

УДК 316.277

O. ORLOVA, A. SURMINA

**FORMING THE CATEGORY OF DAILY AND EVENT
IN MODERN THEATER OF SOCIOLOGY**

The article analyzes the current approaches to the definition of the sociological categories of content daily and event. We consider the views of representatives of the modern phenomenological sociology to the problem and offers the author's approach is to relate these categories of analysis through the prism of technology components of contemporary culture.

Key words: *daily, event, phenomenological sociology, event-discrete, become routine life event-articulation.*

Ordinary reality somehow forces people to follow the existing structures of social order, which, of course, cannot fail to form in people certain culturally determined both protest and relaxation patterns of behavior related to their objective need to search for optimal forms to facilitate the burden of everyday communications and the coercive pressure of everyday life routine.

Human notions of everyday life as a specific ontological equality are the main source of mass perception by people of everyday life as a depressing life routine. It is significant that even in many modern objectivist sociological theories – not functionalize and poststructuralism – the theme of «routinization» of social life is defined as one of the priorities in modern sociological knowledge. Therefore, the study of such a phenomenon is one of the promising areas of sociological theoretical research.

In modern sociological literature, one can find various approaches to understanding the phenomenon of everyday life and treating the notion of «everyday life.» So, in the most general sense, the word «everyday» simply expresses the realities of the empirical life of people. It should be noted that phenomenological sociology has formed a slightly different approach to understanding the phenomenon of everyday life.

Speaking about everyday life, taken in this empirical sense, it is not difficult to form an idea that everyday life is realized in certain space-time coordinates, that is, it is a topological and temporal experience of the joint being of people, where time flows in one direction, and space has three changes. In everyday human experience, empirical life is perceived as a perishable life, transitory existence, the performance of bodily sensations, emotional experiences and various sufferings inherent in, conditionally speaking, both the body and the soul. Thus, everyday life is a place of trials and punishments, suffering and sorrow.

It is characteristic that the sociologists of the phenomenological orientation (P. Berger, M. Weber, I. Hoffmann, T. Luckman, A. Schultz and others)

others) viewed everyday life as a special standardized and standardized cut of empirical life, as a world of rules, cycles, and stereotypes.

The analysis of the positions of representatives of phenomenological sociology allows us to optimize the modern vision of the categories of everyday life and events, to determine the nature of their interaction in public practice and to highlight the characteristic features of their influence on the social life of the subjects, and therefore is necessary from the point of view of studying the phenomenon of modern culture.

The substantial initial assumption of the general philosophical and theoretical and methodological position of the sociologists of the phenomenological school was the idea that people are able to achieve their goals and reproduce their lives every day thanks to the presence of stereotyped, event discreteness and repeatability of generally understood behavioral cycles involving people who are firmly aware of their own «Roles».

It is noteworthy that M. Weber in his work «On some categories of comprehending sociology» [1] emphasizes that such stereotyped, event discreteness and recurrence of habitual behavioral acts is the most important condition for «living» a person in the social world. M. Weber believes that social everyday life itself is formed on the basis of informal «common actions» that form the basic foundations of collective unity of people and provide an unproblematic perception of the meaning of interactions and communications dominating in a particular society.

M. Weber was convinced that such general actions form the initial basis of the collective life of people. Therefore, as a kind of axiom of sociological analysis, he proclaims the following assumption: «There are complexes of common actions that, without any purposefully agreed upon joint agreement of institutions, nevertheless, first, are of such a nature that such institutions exist; Secondly, their specific character is to a certain extent due to the kind of semantic attribution of each individual» [1, p. 322].

In the works of another prominent representative of the phenomenological sociology of A. Schultz there is a detailed argumentation of the position according to which the diverse realities of the everyday existence of people constitute a social reality, the study of which is the main task of the social sciences. «The primary goal of the social sciences,» stresses A. Schultz, «emphasizes, is the achievement of organized knowledge of social reality. Under the notion of «social reality» I tend to understand the total sum of objects and events in the sociocultural world as they are perceived in the experience of everyday thinking of people living everyday life among other people, connected with them by a multitude of relationships and interactions» [2, p. 55].

An important feature of everyday life, according to A. Schultz, expresses the fact that everyday life is perceived by people as a sphere of concerted actions, a behavior where everyone is connected to each other and interprets the

world together. Thus, everyday life not only connects people and stereotyped their world, but also affirms their fundamental ontological equality.

E. Giddens in the work «The organization of society» points to the process of routinization as an important component of everyday life, which helps minimize the stresses resulting from various interactions between people. «Routine is the psychological mechanisms of which minimize the sources of subconscious anxiety, is the dominant form of everyday social activity» [3, p. 385].

At the same time, it is obviously important to take into account the fact that the very process of excessive routinization of everyday life can give rise to extremely contradictory phenomena of social life and can be a destructive factor of human activity.

According to the Ukrainian scientist N. Khamitov, the maximum concentration of everyday life in the activities of modern people is always experienced by him as melancholy. It is in being in a melancholy; a person does not feel the fullness of life, experiences, feels its colorlessness and senselessness. «Everyday life is can be defined as a world in which addictions constantly become a habit, thus destroying the fullness of life» [4, p. 33].

In the perspective of such perception, everyday life is a reality where we cannot act as absolutely free monads and absolutely unique individuals. Moreover, the stereotyped nature of everyday life is often intrusive and violent.

In this connection, it is important to pay attention to the fact that many modern scientists in their works seek to develop the well-known position of A. Schultz, who identified everyday life with the waking state and the waking alert of people. Recall that, considering daily life as a «day-time consciousness,» A. Schultz opposes daily sleep as a night, vague state of the individual's life world.

And in this sense it is important to clarify some conceptual notions about the eventual make a structural model of people's social life.

It should be noted that, while setting the task of clarifying the basic ontological characteristics of the event structure of social reality, even with the simplest attempts to clarify the content of the concept of «event», we immediately encounter an interesting problem. In the common understanding, the semantic meaning of the concept «event» can be defined as «what has taken place, something important».

However, by making the assumption that social reality can be defined as a set of events relating not only to the past tense, but also to the present and future tense, we find the position of a serious conceptual uncertainty of the term «event».

Turning to many serious domestic and foreign reference publications, it is easy to find that, unlike such concepts as «social reality», «social system», «society», «culture», «social interaction», «social structure», «Activity», «personality» and others, the term «event» as a sociological category, in fact, remains

remains outside the attention of modern researchers. The semantic content and ontological characteristics of the given concept are unclear.

This situation, in all likelihood, can be explained by the presence of real difficulties. First, the complexity of the sociological order, since any event can be regarded as a social fact, having a complex (and requiring a correct identification) combination of structural and procedural parameters. Secondly, the complexities of the socio-psychological order, since any event is always associated with different motives and certain patterns of behavior of various social actors of the event. Third, the difficulties of isolating and analyzing the factors of the constructivist plan, since any event can be understood as the result of purposeful constructive efforts of people to transform various circumstances of their life activity.

At the same time, it is important to take special account of the directions, nature, forms of people's active efforts, as well as the extent of the influences and consequences of these efforts for society as a whole, since the events themselves can be both stabilization factors of social life and factors of significant social changes.

Explaining the specifics of the sociological approach to the study of the event parameters of social reality, we should support the position of V. Sudakov [5], N. Soboleva [6] and T. Galiuk [7], who believe that this specificity manifests itself in the general disciplinary strategic orientation of sociology as a science Identification and analysis of the interconnection and interdependence of the structural and procedural parameters of the event as a significant component and phenomenon of public life.

At the same time, reviewing the historical and sociological context of the development of world sociological thought, it is easy to see that most representatives of various classical schools of theoretical sociology also did not consider the study of the semantic characteristics of the concept of «event» an actual problem worthy of analysis. Note that the interpretation of this term is absent in most domestic and foreign encyclopedias and dictionaries. And yet, in some reference publications, the term «event» gets a certain conceptual interpretation and explanation. However, such interpretations and explanations, as a rule, are either very brief, or very vague.

In fact, the only sociological definition of the term «event» was found in the «Russian Sociological Encyclopedia», in which, unfortunately, there is no necessary commentary in such cases, but only a brief definition: «An event is an event, an important phenomenon that occurred In public or in private life» [8, p. 473].

V. Birpichev, the author of the dictionary «Organization and self-organization of social systems», suggests a similar definition, supplemented by some important explanations: «An event is a significant phenomenon, a fact of public, state or private life, a particularly significant incident (political, histori-

historical, international, Event of cultural life); An incident that came true (V. Dal); Coexistence with being; «Being together with others» (M. Heidegger).

According to M. Heidegger, time and being merge into an event. Being is the destiny of man, if only man is destined to return to his own being. Maybe this will be an event? An event is as a like insight, insight? Thus, «a person who is being realized belongs to an event,» «an event comes true» [9, p. 174].

Despite some brevity and semantic uncertainty of the two definitions given by us, we will analyze their content in more detail, thus focusing on some significant rational aspects.

First, the presented definitions emphasize the importance of taking into account the fact of its factuality when analyzing the phenomenon of an event. The factuality of events means that events occur in a certain way, they happen.

Secondly, the indication in both definitions of an event as an «important phenomenon» or «a significant phenomenon» underlines a certain integrative potential of the event, since the event can be represented as a specific effective form of joint activity and joint being of people.

Thirdly, the authors of the definitions point to the «ability» of events to influence in a special way not only the activity, but also the destinies of people, which necessitates taking into account specific worldview characteristics that relate more to the field of philosophical metaphysics and anthropology.

Taking into account the characteristics we have outlined, we can conclude that the sociological study of the phenomenon of the event as a whole is based on conceptual assumptions and assumptions that any event is characterized by specific structural features and characteristics, as well as specific procedural parameters.

Therefore, once again stressing and pointing out the importance of taking into account and analyzing the procedural characteristics of the event, we consider it important to pay attention to the following arguments.

First, social life itself can be represented as a consistent connection and system of events taking place in the economic, political and spiritual life of society. In this sense, as V. Sudakov rightly points out, one can speak about the specific eventual process of social life [5, p. 89].

Secondly, it is necessary to take into account the various factors that determine the dynamics of the development of an event, the discrete status and qualitative boundaries of the event, that is, its beginning and end, the nature of communications between social actors as participants in the event. Precisely because any event combines both dynamic and discrete parameters, objectively poses an important problem for sociology – identifying the content of an event and interpreting its meaning.

According to M. Heidegger, time and being merge into an event. Being is the destiny of man, if only man is destined to return to his own being. Maybe this will be an event? An event is like as a like insight, insight? Thus, «a person who is being realized belongs to an event,» «an event comes true» [9, p. 174].

Despite some brevity and semantic uncertainty of the two definitions given by us, we will analyze their content in more detail, thus focusing on some significant rational aspects.

First, the presented definitions emphasize the importance of taking into account the fact of its factuality when analyzing the phenomenon of an event. The factuality of events means that events occur in a certain way, they happen.

Secondly, the indication in both definitions of an event as an «important phenomenon» or «a significant phenomenon» underlines a certain integrative potential of the event, since the event can be represented as a specific effective form of joint activity and joint being of people.

Thirdly, the authors of the definitions point to the «ability» of events to influence in a special way not only the activity, but also the destinies of people, which necessitates taking into account specific worldview characteristics that relate more to the field of philosophical metaphysics and anthropology.

Taking into account the characteristics we have outlined, we can conclude that the sociological study of the phenomenon of the event as a whole is based on conceptual assumptions and assumptions that any event is characterized by specific structural features and characteristics, as well as specific procedural parameters.

Therefore, once again stressing and pointing out the importance of taking into account and analyzing the procedural characteristics of the event, we consider it important to pay attention to the following arguments.

First, social life itself can be represented as a consistent connection and system of events taking place in the economic, political and spiritual life of society. In this sense, as V. Sudakov rightly points out, one can speak about the specific eventual process of social life [5, p. 89].

Secondly, it is necessary to take into account the various factors that determine the dynamics of the development of an event, the discrete status and qualitative boundaries of the event, that is, its beginning and end, the nature of communications between social actors as participants in the event. Precisely because any event combines both dynamic and discrete parameters, objectively poses an important problem for sociology – identifying the content of an event and interpreting its meaning.

Список використаної літератури

1. Вебер М. О некоторых категориях понимающей социологии / М. Вебер // Вебер М. Избранные произведения / М. Вебер. – Москва : Прогресс, 1990. – С. 345–546.
2. Шюц А. Формирование понятия и теории в социальных науках / А. Шюц // Избранное: Мир, светящийся смыслом. – Москва : РОСПЭН, 2004. – С. 51–68.
3. Гидденс Э. Устроение общества. Очерк теории структурации / Э. Гидденс. – Москва : Академический Проект, 2003. – 528 с.
4. Хамитов Н. В. Философия человека: поиск пределов. Пределы мужского и женского: введение в метаантропологию / Н. В. Хамитов. – Киев : Основы, 1997. – 260 с.
5. Судаков В. И. Социологическое познание: современные тенденции и стимулы развития / В. И. Судаков. – Днепропетровск : Изд-во ДГУ, 1995. – 232 с.

6. Соболева Н. І. Соціологія суб'єктивної реальності / Н. І. Соболева – Київ : Інститут соціології НАН України, 2002. – 296 с.
7. Галюк Т. Л. Специальные события в теории и практике ПР-деятельности (факторы мотивации и организации) / Т. Л. Галюк. – Київ : МАУП, 2005. – 23 с.
8. Российская социологическая энциклопедия / [под общ. ред. Г. В. Осипова]. – Москва : НОРМА-ИНФРА, 1999. – 672 с.
9. Кирпичев В. С. Организация и самоорганизация социальных систем : словарь / В. С. Кирпичев. – Москва : Изд-во РАГС, 2004. – 282 с.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 20.02.2017.

Орлова О. І., Сурміна Г. Ю. Формування категорій «повсякденність» і «подієвість» у сучасній соціології театру

У статті проаналізовано сучасні підходи до визначення соціологічного змісту категорій повсякденності й подієвості. Розглянуто погляди представників сучасної феноменологічної соціології на цю проблему й запропоновано авторський підхід до встановлення взаємозв'язку цих категорій крізь призму аналізу технологічних складових сучасної культури.

Ключові слова: повсякденність, подієвість, феноменологічна соціологія, подієва дискретність, рутинізація життя, подієве артикулювання.

Орлова О. И., Сурмина А. Ю. Формирование категорий «повседневность» и «событийности» в современной социологии театра

В статье анализируются современные подходы к определению социологического содержания категорий повседневности и событийности. Рассматриваются взгляды представителей современной феноменологической социологии на данную проблему, и предлагается авторский подход к установлению взаимосвязи данных категорий через призму анализа технологических составляющих современной культуры.

Ключевые слова: повседневность, событийность, феноменологическая социология, событийная дискретность, рутинизация жизни, событийная артикулированность.