts them, can catch a fish. (Novalis)

Of course, we have only outlined the key nodes in a large network of problems and questions. A number of questions remain outside the scope of this article. We have only described, but have not operationalized or demonstrated practical explications of the four modes of relationship. We have not analyzed the consequences for these modes of attitude from the factors of the transformation of sociological education given in the article. We had no opportunity to investigate the tactics of resistance that the fundamental theory offers to all these processes. All this remains a prospect for further research.

However, we found that modern social and epistemological conditions impose fundamental restrictions on fundamental theorizing in sociology, but they also create new conditions for it. Fundamental theory remains a multi-layered, multifunctional phenomenon that generates worldview, methodological, paradigmatic, conceptual optics, prescribing categories, interpretation schemes, operating rules, etc. to the researcher and prescribing his view. Ignoring or explicit rejection of the fundamental theory does not at all eliminate the problems associated with it, but generates additional problems, the means of solving which, outside of the (re)production of conceptual-theoretical tools, at the moment, no science, including sociology, knows. Postmodern attempts (including the Heidegger-Deleuze intentions of rejecting the «false Socratic path») in this dimension have not been crowned with anything operational and tangible. Therefore, we are inclined to regard the observed «theoretical rollback» not as a herald of a new (non-theoretical) era in the history of science, but as (temporary?) degradation, including the degradation of theoretical, conceptual, categorical, methodological culture. This does not free the researcher from the power of language (including the scientific language), but subordinates the scientist at best to implicit scientific doxes, at worst – to heteronomous doctrines and myths.

That is why we believe that the rejection of the fundamental theory (including the scale of «large texts») in scientific discourse is nothing more than a «lentil soup». The inequality of the exchange of eternity for the momentary, truth – for profit is obvious to anyone who thinks not only in terms of the market. In academic and especially pedagogical discourse, this is (continuing the metaphor of sacredness) nothing more than a Trojan horse, which, behind its simplicity, obviousness and clarity, transfers the illusion of truth and essentiality to the structures of thinking. The catastrophic nature of the potential consequences (it is enough to imagine an engineer-chemist who does not have fundamental knowledge of basic chemistry; a dentist who knows nothing about basic physiology, etc.) is obvious to anyone who operates with at least some strategic concepts. And here sociology is far from aloof from this issue. If the mistakes of a physicist or chemist, physician or biologist are immediately obvious, then the mistakes of a sociologist, social philosopher, thinker, expert precisely because of their non-obviousness are much more scale and ambitious (due to the scale of social systems compared to, for example, biological ones) and long-term (due to non-obviousness). This is just one of the potential costs of the brutal betrayal by sociology of its own theoretical essence.

Bibliography:

1. Гидденс Э. Девять тезисов о будущем социологии. THESIS. 1993. Вып. 1. С. 57-82.
2. Коллинз Р. Социологическая пронципальность. Введение в неочевидную социологию / Личностно-ориентированная социология. Москва: Академический Проект, 2004. 608 с.
3. Миллс Ч.Р. Социологическое воображение. Москва : NOTA BENE, 2001. 264 с.
4. Бурдые П. Опыт рефлексивной социологии / Теоретическая социология: Антология: В 2 ч. Часть 2. Москва : КД «Университет», 2002. 424 с/
5. Голиков А.С. Статус социологии в постсовременности: (не)наука о (не) познаваемом? // Методологія, теорія та практика соціологічного аналізу сучасного суспільства: збірник наукових праць. Харків : ХНУ імені В.Н. Каразіна, 2005. С. 262-268.
6. Тихонов А. В. Отечественная социология: проблема выхода из состояния преднауки и поиска новых стратегий // Вестник Института социологии. 2010. № 1. С. 203-229.
7. Эльстер Ю. Объяснение социального поведения: еще раз об основах социальных наук. Москва: Издательский дом ГУ ВШЭ, 2011. 472 с
8. Кристакис Н., Фаулер Дж. Связанные одной сетью. Как на нас влияют люди, которых мы никогда не видели. Москва: Юнайтед Пресс, 2011. 362 с.
9. Добренков В. И., Кравченко А.И. Фундаментальная социология. Том 1. Теория и методология. Москва: ИНФРА-М, 2003. 905 с.
10. Девятко И. Ф. Метатеоретизирование или философия социальных наук? // Социологические исследования. 2017. № 12 (404). С. 3-9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7868/S0132162517120017>
11. Головин Н. А. Преподавание социологической теории в Санкт-Петербургском государственном университете // Журнал социологии и социальной антропологии. 1998. Т. 1. № 1. С. 139-147.
12. Федотова В. Г. Соотношение академической и постакадемической науки как социальная проблема. Москва: ИФ РАН, 2015. 208 с.
13. Тощенко Ж. Т. Парадигмы, структура и уровни социологического знания // Социология власти. 2009. № 5. С. 7-25.
14. Бабосов Е. М. Структура и методология социологии. Личность. Культура. Общество. 2001. Т. 3. № 4 (10). С. 11-29.

15. Полякова Н. Л. Методологический плюрализм и структура социологической теории // Вестник Московского университета. Серия 18. Социология и политология. 2015. № 4. С. 50-68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24290/1029-3736-2015-0-4-50-68>
16. Девятко И. Ф. Метатеоретизирование в социологии: перспективы концептуальной стандартизации и теоретической кодификации социологического знания // Россия реформирующаяся. 2003. № 3. С. 009-038.
17. Романовский Н. В. Метатеоретизирование в социологии: дискурс и прогноз // Социологические исследования. 2018. № 2 (406). С. 127-135. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7868/S0132162518020137>
18. Троцук И. В. Форматы метатеоризирования в социологии. ПОИСК: Политика. Обществоведение. Искусство. Социология. Культура. 2017. № 3 (62). С. 12-20.
19. Ерофеева М. А. Проблематизация объекта в современной теоретической социологии // Социологические исследования. 2017. № 7 (399). С. 13-23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7868/S0132162517070029>
20. Полякова Н. Л. Новые теоретические перспективы в социологии начала XXI в. // Вестник Московского университета. Серия 18. Социология и политология. 2015. № 2. С. 29-46. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24290/1029-3736-2015-0-2-29-46>
21. Полякова Н. Л. Методологические основания построения теории общества в социологии конца XX - начала XXI в.: отход от социологической ортодоксии // Вестник Московского университета. Серия 18. Социология и политология. 2011. № 4. С. 76-93.
22. Добренков В. И., Кравченко А. И. Система социологического знания // Социология. 2015. № 3. С. 150-168.
23. Попова М. А. Социология как наука об обществе: подходы и уровни изучения // Современные проблемы гуманитарных и общественных наук. 2014. № 3 (3). С. 97-102.
24. Осипова Н. Г. Отраслевая матрица современной социологии: кризис дивергенции // Вестник Московского университета. Серия 18. Социология и политология. 2013. № 2. С. 29-51.
25. Мансуров В. А. Социология и общество: проблемы взаимодействия // Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. Серия: Социально-гуманитарные науки. 2006. № 2 (57). С. 35-36.
26. Филиппов А. Ф. О понятии «теоретическая социология» // Социологический журнал. 1997. № 1-2. С. 5-37.
27. Кимелев Ю. А., Полякова Н.Л. Философия социальных наук // Вестник Московского университета. Серия 18. Социология и политология. 2014. № 1. С. 20-46. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24290/1029-3736-2014-0-1-13-22>
28. Lebedev S. A. Contemporary philosophy of science: object, subject and structure // European Journal of Philosophical Research. 2016. № 2 (6). С. 62-76. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejpr.2016.6.62>
29. Бурдьё П. Практический смысл. Москва: Институт экспериментальной социологии; Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя, 2000. 562 с.
30. Bueno C. C. The Attention Economy: Labour, Time and Power in Cognitive Capitalism. Rowman & Littlefield International, 2017. 210 p.
31. Коллинз Р. Социология философий: глобальная теория интеллектуального изменения. Новосибирск : Сибирский хронограф. 2002. 1280 с.
32. Барт Р. Литература и метаязык / Барт Р. Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика. Москва, 1994. С. 131-132.
33. Якуба Е. А. Социология. Харьков: Константа, 1996. 192 с.
34. Luhmann N. Rechtssoziologie. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1972. 205 s

ПРОБЛЕМА ТЕОРЕТИЗИРОВАНИЯ В / О СОЦИОЛОГИИ И ПРОБЛЕМАТИЗАЦИЯ СОЦИОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ТЕОРИИ

Голиков Александр Сергеевич – доктор социологических наук, доцент кафедры социологии Харьковского национального университета имени В. Н. Каразина, пл. Свободы, 4, Харьков, 61022, Украина, e-mail: a.s.golikov@gmail.com ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>

В статье анализируются проблемы теоретизирования в современной социологии, ограничения и проблемы, с которыми сталкиваются социологи при построении социологической теории в современных условиях. Автор исследует различные модусы практикования и воспроизводства теории в академической социологии. Анализируется проблема статуса теории в современной социологии, её академических, дидактических и социальных репрезентациях. Подчёркивается, что служебное, подчинённое, ограниченное положение фундаментального осмысления в структуре современной социологии является опасным для (вос)производства самой социологии. Приводятся и анализируются типичные практики и структуры использования и (вос)производства фундаментальной теории в современной социологической науке. Отдельный акцент сделан на исследовании дидактических аспектов теоретизирования как в аудитории, так и за её пределами. Здесь важнейшим сюжетом оказывается связь университетского образования как производства универсального образа человека, с одной стороны, и теоретического, обобщающего, абстрагирующего мышления. Кроме того, важным аспектом является проблема социальной и дисциплинарной идентичности социологии, использование ею концептуального, категориального и методологического арсенала в аргументации своей автономности и эпистемологической легитимности. Исследуются возможности развития теоретического инструментария социологии с позиций производства множественности как условия системного развития. Отдельный акцент сделан на идеологической, воспитательной, социализационной, коммуникативной функциях фундаментальной теории. Формулируется вывод о возможностях и ограничениях фундаментального теоретизирования в социологии в современных социальных и эпистемологических условиях.

Ключевые слова: социология, теория, социологическая теория, преподавание, эвристика.

References:

1. Giddens, A. (1993) 'Nine Theses on the Future of Sociology' *THESIS*. Issue 1. P. 57-82 [in Russian]
2. Collins, R. (2004) 'Sociological Insight. An Introduction to Nonobvious Sociology' *Personality-Oriented Sociology*. Moscow: Academic Project [in Russian]
3. Mills, C. R. (2001) *Sociological Imagination*. Moscow: NOTA BENE [in Russian]
4. Bourdieu, P. (2002) 'Experience of Reflective Sociology' *Theoretical Sociology: Anthology: In 2 parts. Part 2*. Moscow: KD «University» Pp. 160-185 [in Russian]
5. Golikov, A. S. (2005) 'The Status of Sociology in Postmodernity: the (Non)Science about (Un)Knowable?' *Methodology, theory and practice of sociological analysis of the modern society. Collection of Science Works*. Kharkiv: V. N. Karazin KhNU p. 262-268 [in Russian]
6. Tikhonov, A. V. (2010) 'Russia sociology: the problem of getting out of the state of pre-science and finding new strategies' *Bulletin of the Institute of Sociology*. No. 1. S. 203-229 [in Russian]
7. Elster, Y. (2011) *Explaining Social Behavior: More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Moscow: Publishing House of the State University Higher School of Economics, 2011 [in Russian]
8. Christakis, N. and Fowler, J. (2011) *Connected. The Surprising Power of Our Social Network and How They Shape Our Lives*. Moscow: United Press [in Russian]
9. Dobrenkov, V. I. and Kravchenko, A. I. (2003) *Fundamental Sociology. Volume 1. Theory and methodology*. Moscow: INFRA-M [in Russian]
10. Devyatko, I. F. (2017) *Metatheorizing or Philosophy of Social Sciences? Sociological Studies*. No. 12 (404). Pp. 3-9 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7868/S0132162517120017> [in Russian]
11. Golovin, N. A. (1998) 'Teaching Sociological Theory at St. Petersburg State University' *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology* T. 1. No. 1. Pp. 139-147 [in Russian]
12. Fedotova, V. G. (2015) *Academic-Postacademic Sciences Relation as a Social Problem*. Moscow: Institute of Philosophy of Russian Academy of Sciences [in Russian]
13. Toshchenko, Zh. T. (2009) 'Paradigms, Structure and Levels of Sociological Knowledge' *Sociology of power*. No. 5. Pp. 7-25 [in Russian]
14. Babosov, E. M. (2001) 'The Structure and Methodology of Sociology' *Personality. Culture. Society*. T. 3. No. 4 (10). Pp. 11-29 [in Russian]
15. Polyakova, N. L. (2015) 'Methodological Pluralism and Structure of Sociological Theory' *Moscow State University Bulletin. Series 18. Sociology and Political Science* No. 4. Pp. 50-68 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24290/1029-3736-2015-0-4-50-68> [in Russian]
16. Devyatko, I. F. (2003) 'Metatheorizing in Sociology: Perspectives of Conceptual Standardization and Theoretical Codification Of Sociological Knowledge' *Russia is reforming*. No. 3. Pp. 9-38 [in Russian]
17. Romanovsky, N. V. (2018) 'Metatheorizing in sociology: review of discourse and a forecast' *Sociological Studies* No. 2 (406). Pp. 127-135 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7868/S0132162518020137> [in Russian]
18. Trotsuk, I. V. (2017) 'Forms of Metatheorization in Sociology' *SEARCH: Politics. Social studies. Art. Sociology. Culture*. No. 3 (62). Pp. 12-20 [in Russian]
19. Erofeeva, M. A. (2017) 'Object Problematization in Modern Theoretical Sociology' *Sociological Studies* No. 7 (399). Pp. 13-23 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7868/S0132162517070029> [in Russian]
20. Polyakova, N. L. (2015) 'New Theoretical Perspectives in Sociology at the Beginning of the XXI century' *Moscow State University Bulletin. Series 18. Sociology and Political Science*. No. 2. Pp. 29-46 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24290/1029-3736-2015-0-2-29-46> [in Russian]
21. Polyakova, N. L. (2011) 'Methodological Foundations for Constructing a Theory of Society in Sociology of the late XX - early XXI century: a Departure From Sociological Orthodoxy' *Moscow State University Bulletin. Series 18. Sociology and Political Science*. No. 4. Pp. 76-93 [in Russian]
22. Dobrenkov, V. I. and Kravchenko, A. I. (2015) *The System of Sociological Knowledge. Sociology*. No. 3. Pp. 150-168 [in Russian]
23. Popova, M. A. (2014) 'Sociology as a Science About Society: Approaches and Levels of Study' *Contemporary Problems of the Humanities and Social Sciences*. No. 3 (3). Pp. 97-102 [in Russian]
24. Osipova, N. G. (2013) 'Sectoral Matrix of Contemporary Sociology: Divergence Crisis' *Moscow University Bulletin. Series 18. Sociology and Political Science*. No. 2. Pp. 29-51.
25. Mansurov, V. A. (2006) 'Sociology and Society: Problems of Interaction' *Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Series: Social Sciences and Humanities* No. 2 (57). Pp. 35-36 [in Russian]
26. Filippov, A. F. (1997) 'On the Concept of «Theoretical Sociology»'. *Sociological Journal* No. 1-2. Pp. 5-37 [in Russian]
27. Kimelyev, J. A. and Polyakova, N. L. (2014) 'Philosophy of the social sciences' *Moscow State University Bulletin. Series 18. Sociology and Political Science* No. 1. Pp. 20-46 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24290/1029-3736-2014-0-1-13-22> [in Russian]
28. Lebedev, S. A. (2016) 'Contemporary Philosophy of Science: Object, Subject and Structure' *European Journal of Philosophical Research*. No. 2 (6). Pp. 62-76 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejpr.2016.6.62> [in Russian]
29. Bourdieu, P. (2000) *Practical Reason*. Moscow: Institute of Experimental Sociology; St. Petersburg: Aleteya [in Russian]
30. Bueno, C. C. (2017) *The Attention Economy: Labor, Time and Power in Cognitive Capitalism*. Rowman & Littlefield International
31. Collins, R. (2002) *The Sociology of Philosophies: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Novosibirsk: Siberian chronograph
32. Barthes, R. (1994) 'Literature and metalanguage' *Selected Works: Semiotics. Poetics*. Moscow Pp. 131-132 [in Russian]
33. Yakuba, E. A. (1996) *Sociology*. Kharkov: Constant [in Russian]
34. Luhmann, N. (1972) *Rechtssoziologie*. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt