

РОЗДІЛ 1

ТЕОРЕТИКО-МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ СОЦІОЛОГІЇ

DOI: 10.26565/2227-6521-2022-48-01

УДК 316.2

SYSTEMICITY AS A CHARACTERISTIC OF SOCIETY IN THE INTERPRETATION OF YELENA YAKUBA: HEURISTIC POSSIBILITIES FOR CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY

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

The article analyzes systemicity as a metaphilosophical and world view characteristic for society in the sociological conception of Kharkiv sociological school' founder Yelena Alexandrovna Yakuba. Carrying out an epistemological analysis of systemicity in the concept of Y. Yakuba, the author demonstrates various aspects and manifestations of this property, and also analyzes the actual and potential connections with the general theoretical sociological and philosophical heritage. The features of the interpretation of society as a system by E. Yakuba are studied, a comparison with other interpretations of the system and systemicity is made. It is emphasized that ignoring the ontological systemic nature of society (which is not identical with the genetic systemicity) in modern sociology leads to a number of epistemological and methodological effects. Y. Yakuba's arguments regarding systemicity as a property of society are given and analyzed. The author singles out a number of such arguments, carrying out a detailed analysis of each of them separately. Special emphasis is placed on the analysis of how systemicity manifests itself, what it consists of, what is its phenomenality and epiphenomenality. It is shown that in the concept of Y. Yakuba, society is a real phenomenon, it is connected with the individual not directly, but through a whole network of elements of the social structure. At the same time, personality as a social product manifests itself in any person, the question is only in the degree of manifestation. The measure of this manifestation is the status, and an indicator of the status is the role as a set of actions that the individual occupying this position should perform. Statuses and roles are studied as ones integrating various human acts into the social order. It is the point, from which, as the author shows, the problem of social activity arises. Here, the most important plot is the connection of systemicity as a property of society with activity and subjectivity as a property of the action of its members. A number of conclusions are formulated regarding systemicity as a category, its place in the sociological concept of Y. Yakuba, as well as its heuristic potential in modern sociology.

Keywords: society, system, systemicity, Yelena Yakuba, sociological theory, heuristic possibilities.

Для цитування: Golikov O. Systemicity as a Characteristic of Society in the Interpretation of Yelena Yakuba: Heuristic Possibilities for Contemporary Sociology. *Visnyk of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series "Sociological studies of contemporary society: methodology, theory, methods"*. 2022. 48. С. 7-13 <https://doi.org/10.26565/2227-6521-2022-48-01>

An intelligent person is characterized by spirituality, which is expressed in the unity, systemicity of the value system, the unity of the rational, emotional and volitional level of their acceptance... An intelligent person is characterized by above-standard activity, consistent upholding of one's positions, moral activity as a resolute upholding of humane norms, the struggle against their violation, the unity of goals and means of activity and the rejection of violent methods, means as inappropriate for high universal human goals.
(Yelena Yakuba)

Setting the problem in its general form and its connection with important scientific or practical tasks

Sociological theory, after almost a full quarter of the twenty-first century, has found itself in the face of completely unexpected challenges. If we turn to the analysis and forecasts of 30-40 years ago, we will see that the sociological Cassandras did not envisage either a situation of mesotheorizing inflation in sociology, or sociology's

sluggish disregard for a dramatic collision in general sociological theory, or sociology's lazy rejection of any attempts at metatheorizing. This specific "pyramid" in sociological theory currently looks like this:

- exorbitantly inflated by both institutional-publishing and social means theories of the middle level, which not only often do not pay attention to the realism of the claimed theory (up to the appearance of such specific phenomena as "sociology of professionalism" [17], which was more than once caustic dismantled [18]);

- frozen contradictions and conflicts at the level of general sociological theory, in which the titanic efforts made in the last third of the 20th century in synthetic methodology, in poststructuralism, in neofunctionalism, and in a number of other areas turned out to be, if not a dead end, then at least ignored by sociologists of the 21st century, who only in some cases (actor-network theory, "économie de la grandeur" L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot, etc.) were developed and concretized. For the rest, the sociological theory of the first quarter of the 21st century looks either as sporadic helpless single attempts made from narcissistic-egocentric positions (like the attempt of N. Christakis [1]), or as abstract reviews with minor modifications and add-ons (for example, J. Elster [3]), or as private developments based on existing theories for specific tasks and problems (like R. Collins [2] or A. Honneth [7]);

- finally, de-sociologization of previously successfully sociologized issues of reflection of sociology, its self-analysis, mastered by sociology, the construction of a sociology of sociology, which formally and quantitatively continues to develop (especially in the analysis of the internal differentiation of sociology as a social space, institution, practice), while qualitative advancement looks quite problematic .

Analysis of recent researches and publications in which the solution to this problem was initiated and which author relies; the allocation of previously unsolved parts of the general problem the article is devoted to

In this situation, sociology is increasingly turning to rethinking its classics and neoclassics. These appeals are carried out not only in search of answers to today's questions (or, in any case, in search of possible directions of movement towards answers), but also in search of sociological "pedigree", identity, genealogical tree.

On the other hand, under the conditions of the non-obvious domination of liberal and post-liberal metaphilosophy and worldview in Western and Westernized societies, in sociology the liberal picture of the social world is increasingly implicitly spreading. In this picture the systemic nature of society, its integrity and emergence are either ignored or disavowed, or devalued. Based on arguments about the technological power of modern humanity, about the growth of communicativeness and internetization of everyday life, about the growth in the number of things-subjects, sociologists are increasingly shifting to the "nominalism – microsociology" sector of the continuum formed by the "nominalism – realism" and "macrosociology – microsociology" axes [13].

However, both the crisis situations that arise in the context of the obvious stalling of neoliberal capitalist globalization (which was actualized by the COVID pandemic [15]), and the transformation of the sociality of the modern world itself, pose the task for sociologists to return to this issue from the less biased (and, accordingly, less demagogic and nominalist) positions. In particular, the fact of the genetic realism of society, that is, the fact that, at least at the level of *genesis*, the relationship between society and man is described by realist rather than nominalist logics, remains not fully comprehended.

Formulating the purpose of article. All of the above directly and indirectly actualizes the developments of the founder of the Kharkiv sociological school, Yelena Alexandrovna Yakuba (1929-2002). We have already presented separate ideas in an attempt to solve this problem [6], however, of course, it is not possible to carry out a full-scale revision of the concept and reveal the heuristic potential of Yelena Yakuba's sociological theory within the framework of one article. Whereas the name of Elena Yakuba should rightfully go down in the history of native sociology as the name of the author of original and deep concept. That is why, having done important reconstruction for the concept of "activity" in the theory of Y. Yakuba, we set the same *goal* in relation to the concept of "systematicity", that has become a main goal of the current paper.

Presentation of the main research material with full justification of received scientific results. Even a minimal and superficial preliminary analysis of the object of study demonstrates that the object is internally rich and diverse in terms of research possibilities. We turned to the analysis of one of the opus magnum by Yelena Yakuba, namely to her textbook "Sociology" [19] (all further data and citations are given from it) – a textbook that was written by her not only as a didactic manual, but also as a holistic presentation of her own scientific and epistemological developments, as a personal testament to her own students, as a worldview foundation for the formation of entire generations of sociologists. That is why a preliminary system analysis can demonstrate the place of the category "systemicity" (at least in quantitative terms) in the Y. Yakuba's developments, as well as demarcate the indicative landscape of her conceptual range.

On 176 pages of the compact and very dense textbook by Y. Yakuba, known to many generations of Ukrainian sociologists, the root of "system-" occurs 220 times. This is not the only root that characterizes Y. Yakuba's attention to the problems of systemicity of society: for example, the semantic cluster "function-" occurs 236 times, 174 times – the semantic cluster "whol-" (excluding the ordinary meaning of the words cluster "whole"), 142 "-organi-" (that is, both "organization-" and "organism-"), 83 – "element-", 72 – "regul-", 66 – "mechanism-"; 31 – "integr-". Thus, 1092 representatives of semantic clusters related to the systemic picture of

society (of which 220 are directly related to the root "system-", another 872 – to conjugate and semantically correlated).

Of course, this is not the most powerful semantic cluster that can be identified. So,

- a gigantic **general theoretical cluster** of "social-" (1005) and "societ-" (751) gives significantly more references (in total 1756);

- a large **methodological and sociologically reflexive cluster** "sociolog-" (491), "method-" (107), "knowled-" (231), "scien-" (373), "theor-" (112) in the sum exceeds by 30% in volume the cluster of systemicity (1314);

- **microsociological cluster** of "groups-" (208), "personality-" (222), "norm-" (209), "value-" (211); "behav-" (125) is almost equal to the system cluster, giving only 41 mentions (4%) more (975);

- **the meso-sociological cluster** of "educat-" (273), "econom-" (220), "polit-" (72), "strat-" (57), "instit-" (158) is almost two times inferior (780);

- finally, **the general scientific cluster** "-connect-" (312), "active-" (138), "specific-" (26) is more than twice as inferior (476).

Thus, the cluster formed by the categories of systemicity occupies an important place in the general theoretical discourse of Y. Yakuba, and the category of systemicity itself from the 29 categories studied by us occupies a significant volume (220 out of 6363 observation units). Thus, the semantic cluster with the root "system-" is mentioned in the same "quantitative category" with such clusters as "educat-", "econom-", "person-", "valu-", "knowled-", "function-", "group-", "norm-". These clusters form the "second tier" (or "second category") in terms of the average number of references (between 200 and 300) and are noticeably inferior only to the "first tier" formed by the five most powerful semantic clusters: "social-", "societ-", "sociolog-", "scien-", "-connect-" (all – more than 300 references; in total - 2932, that is, in total, almost half of all references).

In other words, in absolute terms, the "system-" cluster is in the top ten of the three dozen key semantic clusters that we have identified, sharing 9-10 places with the "econom-" cluster.

Yelena Yakuba's use of clusters of categories united by the root "system-" is not just diverse. It characterizes the integrity of her perception of these categories, their interconnectedness and deep meaningfulness. For example, she speaks about the systemic nature of sociological knowledge, and about the systemic nature of society. In other words, methodologically and epistemologically, the systemicity of ontology necessarily entails the systemicity of epistemology.

In particular, Y. Yakuba writes that "without a general theory, there is not and cannot be a developed integral system of scientific knowledge, because the general theory performs the functions of initial and generalizing knowledge, ensuring the further development of special and concrete". This is not only a requirement for fellow sociologists – it is also a statement of her own worldview and epistemological position, because the author herself postulates that "the main object of sociological analysis is the integrity of society. This is no longer an isolated society within the state-national framework, but a system of societies". We point out separately that she says all this in the comments to the "nine theses" of A. Giddens [5]. So, in the perception of Elena Yakuba, systemicity and integrity are both epistemological imperatives and ontological properties of society.

In such a somewhat Hegelian style of seeing the integrity of the world, it is not surprising that certain phenomena and processes are interesting "...from the point of view of their place and role in the system of social relations, in the structure of a single functioning organism". And although she understands that not only sociology, but also other sciences build some integrity of their models, she points out that "for philosophy, this is the integrity of the world, for history, the integrity of a single historical process. Unlike philosophy in sociology, the integrity of society is not speculative, but is revealed as a concrete reality with the help of not only theoretical, but also empirical methods. This means, in particular, that it is not enough for sociology to analyze society as an integral entity; for it, "the mechanisms of its functioning and development are important. Integrity is revealed in sociology as a system of social mechanisms that cause the movement and development of society.

In other words, in the holistic, systemic view of Yelena Yakuba, ontology and epistemology turn out to be integrally connected (this is also a somewhat Hegelian property of her concept). She aptly characterizes this as an important distinction of the sociological view: not only *what to* study, but also *how to* study. Sociology, from her point of view, "reveals the needs, interests, value orientations, activities of people, their connections with each other, society is considered a social whole, as a system of social interaction, as a clash of various interests, orientations, types of activity".

We see that, unlike N. Luhmann [10], society here does not appear as a formalized structured system of exclusively communications (to which, we recall, N. Luhmann reduced all the above-mentioned variety of elements of social systemicity). If for N. Luhmann it was Bourbakian-important not only to establish the property of the systemic nature of society, but also to derive that initial fact of sociality, that primary element from which the whole diversity of society is subsequently built, then for Y. Yakuba this fact was clearly far from a priority. Connections, relationships, interests, activities, communications, needs – all these elements of social systemicity were put in one row by her.

However, like N. Luhmann, she implemented the principle of systemicity steadily and constantly. Considering even social singularities (monads) like a person, she constantly clarifies that a person "is considered not from the point of view of his unique abilities, unique features, but in the system of social relations as a representative of a social group, a certain society", including settlement, social and social relations. class, demographic, professional groups, their orientations, interests, their social experience.

This leads to a somewhat Giddensian "overload" with categories and levels of analysis [4], when, in the interests of a systematic view, it is proposed to analyze a complex, sometimes cumbersome, far from always clearly defined and demarcated sum of phenomena at different levels (personality and community; between communities; personality, community and social Whole; and even society and nature) and in different planes (connections, interactions, relationships). As a result, the author herself reaches the scale (and even formulations) of V. Vernadsky's noospheric ideas [8] in an attempt to discover systems of an ever higher level. Perhaps, while maintaining a purely sociological identity of theorizing, Y. Yakuba should have put forward positions similar to Luhmann's "society of societies" [9]. However, it is indicative that in any case the systematic approach will demand more and more Whole, more and more "external systems" in relation to more and more large-scale objects of study.

Moreover, Y. Yakuba does not recognize another options for studying society, because, from her point of view, seeing society sociologically means always "analyze a phenomenon, a process in a system of social relations, to analyze from the point of view of its relationship with the social whole" – and she emphasizes that is just one way and no other. After all, "social processes and phenomena can be explained by analyzing their functions in the social system". Here, as we see, her sociologically systemic view grows primarily from a functionalist approach to social systems. In other words, the connection between the element and the system is established through the category of functionality (or through the functional connection between them), by means of which the part is characterized by the role played for the whole, and the whole by epiphenomena and the effects of this part being embedded in it.

This is well illustrated by her understanding of social groups as relatively stable and established communities that "differ in role and place in the system of social ties of a historically defined society". Here the functionalist rhetoric ("role and place") is quite evident. Moreover, it is backed up by the realistic optics of studying the genesis of the social, where social groups are the product of objective circumstances, and belonging to them is the product of a person's objective position in the system of social ties and the fulfillment of social roles.

This is how, thanks to the functionalist understanding of systemicity, the structural and stratification problems are in a subordinated position. And although stratification is defined by Y. Yakuba as a "system of social stratification", and is characterized as a "system of social groups and communities" and "institutional organizational forms" of development, dynamics, stability and certainty for these communities and groups, nevertheless, the structural problem turns out to be secondary at least genetically.

This noticeably distinguishes the view of Y. Yakuba from the view of such a system theorist as T. Parsons [12], for whom, we recall, the structure is still epistemologically primary. Whereas Y. Yakuba, for example, understands "organization" through the prism of a system of social statuses, roles and values (which, we recall, are constituted in a functionalist way), and it is from here that he derives purposefulness, regularity, stability of interactions – that is, their organization, in the end.

And although this does not lead to the fact that the concept of Y. Yakuba largely does not repeat the epistemological trajectory of the structural-functionalist understanding of systemicity, there are still some differences. So, when she talks about what R. Merton called dysfunctions [11], she explores distortions in the system of value orientations, considering distortions of this system, its insystemicity and instability as dysfunctions. As examples, she cites the discrepancies between the cognitive and activity side of value, as well as the reduction of the idea of justice to an egoistically and individually understood justice in the form of passivity, dependency, self-interest.

This, by the way, is quite a characteristic moment: a systematic view of society as an integrity with a high probability (not to say "inevitably") gives rise to a normative, ethical, moralizing view of society, its effects, its features and manifestations, gives rise to a human and research assessment "dark sides" of social phenomena, and they are described as dysfunctions – and not at all as a natural and consistent generation of system functionality and functioning of the system. In this sense, for example, the view of Yelena Yakuba is similar to the view of structural functionalists ("system theorists" of the second generation, if we consider the generation of positivists to be the first), but differs greatly from the view of the same N. Luhmann – "third generation", already freed from ethical presumptions [14].

Y. Yakuba's systematic view also extends to particular social phenomena: for example, she proposes to consider the city as a "holistic, relatively independent socio-economic and cultural system", culture is described as "a systemic integrative quality of society, expressing the level achieved in its development" and so on.

However, the most revealing and important, from our point of view, plot is her study of how a person fits into a social system, how the subjectivity of a person's behavior and relationships correlates with needs, interests, the spiritual world, and how it all integrates with a system of complex and diverse personality relationships with the social micro- and macroenvironment. This is important not only because for Y. Yakuba the issue of activity and subjectivity is one of the socially and epistemologically important ones, but also because the correlation of the

highest macro-sociological categories with the most micro-sociological categories is a very vivid illustration of how systemic "grows" through the whole fabric concept.

So, firstly, in the concept of Yelena Yakuba, it is postulated that society is a real phenomenon, and that it is society that makes person real.

Secondly, it is argued that society is connected with the individual not directly, but through a whole network of elements of the social structure (social groups, institutions, social organizations), through a system of social roles, norms, values of society. It is all this machinery that includes a person in both senses of the word: both includes him in society, and "works as a switch".

Thirdly, it is assumed that personality as a social product manifests itself in any person, the question is only in the degree of manifestation. By what is meant the expression by a human as a personality of the characteristic features of society, groups, communities, etc.

Fourthly, the implicit measure of this manifestation is the status as "the place of the individual in the social system", and the role as the status indicator as "the set of actions that the individual occupying this place must perform". In other words, again, personality is measured and defined in terms of apparently socially rooted, realist, anti-nominalist phenomena like status and role.

Fifthly, it is the statuses and roles, acting as a toolkit of norms, that integrate various human acts into the social order, which shifts the sociologist's view from the status and roles even "higher" up the ladder of the social hierarchy, at least to the mesolevel of norms. It is directly stated that it is the study of social norms (moreover, associated with the personality of persuasion, understanding of justice, value coincidence) that makes it possible to understand the characteristics of the personality and typify it.

It is from here that the problem of social activity arises, which, according to Y. Yakuba, is characterized, as we have already written [6], by a strong, stable, non-situational desire to participate in social processes and affairs, to influence them. Here, again, a specific ethization of the social is manifested: for example, in this concept, "true social activity" is linked with "highest universal values", to which the author refers freedom, justice, democracy, truth, the development of science, knowledge of the higher meaning of existence

As E. Bataeva comments on this, "and vice versa, if a person performs many actions and interactions, pursuing selfish goals of obtaining personal gain or realizing his own ambitions, if he is initiative and diligent, but his initiative and diligence is due to careerist motives or the desire to receive material reward for the actions performed, then in this case it is more correct to speak of medium-low levels of human social activity" [16]. Such obvious ethization, where the ethical and the epistemological, the deontological and the ontological intertwine and coalesce, as we have already indicated, is not accidental for the systemic theory, but it is most indicative in the subject of social activity.

In particular, it is indicative because Y. Yakuba directly connects activity with sociality as a "connection with the social whole" (society, communities, humanity), and it is the study of the systems of social relations of an individual with communities that will reveal sociality. As the author herself writes, "the concept of social activity gives an idea of the quality of sociality, the level and nature of its implementation".

In other words, the general social, universal, macrosociological concept of sociality here is directly connected with the microsociological, activity, purely personal concept of personal activity.

However, the main macro-sociological focus still remains, because the author defines social activity itself as "a systemic social quality in which the level of its sociality is expressed and realized", which is metaphorized as "the depth and completeness of the relationship of an individual with society, the level of transformation of an individual into a subject public relations".

In attempts to operationalize social activity, Y. Yakuba mentions the moments of consciousness and activity, and a holistic social quality, and a stable active attitude towards society, and an active attitude to the problems of social development, and qualitative features of consciousness, activity and states of the individual. In other words, both categories of macrosociological and microsociological analysis are intertwined here, which, however, the author herself understands well, summarizing: "With a systematic approach, social activity appears as an internally multifaceted phenomenon, as a unity of the subjective and objective, as a system of orientation and values expressing interests of certain social communities, as a system of feelings, knowledge, volitional components, as a creative attitude, involving innovations in the understanding and implementation of values in various forms". Ultimately, social activity turns out to be a quality that is system-forming for the individual and creates the integrity of the individual himself. Already here conceptual questions arise: after all, if everyone is a person, the question is only in the measure of sociality, then it turns out that activity also characterizes the activity of each person, the question is only in measure. While the counterargument cited by Yelena Yakuba herself also allows for a complete lack of activity: for example, if there really is a violation of the relationship between value orientation and activity in the form of situational activity, without taking into account value orientations, then a complete gap between the value and activity components of the personality will be a complete collapse as an activity activity, and individual activity. And then the actor can hardly claim to be a personality, and then the question arises about his built-in personality.

And this question (only one of those that arise, let us emphasize it again) is far from scholastic: after all, later studies and social realities have shown that social systems are able to embed actors in whose actions there is no rigid and unambiguous connection between the value and activity components – and for some social systems this is an even more comfortable and functional case. The concept of Y. Yakuba does not give an answer to this question, as well as to a number of others. However, this applies already to the prospects for further research in this area.

Conclusions and prospects for further exploration in chosen direction.

Thus, systemicity is a metaphilosophical and ideological characteristic of society in the sociological concept of the founder of the Kharkiv sociological school, Yelena Alexandrovna Yakuba. In other words, it exists not only as a conceptual element of her theory, but also as a methodological setting and even an ideological imperative (from which, as we saw, moral and ethical imperatives are also growing). It is precisely such classical and neoclassical concepts as the concept of Y. Yakuba that demonstrates to us that ignoring the ontological systemic nature of society, which is not identical with the genetic systemic nature, which is still ignored much less often, in modern sociology leads to a number of epistemological and methodological effects, which we do not find in system concepts. In particular, the systemic nature of Y. Yakuba's theory does not prevent her from turning to seemingly micro-sociological and even socio-psychological subjects and categories in the study of activity and subjectness, as well as their connection with socio-structural and socio-cultural phenomena.

Even our not-so-detailed analysis of systemicity as a category, its place in the sociological concept of Yelena Yakuba, as well as the heuristic potential of the concept of systemicity in modern sociology, allows us to demonstrate that modern sociology, often refusing both general sociological theorizing and the macrosociological and realistic view of the social world, significantly loses not only in the severity of conceptualizations, but also in the content and diversity of the description of the social world a.

Further development of the topic we have chosen involves obtaining classifications and typologies of indicators and signs of the systemic nature of society in the interpretation of E. Yakuba, comparing the systemic characteristics of society in its concept with such concepts as the developments of N. Luhmann and T. Parsons, studying the synthetic logic of constructing a concept, where along with with the category of systemicity, the key concept for E. Yakuba is the concept of activity, and many other areas.

Received 18.01.2022

Accepted 30.05.2022

СИСТЕМНІСТЬ ЯК ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА СУСПІЛЬСТВА В ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЇ ОЛЕНИ ЯКУБИ: ЕВРИСТИЧНІ МОЖЛИВОСТІ ДЛЯ СУЧАСНОЇ СОЦІОЛОГІЇ

Голіков Олександр – доктор соціологічних наук, доцент кафедри соціології соціологічного факультету Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна, площа Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна, e-mail: golikov@karazin.ua, ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6786-0393>

У статті аналізується соціологічна концепція засновниці Харківської соціологічної школи Олени Олександрівни Якуби, зокрема її трактування системності як метафілософської та світоглядної характеристики суспільства. Здійснюючи епістемологічний аналіз поняття системності в теоретизуванні О. Якуби, автор демонструє різні аспекти та прояви цієї властивості, а також розглядає актуальні та потенційні зв'язки із загальнотеоретичною соціологічною та філософською спадщиною. Досліджуються особливості інтерпретації О. Якубою суспільства як системи, здійснюється порівняння з інтерпретаціями системи та системності іншими науковцями. Наголошується, що ігнорування онтологічної системності суспільства (що не тотожно генетичній системності) в сучасній соціології призводить до ряду епістемологічних та методологічних ефектів. Наводяться та аналізуються аргументи О. Якуби щодо системності як якості суспільства. Автор виокремлює низку таких аргументів, здійснюючи детальний аналіз кожного з них. Особливий акцент зроблено на аналізі того, як системність проявляється, у чому полягає, яка її феноменальність та епіфеноменальність. Доводиться, що у концепції О. Якуби суспільство – це феномен реальний, воно пов'язане з особистістю не безпосередньо, а через мережу елементів соціальної структури. Підкреслюється, що особистість як соціальний продукт проявляється у будь-якій людині, питання лише якою мірою. Мірилом прояву затверджується статус, а індикатором статусу – роль як сукупність дій, які має виконати індивід, який посідає певне місце. Статуси та ролі досліджуються як такі, що інтегрують різні людські акти до соціального порядку. Саме звідси, як вважає автор, зростає проблематика соціальної активності. У цьому контексті найважливішим сюжетом виявляється зв'язок системності як якості суспільства з активністю та суб'єктивністю як властивостями дії його членів. Формулюється низка висновків щодо системності як категорії, її місця у соціологічній концепції Олени Якуби, евристичного потенціалу для розвитку сучасної соціології.

Ключові слова: Олена Якуба, суспільство, система, системність, соціологічна теорія, соціальна активність.

References:

1. Christakis, N. A., Fowler James H. (2009) *Connected* [Second Edition]. Little, Brown and Company.
2. Collins, R. (1998) *The Sociology of Philosophies: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Harvard University Press.
3. Elster, Jon (1983) *Explaining Technical Change: A Case Study in the Philosophy of Science (Studies in Rationality and Social Change)* [1 ed.]. Cambridge University Press.
4. Giddens, A. (1986) *The Constitution of Society*. University of California Press.
5. Giddens, A. (1987) 'Nine Theses on the Future of Sociology'. *Social Theory and Modern Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press, ch.2. 22-51.
6. Golikov, A. (2020). 'Heuristics of "social activity" concept in Yelena Yakuba's interpretation: view from sociology of knowledge and view from 2019' *Ukrainian Sociological Journal*. 21. 7-15.
7. Honneth, A., Anderson, J. (1996) *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts* [MIT Press ed]. The MIT Press.
8. Levit, G. S. (2001) *Biogeochemistry – Biosphere – Noosphere. The theory of V.I. Vernadsky*. Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung.
9. Luhmann, N., Barrett, Rh. (2012/2013). *Theory of Society, Volume 2*. Stanford University Press.
10. Luhmann, N. (1996) *Social Systems (Writing Science)* [1 ed.]. Stanford University Press.
11. Merton, R. K. (1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure [Enlarged Edition]*. Free Press.
12. Parsons, T., Turner, B.S. (Preface) (1991) *The Social System*. Routledge. LXII
13. Ritzer, G. (2005) *Encyclopedia of Social Theory* [Vol 1, 1 ed.]. Sage Publications.
14. Von, Bertalanffy L. (1969) *General System Theory*. George Braziller.
15. Žižek, S. (2020) *PANDEMIC!: COVID-19 Shakes The World*. OR Books.
16. Bataeva, K. (2018) 'Actual Problems of the Theory of Social Activity of Students'. *Scientific notes of Kharkiv University of Humanities «People's Ukrainian Academy»*. XXIV. 57-68 [in Russian]
17. Pohribna, V. L. (2008) *Sociology of Professionalism: Monography*. Kyiv: Alerta [in Russian]
18. Yakovenko, Yu. (2009) 'Sociology of professionalism – false start, or Dangerous precedent of proclamation of allegedly new sociological branch' *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing* 4. 157-171 [in Ukrainian]
19. Yakuba, Y. A. (1996) *Sociology*. Kharkiv: Constanta [in Russian]

Отримано 18.01.2022

Прийнято до друку 30.05.2022