



**THE PAISSIY HILEENDARSKI UNIVERSITY OF PLOVDIV  
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND HUMAN SCIENCES**

**Milena Georgieva Tasheva**

**PRAXEOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF REFLEXIVITY:  
A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE**

**EXTENDED SUMMARY**

of a dissertation thesis for acquiring the educational and scientific degree of Doctor  
(PhD)

Area of higher education 3. Social, economic and legal sciences  
Professional field 3.1. Sociology, anthropology, and sciences of culture  
Doctoral programme: Sociology

Supervisor:  
**Assoc.Prof. PhD Stoyka Penkova**

Plovdiv  
2019

The dissertation thesis was discussed and proposed for defense at an expanded session of the Department of Sociology and Human Sciences of the Paissiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, taking place on 6 April, 2019.

The dissertation thesis *Praxeological dimensions of reflexivity: a sociological perspective* has a total volume of 241 pages, containing an introduction, two parts having three chapters each, a conclusion, four appendices and a bibliography. The bibliography comprises a total of 178 sources, of which 144 titles in Bulgarian, 25 in English, 8 in French and 1 in Russian.

**Members of the scientific jury:**

Prof. Dr. Kolyo Koev

Prof. PhD Dimitar Vatsov

Prof. PhD Liliana Deyanova

Assoc.Prof. PhD Svetlana Sabeva

Assoc.Prof. PhD Andrey Bundjulov

The public defense of the dissertation thesis is to take place on 5 May, 2019, in the building of the Faculty of Philosophy and History of the Paissiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv. The defense-related materials are available in the Department of Sociology and Human Sciences.

## **Contents of the extended summary**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Table of contents of the dissertation thesis .....                 | 4  |
| 2. Object and problematic of the study .....                          | 7  |
| 3. Methodology .....  | 11 |
| 4. Structure and synopsis of the dissertation thesis .....            | 13 |
| 5. Towards outlining the focus of future studies .....                | 22 |
| 6. List of contributions by the study.....                            | 25 |
| 7. Publications related to the theme of the dissertation thesis ..... | 26 |
| 8. Literature used in the extended summary.....                       | 27 |

## 1. Table of contents of the dissertation thesis<sup>1</sup>

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>Introduction</b> .....  | 5   |
| <b>PART ONE</b>  |     |
| <b>SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL REFLEXIVITY: THROUGH BOURDIEU AND ETHNOMETHODOLOGY</b> .....   | 21  |
| <b>Chapter One: <i>Scientific reflexivity, practical logic, and gift</i></b> .....   | 22  |
| 1. Bourdieu: reflexivity as a working method .....   | 23  |
| 1.1. <i>Sociology of sociology</i> .....   | 23  |
| 1.2. <i>Reflexivity as a disposition of scientific habitus</i> .....   | 28  |
| 1.3. <i>The logic of practice and ‘the logical logic’</i> .....  | 31  |
| 2. Towards criticizing Bourdieu from the context of self-reflexive scientific practice: ‘theory of non-coincidence of theory and practice’, practical logic and gift ..... | 37  |
| 2.1. <i>The practical logic of the gift and the ‘theory of non-coincidence of theory and practice’</i> .....   | 40  |
| <b>Chapter Two: <i>Practical reflexivity</i></b> .....   | 59  |
| 1. Through Bourdieu: reflex reflexivity as a disposition of the acting agent .....   | 60  |
| 1.1. <i>Preliminary specification of practical reflexivity</i> .....   | 60  |
| 1.2. <i>Dialectics between habitus and habitat: the unpre-giveness and dynamism of ontological complicity. Reflex reflexivity</i> .....                                    | 64  |
| <b>Chapter Three: <i>Reflexivity as a problem before ethnomethodology</i></b> .....  | 79  |
| 1. Ethnomethodology: a ‘program of descriptive study’ of the phenomena of social order, ‘alternate’ to classical research .....  | 80  |
| 2. Reflexivity in the vision of early ethnomethodological studies: ‘ethno-methods’ .....   | 83  |
| 3. Reflexivity in the vision of late ethnomethodological studies: ‘embodied reflexivity’ .....   | 89  |
| <b>Interim recapitulation I</b> .....  | 98  |
| <b>PART TWO</b>  |     |
| <b>DEPLOYMENTS OF PRACTICAL REFLEXIVITY: PERFORMATIVITY AND MOLECULARITY. PRACTICAL LOGIC OF MOLECULAR PERFORMATIVE INTERACTIONS</b> .....                                 | 102 |

---

<sup>1</sup> Page numbers are stated as they are in the dissertation thesis.

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Towards the practical logic of molecular performative interactions</b> .....   | 103 |
| <b>Chapter One: <i>The ethnomethodological interest in ‘formal structures of activity’</i></b> ..   | 108 |
| <b>Chapter Two: <i>Social interaction as a performative form</i></b> .....  | 117 |
| 1. Performative effects of reflexivity: beyond Austin’s performativity .....  | 117 |
| 1.1. <i>Performativity in Austin</i> .....  | 118 |
| 1.2. <i>Beyond Austinian performativity – ‘through’ ethnomethodology and Pierre Bourdieu</i> .....  | 120 |
| 1.2.1.1. <i>Bourdieu’s critique of Austin</i> .....   | 121 |
| 2. The performativity objectified in things .....   | 126 |
| 3. The performativity of the body .....   | 128 |
| 3.1. <i>Explicit bodily performativity under conditions of codification: the gesture as a bodily performative</i> .....                                   | 130 |
| 4. Reflex-reflexive action as an inference in a practical syllogism .....   | 137 |
| 5. The practical logic of explicit and implicit bodily performativity: the case of Hugh Capet under the microscope of the theory of practical logic ..... | 144 |
| <b>Chapter Three: <i>Social interaction as a molecular structure</i></b> .....  | 154 |
| 1. Conversation analysis as ‘molecular sociology’ .....   | 157 |
| 2. The practical inferability of a performative from a performative .....   | 163 |
| 3. Practical negation as a problem before the practical logic of molecular performative interactions .....  | 169 |
| 3.1. <i>Practical-logical functions of the preliminary gift as an investment in the future of the Who-identity</i> .....                                  | 173 |
| <b>Interim recapitulation II</b> .....  | 184 |
| <b>CONCLUSION</b> .....   | 185 |
| <b>APPENDICES</b>   |     |
| <i>Appendix 1: The ‘hanging coffee’ initiative, or on the ‘gift in a disaster or by inspiration’</i> .....  | 192 |
| <i>Appendix 2: The contradictions of the inheritance of those ‘excluded from within’: the case of Mariana Boyrikova</i> .....                             | 202 |
| <i>Appendix 3: The symbolism of the authorized body</i> .....   | 219 |
| <i>Appendix 4: The silent request of Mr. Ramsay</i> .....   | 231 |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....   | 242 |

## The social problem: Insecurity overruns us from all sides

The 21<sup>st</sup> century offers a number of heretofore unknown challenges related to the global spread of biopolitics of supermodernity, to new forms of control and inequalities, as well as the ensuing dimensions of social suffering, different from those known so far. These swooping phenomena of insecurity destabilize the basic structures and modes of experiencing everyday life, turning us into beings that are both vulnerable and hurting. They disbalance modern man's self-perception and thus its identity. Thus in everyday life, new forms of social suffering and vulnerability are increasingly more stably present and increasingly more obtrusively observed, ones that do not yield to analysis and understanding by conventional sociological, psychoanalytic, medical, social and institutional discourses, approaches and policies.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, they are often invisible for them.

These previously nonexistent social problems of supermodernity raise the question of the need for their sociological conceptualization from the context of a **theoretic and analytic perspective oriented to their overcoming**. This precisely is the intention of the post-Bourdiesian socioanalysis of self-inheritance (Deyanov, Sabeva, Petkov 2015). This project proposes a theoretical framework and an analytical approach that are able not merely to identify them but also to retain the specifics, singularity and uniqueness of everyday modes of experiencing social vulnerability and the suffering generated in and by society itself.

---

<sup>2</sup> In *Science as a Vocation* Weber, in asking what the 'intellectualist rationalization, created by science and by scientifically oriented technology, means practically', locates his answer in the context of the so-called 'disenchantment of the world' that consists in 'the knowledge or belief that if one but wished one *could* learn [the conditions under which one lives] at any time. Hence, it means that principally there are no mysterious incalculable forces that come into play, but rather that one can, in principle, **master all things by calculation**' (Bečep 2004). This idealization of modern man comes out to be practically false in the contemporary conditions of facing mostmodern risks and the insecurity that they bring about.

## 2. Object and problematic of the study

The dissertation thesis lies within the analytic horizon, relevant to external challenges, of this theoretical project, setting itself the objective of additionally developing its methodological apparatus by **the theory of the practical logic of molecular performative interactions** which operates with a praxeologically derived notion of *reflex reflexivity*. Thus the main **object** of the study is developing the problem of *practical reflexivity* in adding a specific emphasis to it: not just work *on* practical reflexivity and interpreting it as a *praxeological problem* but also explicitation *of* the work of practical reflexivity as a *reflex reflexivity actually unfolding in practice*, acting ‘*not ex post on the opus operatum but a priori on the modus operandi*’ (Bourdieu 2001) whose ‘*embodied*’<sup>3</sup> character is analyzed in the context of socialized corporeality.

This orientation of the analytic gaze on practical reflexivity is a function of the **gradual narrowing** of substantially linked **problem contexts**. **Socioanalysis** is the widest background of problematization. Within it, as a second problem context, the **logic of molecular performatives** is located. The third and narrowest problem frame that the exposition inscribes in the other two is the **practical logic of molecular performative interactions**. The gradual narrowing of these problem horizons, done in the introduction, reveals **three corresponding concrete problem circles**, namely: 1) the overcoming of vulnerability as a drive objectified in the exposition as **everyday work**, as **investment in achieving Who-identity**, whence the emphasized analytic attention to **uttered words and performed actions**; 2) **performativity and molecularity as essential specifics of social interaction**; and 3) a praxeological conception of reflexivity – **reflex reflexivity or the (self-) correcting effort of the habitus** that deploys everyday work as oriented to self-inheritance.

In this manner, making a circle, the exposition comes again, in the Conclusion, to its initial widest problem horizon – the socioanalysis of self-inheritance.

---

<sup>3</sup> This aspect of my conception of reflexivity, as the dissertation thesis shows, is closely influenced by ethnomethodology (Lynch, Livingston, Garfinkel 1993).

As was said above, the *socioanalysis of self-inheritance* outlines the widest theoretical **horizon** of the dissertation thesis, as far as the basic problem of this theory, inspired both by Bourdieu's socioanalysis and Stanghellini's phenomenological psychopathology, is: 'How is successful self-inheritance possible?', i.e. 'the *overcoming* both of the "psychopathologies of everyday life" and of the biographical psychopathologies that are due to *losing the biographical illu*sio' (Deyanov, Sabeva, Petkov 2015). The above indicated perspective to socially generated suffering is crucial to this study, since it makes the project go beyond the socioanalysis of Bourdieu, focusing on 'the agent's work of investing into a future identity in which the subject of socioanalysis would not only get rid of suffering by understanding himself but also – through this understanding – overcome his fractalized identity. In short, he would become "who he is" (contrary to "what he is")' (*ibid.*). This perspective outlines **the first problem circle of the study**. Within it, it is additionally expanded – the focus is on the *everyday* 'work of the agent'. It is conceived not merely as that from which the fractality of experience results but also as a road to self-inheritance by everyday investment in achieving 'personal Who-identity'. Conceiving **everyday work as a road to self-inheritance** is the main reason for the thesis to make *practical reflexivity* its **main object** of study, as a part of the more general design of developing a theory of practice based on the praxeologically conceived notion of *reflex reflexivity* as a *constant self-corrective effort of the socialized body*. Focusing on reflex reflexivity puts in the centre of analysis *the everyday actions that make up the local order<sup>4</sup> of interaction*. It is by everyday actions and words that the habitus, generally prone to lagging behind the social conditions of its existence<sup>5</sup> (Chevalier, Chauviré 2018), reproduces the agent's vulnerability and his hurtness. In this context, the study conceives of everyday actions as resulting from *unconscious strategies of a practical sense that falls into hysteresis and*

---

<sup>4</sup> Here and throughout the extended abstract and the dissertation thesis, the expression 'local order of interaction' takes up the ethnomethodological stance of attention to the *in situ* specifics of activity.

<sup>5</sup> The concept of hysteresis in Bourdieu has the function of presenting the specific state of 'inertia of the habitus and the ensuing dissonance in relation to social structures' (Chevalier, Chauviré 2018). Here and in the dissertation thesis, the meaning of the 'inertia' indicated by Bourdieu is made stronger, as it is interpreted as everyday work, unconsciously done by the agent, that deepens 'the displacement of dispositions in relation to situations' and thus furthering both the condition of remaining in fractality and the latter's reproduction in time.

*brings about fractality through them, eo ipso working for remaining within it.* Hence the need for the socioanalytic gaze to reveal these situations that fractalize experience and identity<sup>6</sup>, as well as to objectivate and analyze the subjective ‘investments’ with a minus sign. Making explicit these practical strategies of the agent is a condition of possibility of establishing properly socioanalytic strategies standing on de-paralyzing possibilities derived in the process of analysis – alternative positions, knowledge, skills, competences, accesses, acquaintances, ways of expression, of seeing, of perceiving and relating to oneself, to the others and to the social conditions of existence. From this point of view, it is necessary for *hurtness* to be conceived as a *dynamic structure* modified, modulated and deployed in and through the everyday relating of the agent to it. Hence the need for attention to the *actually uttered words and performed actions*. In the dissertation thesis, these are conceived as logical data – *practical inferences* (Aristotle 1993; Von Wright 1983) of the socialized body through which the body ‘engages the world’, constituting a mode of mutual correspondence, a form of ‘ontological complicity’ with it. This is also related to the interest of the study – to show that *ontological complicity* is a *dynamic structure established every next time over* in result of every next affectation and provocation on the part of the concrete agents and circumstances that set the *in situ* specifics of the interaction (Garfinkel 2005). The analyses demonstrate that practical action is the response produced by the sense of regularity of the agent’s socialized body. Being always reflex-reflexive, the action as a *habitual improvisation is also always unique*, i.e. performed, according to the ethnomethodological formula, ‘every next time like for the first time’. Intent on retaining the perspective of the acting agent, the dissertation thesis analyzes practical action as an *indexical inference from a practical syllogism* whose conditions of possibility are given by the context and sedimented – by the already past corrective efforts – as a ‘responsive potential’ (Sabeva) in the body. Hence the irrelevance becomes evident of its conventional conceptualizations in oppositional terms like correct/incorrect, logical/illogical, successful/unsuccessful. In a deploying practical situation, the action

---

<sup>6</sup> The phenomenal experience of ‘fractality’ of existence has been remarkably explored by Svetlana Sabeva in her *Fractal Sociality* (Sabeva 2010). The motive of fractality of being has the meaning of a leading motive in developing the project of socioanalysis of self-inheritance (see Deyanov, Sabeva, Petkov 2013; 2015)

performed by the socialized body – which the thesis conceives as an *immediate*, i.e. uncontingent but also unpre-given response to external provocation hitting, according to Bourdieu, on an existing disposition – *creates a mode of relations* with the world and with the other agents.

Therefore, situationally performed *actions* are also *interactions* – intra-subjective (and first of all intra-corporeal), intersubjective (and first of all intercorporeal). By the actions in the interaction, one does not just do things. The uttered words and performed actions here-and-now reveal, bestow, affirm identities of participants, objects, places, times, create the appearances of situations, and hence require and/or bring about a certain response reaction. Due to this, the *logic of molecular performatives* (Deyanov 2004) as an essential part of the methodological body of the socioanalysis of self-inheritance provides the **second, narrower horizon** of the dissertation. *Molecularity* and *performativity*, then, outline the **second problem circle** on which the study focuses. Conceptualizing practical reflexivity ‘through’ the ‘formal structures of activity’ as made explicit by ethnomethodology<sup>7</sup> allows the specification of such notions of *performativity* and *molecularity* that would be adequate to the study’s perspective – as two layers of social interaction that deploy through one another. The task of the analytic gaze, therefore, is to establish – within the observed object – *the way in which practical reflexivity weaves them in, producing in time the structure and appearances, the molecular organization and the performative form of the interaction*.

This requirement of endogeneity points to **the most important moment** in the unfolding of the research object. A theory capable of putting to endogenous analysis the mutual deployment of performativity and molecularity *in situ* is that of the ***practical logic of molecular performative interactions*** as proposed in the thesis and developed with the intention to integrate it as an *element of the methodological apparatus of the logic of molecular performatives*. Specifying it on the ground of the actual conjoining of the relational identities in correspondence with which (Koev 2017) the agents come as a function of the situational occupation of social positions allows a profound sociological and practical logical problematization of the ***everyday situations of performative***

---

<sup>7</sup> Here I refer to what Cuff, Sharrock and Francis see as a repetitive orderliness of action (Cuff, Sharrock, Francis 2004) and to what Koev means by ‘formal structures of practical actions’ (Koev 2017).

*interactions retained in their molecularity*, i.e. in their being structured as *multiplace and not solely as dyadic relations* of interaction. Thus the study demonstrates that a sociological and practical logical analysis that intends to be reflexive towards its object must take into account that social interaction is not always restricted to a dyadic relation. Retaining *multiplaceness* reveals the situationally produced (endogenously and jointly) organization of interaction. It is the *molecular organization* – in and through the performed actions and uttered words – that produces the *situated performative effects* that create both the appearances of the situation and its affective atmosphere. And the actions performed and words uttered *here, now* and *like that* come as a consequence of the work of practical reflexivity. Staging a dialog, never taking place before, between the visions of Bourdieu and of ethnomethodology on reflexivity permits the shaping of a concept of reflex reflexivity taking its ‘embodied’ character from ethnomethodology but analyzed in the context of socialized corporeality. From this perspective, reflex reflexivity is derived *as a (self-)corrective effort of the habitus/the body*. In using the developed concept as an instrument, the analyzes grasp the dynamism and unprejudiceness in establishing a relation between the agent and the ever concrete and unique circumstances in which the interaction is taking place. The ontological complicity in question takes place in response to provocations in the part of external conditions. ‘Practical reflection’ as an *a priori* reflex – is actualized in the contact with them, establishing a form of corresponding as if for the first time.

Developed as an instrument of the practical logic of molecular performative interactions, the concept of reflex reflexivity has the potential to become a socioanalytic instrument applicable to the benefit of socioanalytic understanding and of the fulfillment of the main functions of the theory of the socioanalysis of self-inheritance, oriented to pre-clinical and clinical therapeutic practice.

### 3. Methodology

As outlined so far, the gradual precization of the problem horizons that shape the theoretical framework and the empirical field of the dissertation thesis shows that the thesis is a very **narrow, specialized study of a concrete problem** – the practical logical functions of practical reflexivity. For this purpose, it makes use of a few, but relevant to

the very clearly stated theme, authors: Bourdieu, Mauss, Austin, Deyanov, Sacks, Coulter, Koev, whose perspectives are involved in productive dialogues.

Due to that, the **methodological strategy** on which the study stakes is that of **‘thinking through’** (Koev 2017; Deyanov 2013). It permits not only to reveal the limits of thinkability of each of the invoked authors but also, through what Mamardashvili would call a ‘free action’ in the ‘singular point’ of their encounter, to overcome the limits of what is thinkable by them. Thus one reaches an ‘objectification of possibilities that are not pre-given’ in their works. *Applied with regard to Bourdieu and ethnomethodology*, this strategy permits *the staging of a dialogue, never taking place before, between their respective visions of reflexivity*. Its staging in the dissertation thesis opens the horizon for *specifying the author’s own concept of reflex reflexivity as an embodied corrective effort of the socialized body, modulating its relations with the external conditions*. Productivity is also demonstrated the rethinking of the problematic of the gift in Mauss ‘through’ ethnomethodology in the context of the conception of interaction as a multiplace relation. On the other hand, rethinking Austinian performativity ‘through’ Bourdieu and the ethnomethodology of Garfinkel and Sacks permits the formation of an expanded notion of performativity and hence the derivation of the concept of ‘bodily performative’.

As a result of the selected strategy, the study proceeds in the space of a productive experimental dialogue not only of theoretical perspectives but also of methodological approaches. The integration of the properly ethnomethodological categorical and sequential analysis (Sacks 1995) to logical analyzes carried out in the context of the logic of molecular performatives (such as the performative logic of the acts of naming, the explicitation of practical logical forms of bestowing affirmative, negative and deviating identity, as well as applying the ‘methodological microscope’ of the theory of pre-predicative evidences – Deyanov 2001) permit the analysis to penetrate into the details of the practical inferability of an action-performative from another action-performative. And hence to develop – as Wittgenstein would say – the ‘toolbox’ of the practical logic of molecular performative interactions that demonstrates its heuristic functions with regard to the explanation, description and fuller logical understanding of contextually correlated words and actions.

#### 4. Structure and synopsis of the dissertation thesis

The *gradual narrowing* was already outlined of the theoretical and problem contexts within which the dissertation thesis unfolds. In the widest problem context provided by the **socioanalysis of self-inheritance**, the one of the **logic of molecular performatives** is located. The third and most narrow framing that precises the specific approach to the research object is the **practical logic of molecular performative interactions**, a part of whose working instruments is the concept of **reflex reflexivity**. The discursive strategy on which the dissertation thesis relies is *walking the reverse path in two steps*:

- 1) starting from the specific problem (**Part One: Scientific and practical reflexivity: through Bourdieu and ethnomethodology**) and
- 2) passing to a wider methodological and theoretical frame (**Part Two: Deployments of practical reflexivity: performativity and molecularity. Practical logic of molecular performative exchanges**).

This is no arbitrary solution. It conforms to the need of profound and detailed thinking into the concrete object – practical reflexivity – from perspectives relevant to the research problem: the practical logic of Bourdieu, the practical logic of the gift, Austinian performativity, locally produced specifics of activity as retained by ethnomethodology. Developed in this way, the problematic of practical reflexivity is productively revisited and sublated in the concept of reflex reflexivity which is now capable of fulfilling the functions of a working instrument in the proposed practical logic of molecular performative interactions, and *eo ipso* in the socioanalysis of self-inheritance.

The following lines succinctly present the contents of the separate part and chapters of the dissertation thesis.

*Part One* raises *practical reflexivity* as a problem to Bourdieu and ethnomethodology. As was made clear, their visions are problematized by the method of ‘thinking through’. In result of the dialogue staged between them, the *praxeological*

*notion of reflex reflexivity* is derived. This is done in separate steps each of which is set apart in an independent chapter.

**Chapter One** develops the **thesis** that in Bourdieu scientific reflexivity is a mode of practical reflection. Therefore the **first section** enters into a dialogue with the perspective, set by him, towards reflexivity as a necessary disposition of the ‘scientific habitus’. This theoretical introduction, additionally expanded by a critical rethinking of Bourdieu’s vision, is necessary in order to provide a horizon to the critique to which he is put in the **second section**. There, viewing reflexivity as a praxeological problem before his own analytic practice, the **thesis** is developed that, despite the strong accent on the need of (self-)reflexivity, Bourdieu fails to apply to the full his basic methodological requirement to the analyses of the practical logic of the gift. Therefore the exposition problematizes the practical logic in Bourdieu and most of all the logic of the gift<sup>8</sup>, in rethinking critically and reviewing in detail the interpretations of the gift’s theoreticians Mauss, Levy-Strauss and Bourdieu. As a result, the **conclusion** is reached that they do not retain in their analyses ‘the practical functions of time’. The **solution** of this research problem is found ‘through’ the analytic context of *Conversation Analysis* as developed by Sacks. It permits the necessary retaining of the practical functions of time, namely retaining the sequential relevance of the separate actions in the molecular structure of the gift which, for the purposes of analysis, is viewed by analogy with the conversational interaction from the analytic perspective of the ‘molecular sociology’ of Sacks (Lynch 1993). Making explicit the endogenous logic of the gift with an emphasis on the temporal deployment of the interaction reveals **the most important substantial moment in Chapter One** – the raising and resolving of the questions of the functions of the third participant in the molecular structure of the practical logical form of ‘gift’.

Retaining the perspective to reflexivity as set in Chapter One, it is thematized in **Chapter Two** not any more as only a ‘constitutive dispositions’ of scientific habitus but also as an *essential* feature of the habitus of the agent who acts beyond the scientific field. The goal is, ‘through’ Bourdieu, to reach an initial *praxeological notion of reflexivity, analyzed from the context of the dynamic and unpre-given ontological*

---

<sup>8</sup> Darin Tenev remarkably interprets critically, intersecting and mirroring the visions of Derrida and Bourdieu, as well as those of Austin and Mauss with that of Derrida (Tenev 2013).

*complicity between habitus and habitat*. Thus in the **first section** practical reflexivity is commented ‘through’ Bourdieu from the context of the already proven thesis that scientific self-reflexivity is a different but analogous mode of practical reflexivity. Here I go beyond that, raising the thesis that practical reflexivity is deployed in every contact of the agent with the contingent agents and circumstances that form the context of social interaction. Its deployment is done by focusing the analytic attention on the ontological conditions of possibility of the reflexivity that actually takes place in practice. The **result** of the analysis is making explicit essential phenomenological aspects of the reflex reflexivity, thus reaching its *first thematization*, namely as the realization of a bodily disposition, as corrective work done by the agent involved in practicing the practice – work oriented to establishing a relation of mutual relevance between the concrete field of action and the acting agent.

**Chapter Three** continues the analytic unfolding of the problem of practical reflexivity but now ‘through’ the ethnomethodological perspective that retains the locally required and the produced, situational, specifics of the activity performed by the ‘competent’ agent. The **first section** thematizes the specificity – as compared to classical research – of the ethnomethodological analytic gaze to the ‘world of the everyday’, namely its ‘alternateness’, i.e. the fact that it is inseparably linked to them by its object – ‘social order’ – but decisively different from them in its attitude and approach to it (Koev 2017). The analytic attention in the **second section** is focused on reflexivity in the vision of early ethnomethodological studies. Therefore the research interest starts from the so-called ‘ethnomethods’ by which, as a ‘joint achievement’, the sense, meaning and understanding of the situation is developed, going to the conclusions of the so-called ‘disruptive experiments’ – the destruction of ‘ordinariness’, of the ‘normal appearances’ of the situation, which practically and factually disorganizes the interaction. At this point of the analysis, the **thesis** is developed that *the crisis so created is a provocation to the ‘essential reflexivity’ of the ‘victims’*, i.e. it provokes their reflexivity as an *in vivo* phenomenon, as a ‘formidable feature of practical actions’ (Garfinkel 2005). An **empirical approbation of the thesis** is done by analyzing one of the reflex-reflexive procedures that ‘members’ set in motion in response to ‘provocation’ – using formulas, glosses, as a ‘resource of everyday interaction’ (Koev 2017). A concrete formulation is put under the microscope, i.e. an everyday conversation particular whose interpretation

combines properly ethnomethodological categorical and sequential analysis with a logical analysis developed in the context of the logic of molecular performatives. The goal of such a discursive move is not only to demonstrate the heuristic functions of integrating both types of analysis in relation to the explanation, description and fuller logical understanding of the non-thematizable ‘seeing’ of ‘banality’, of the ‘ordinariness’ of everyday situation, but also to make a first demonstration of practical inferability of a performative from a performative. The **third section** deepens the undertaken problematization of practical reflexivity ‘through’ the vision of late ethnomethodological studies, oriented to the description of ‘embodied reflexivity’. The re-orientation of the ethnomethodological research perspective is traced and critically rethought. The analysis reaches the **conclusion** that this re-orientation is essentially provoked by the discrepant temporalities of the ethnomethodological ‘expositions’ of scientific activity, on the one hand, and the ‘actual course of scientific activity’ which is the object of the ‘exposition’. Hence the drive, typical of late ethnomethodological research, for neutralizing the temporal discrepancy is now presented as natural and necessary. It is in response to it that the requirement comes, defining the specifics of late research, for a first-person description of the ‘embodied production’ of social objects, which is essential to the problematization of practical reflexivity as undertaken in the dissertation thesis. Analyzes reach the **conclusion** that what comes into the ethnomethodological focus is precisely the need to *incorporate* a ‘member’ competence that is called upon to provide the necessary ‘responsive potential’ for the production of ‘embodied objects’. Hence the main **conclusion** to which I come to ultimately specify the concept of reflex reflexivity as developed in the thesis is as follows: through ‘embodied reflexivity’, the contingent circumstances and the body develop one another by establishing/re-establishing/restoring the ontological correspondence between them, creating in collaboration that ‘one and the same history which’, according to Bourdieu, ‘every historical action reveals: the “history in an objectivated state” and the “history in an incorporated state” ’ (Bourdieu 1980).

**Interim recapitulation I** sums up what was done in Part One, namely: the staging of a dialog on reflexivity, never done before, between the visions of Bourdieu and of ethnomethodology. The method of thinking ‘through’, deliberately and methodically adhered to in this part of the dissertation thesis, permits, on the one hand,

going beyond what is thinkable in both theoretical perspectives, showing that each is able to productively develop implicit layers of the other; on the other hand, ‘through’ this dialog on reflexivity between them, a horizon is opened to specify a concept of *reflex reflexivity* as an *embodied corrective effort of the socialized body that is activated in each contact of the agent with the concrete and unpredictable circumstances and agents that make up the external conditions and in this sense the habitat of social interaction*.

**Part Two** is an exercise *in* and *on* the *logic of molecular performatives* by making explicit the practical logical functions of reflex reflexivity in the practical logic of molecular performative interactions. The exposition expands *its empirical field* in emphasizing that the analytic gaze should not just stay at the relational identities as *set by tradition* (Deyanov 2004) but it must also revert to the *actual conjoining* of those – again relational – identities *in correspondence with which* agents come as a function of the situation occupation of social positions. They are conventionally recognized as linked to certain rights and obligations structuring the relations at the everyday level. As a possible version of their specification, the one provided by ethnomethodology is adopted, as it develops the idea of the so-called symmetrical or asymmetrical pairs of related terms. But the research interest must also turn to the identities that are *actually conjoined and bestowed by discourse and the bodily relating to the Other*, identities that are constituted as the result of the symbolic charging of a difference and its becoming a social practice and hence a form of social inequality and distinctiveness – in a positive or negative sense<sup>9</sup>. From the socioanalytic perspective, the empirical field can also include those relations between the agent and the social conditions which result in self-bestowing an identity and which include both the agents and the circumstances of their existence<sup>10</sup>, i.e. the *fractalized identities* of agents perceiving their own un-identity with themselves.

---

<sup>9</sup> Here I have in mind the problem area uncovered by Penkova, in which the social inequality created in and by the discourse and discursive practices is productively studied (Penkova 2012, 2018).

<sup>10</sup> Here I have in mind the empirical cases explored within the framework of the project *‘I have no-one to turn to!’ – socioanalytic dimensions of vulnerability*, financed by the Scientific Research Fund under contract DM 20/4 as of 20.12.2017. The project is being carried out jointly with doctoral students and young scientists of the departments of ‘Sociology and Humand Sciences’ and of ‘Philosophy’ of the Faculty of Philosophy and Hisroty of the Paissiy Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, under leadership of

To outline the methodological framework, a critical rethinking is also needed, beyond Austin and Sacks, of the concepts of *performativity* and *molecularity* as micro-specifics of the situation. This is also the task of **Chapter One** of this Part in which they are presented as praxeological modes of deployment of reflex reflexivity. Rethinking the ethnomethodological perspective ‘through’ Austin results in the **observation** that a crucial effect of situated action is the doing of things by words and actions. Hence the **thesis**: the ethnomethodological endogenous search for acting formality, as far as it focuses on the invariant, in fact retains and describes the performative form of action. This becomes possible since, as the exposition demonstrates, the idea of performativity is generalized by ethnomethodology and especially by *Conversation Analysis* so as to expand beyond the Austinian discursive performativity. In their perspective, the emphasis is put on the implicit but expoundable and seen performativity of the ‘overall speech situation’. In the dissertation thesis, I go even further, interpreting the ‘overall speech situation’ as a performative molecule made of reflexively correlated, i.e. ordered in a certain corporally-reflexive way, atoms – indexical expressions and actions. Against the background of the **conclusion** that the performative form of activity receives its definiteness of meaning by its actual ‘doing’ ‘every next time’ as a situated and member’s building of the molecular structure, of the ordered sequence of activity, I reach the **conclusion** that *molecularity and performativity are praxeological deployments of reflexivity that are each other’s vehicle*. As such, it is not possible from the practical perspective, and hence not in place from the analytic perspective, to disarticulate them from one another. Hence the need for the analytic gaze to make explicit always the unique ways in which the reflex reflexivity of agents deploys them one through another, creating the molecular structure and thence the performative form, the appearances of the practical situation. Proceeding against this background, the analyses that follow do not stay at the understanding of performativity and molecularity as traits of the social situation but stake on their problematization as logical problems in the practical logic of molecular performative interactions. The logical functions are also

---

Martina Mineva, to all of whom I want to give thanks for the productive discussions a part of which also find lace in the current study.

conceptualized of reflex reflexivity from the context of the molecularity and performativity so conceived.

Entering in-depth into the defined perspective, **Chapter Two**, in its turn, focuses on social interaction as a performative form. The **first section** aims, by overcoming the restrictions of Austin's discursive performativity, to outline a widely understood notion of implicit performativeness. It is shown that such a move has its grounds in both Bourdieu and ethnomethodology. Therefore the method of thinking 'through' them is applied again, this time directed to performativity. In result, the **conclusion** comes that *one can justly make explicit two important common denominators between the two perspectives* – on the one hand, 'membership' (Garfinkel) or the 'doxic relation with the native world' (Bourdieu) is a condition for the reflexive mutual relation between agents and contingent circumstances, so that by embodied reflexive actions to develop the context of interaction, creating in result a new, different appearance to it – this development, following Bourdieu, is objectivated in 'naming the unnameable'; on the other hand its ethnomethodological variant in its weaker and everyday version is 'formalization' as a 'member's method', which in itself is also 'making public', 'officialization' in Bourdieu, i.e. 'something different from the mere saying of something' (Austin 1996) and in this sense, a performative action. As the next step, the concept of performativity, as developed beyond Austin, integrates in itself also the performativity that is objectivated in things (Deyanov 2005; Penkova 2018). But its most essential expansion done by the current study is towards the performativity that is incorporated in the bodies. The orientation of the answer to the question 'how to do things with words when words are absent'<sup>11</sup> to *the body* raises the problem of implicit and explicit bodily performativity. I dare say **the most important result** of the undertaken problematizations is the derivation of the concept of '**bodily performative**'.<sup>12</sup> Its practical logical functions are studied in the context of nonclassical transcendental logic by a critical rethinking of Von Wright's interpretation of Aristotle's idea of *action as an inference* in a practical syllogism. Hence the **conclusion**: *bodily*

---

<sup>11</sup> This question was raised within a working seminar on performatives in an objectivated and an incorporated state that had with Deyand Deyanov and Stoyka Penkova in the distant year 2005. I believe, however, that this question is no doubt still actual today.

<sup>12</sup> Bourdieu hints at incorporated performativity and one objectivated in things (Bourdieu 2005).

*performatives are reflex-reflexive practical inferences, the function of (self-)corrective relating of socialized corporeality, oriented to a here-and-now establishment of ontological complicity with circumstances and agents that make up the situation as a field of interaction.*

Retaining what was achieved, **Chapter Three** can now concentrate on the problem of the molecular structure of social interaction as the basis on which its performative form is deployed. The prism of the analyzes in the **first section** is the ‘molecular sociology’ (Lynch 1993) of Sacks. Here the application of the method of thinking ‘through’ gives a chance to endogenously problematize the situated building of the organization of local situations of everyday interaction. Its situative assembly is demonstrated by the endogenous analysis of an everyday conversational particular by categorical and sequential analysis. This also demonstrates the working of the reflex reflectivity – a working that is self-objectivated in the production of an ‘answer’ relevant and appropriate to local conditions, which in its turn ‘sets the tune’ for the next appropriate and relevant remark. The **second section** gets down to analyzing how this takes place, aiming at make explicit the embodied mechanisms by which the ‘assembly’ is practically realized of the ordered sequence, or the molecular structure of interaction. From the perspective of the practical logic of molecular performative interactions, i.e. in the context of the micro-levels of interaction, the question of the ‘molecularity of the social situation’ appears as a properly logical problem related to the form taken each time by the practical inferability in and through which interaction is developed in collaboration. The combination of the ethnomethodological categorical and sequential analysis in the context of the nonclassical transcendental logic is applied to an example of Sacks, analyzed also by Koev, which is adapted under the form of thought experiment. This move allows the dissertation thesis to reach the **conclusion** that the competent recognition of form is in fact a categorization ‘in one glance’ of both the counter-agent and the activity he does. Hence the **conclusion**: *by ethnomethods applied in using words and actions, the agent produces performatives that, in their turn, provoke the reflex reflexivity of the counter-agent to produce other performatives – again by a ‘member’s’, i.e. appropriately-relevant and competent use of words and actions.* The empirical field of the practical logic of molecular performative interactions reveals the next problems to consider in the dissertation thesis, namely, on the one hand, the

problem of practical negation as the general form of what socioanalysis views as fractality due to privation, and on the other, the problem of the negation of privation as negation by using a performative. This properly logical problematic is the object of study in the **third section**. Initially, thinking ‘with’ Deyanov, the statement is thematized that ‘privation as negation provokes performative utterances’ (Deyanov 2008). The next step is considering it from the socioanalytic perspective by translating this problem onto the field of practical logic of molecular performative interactions. Under its conditions, the problem of negation receives a new dimension objectivated by the **thesis** that a possible mode of negating the negation as privation is the preliminary giving (as distinguished structurally and logically from the preliminary return gift, Deyanov 2004). The exposition reaches the **conclusion** that *not only the preliminary return gift is a strategy of the un-self- identical habitus of exiting the interstice of fractal experience but such a strategy is also the preliminary gift which is structurally different from it and which has been noticed as early as by Mauss*. The practical logical analysis of the practice of giving described by Mauss (Mauss 2001) demonstrates the endogenous way in which preliminary giving is a strategy (in Bourdieu’s sense) of practical sense but *eo ipso* also an investment into the future on the part of the identity that feels itself as un-self-identical, i.e. here and now deprived of its unregiven essence. Thus the exposition’s content comes to its initial and widest problem horizon – the socioanalysis of self-inheritance which motivates the current work of exploring practical reflexivity.

**Interim recapitulation II** sums up what has been done in Part Two of the dissertation thesis, namely the proposal, as an analytic instrument, of the *practical logic of molecular performative interactions* operating with the developed praxeologically conceived notion of reflex reflexivity. On the one hand, Part Two singles out its empirical field, and on the other it raises and provides solutions to its own properly logical problems, demonstrating its possible applications and its productivity in different empirical contexts. As far as it contains a potential to use endogenous practical logical analysis on everyday micro-situations of social interaction, objectivating the reflex-reflexive correlation between agents and the concrete circumstances of the situation, the practical logic of molecular performative interactions becomes seamlessly integrated into the methodological body of the logic of molecular performatives which is a necessary instrument in the socioanalysis of self-inheritance.

The **Conclusion** makes a short overview of the contents of the separate stages through which the exposition has passed, emphasizing the raised theses and the achieved conclusions. As the next step, it outlines a perspective for future research which is a natural continuation of what has been achieved in the dissertation thesis. Thus, *the focus of future problematizations is defined as the nonclassical experimentation as a chance before the socioanalysis of self-inheritance.*

To the main body of the dissertation, **four appendices** are added. In these, the methodological instruments and the theoretical premises problematized in the dissertation thesis are approbated in the empirical contexts of social initiatives and everyday practices, oral life stories and described historical cases, as well as of literary works taken as a form of thought experiment within which the practical logical functions of reflex reflexivity are analyzed and made explicit. From this point of view, applications have an essential role in the development of the logic of molecular performative exchanges as an element of the organon of the socioanalysis of self-inheritance, as far as they are located within the horizons of fractal experience, but also of distinctiveness, of symbolicity of words and deeds, i.e. in the practical sphere of deployment of the socioanalytic perspective.

## 5. Towards outlining the focus of future studies

Proceeding within clearly defined theoretical horizons, the dissertation thesis develops as a narrowly framed study of a concrete problem, reaching an understanding of practical reflexivity as a (self-)corrective relating of the socialized body to itself and to the concrete agents and circumstances forming the contingent conditions under which social interaction is deployed. In result of this relating between them, a form of relation is established each next time as if for the first time.

Specified thus, the proposed concept of reflex reflexivity is capable of **aiding the therapeutic functions** of the socioanalysis of self-inheritance, as far as it can orient the ‘everyday work’ of the agent towards overcoming the hysteresis of the habitus. Incorporating a positive relating to oneself and to the world could convert the ‘bad’ investments of the habitus that works for its staying in fractality into everyday self-

corrective efforts for positive investments into a future Who-identity. For overcoming hurtness, what is needed is only an ‘obsessive persistence’ for turning **(self-)correctivity into a reflex acting ‘not ex post on the opus operatum but a priori on the modus operandi’** (Bourdieu 2001). This newly constituted relating to oneself and to the world, as a function of becoming aware of ‘the responsibility to become who we are’, is a possible road to successful self-inheritance. This road is a trial – in walking it, the hurt personality achieves herself as that what she ‘is’ (which, also, is not pre-given). Therefore it could be said that her path is an incessantly renewed nonclassical experiment that seeks not its reproducibility but a constant, i.e. turned into a reflex, surpassing of her own limits.

Thus we come to the plotline for future research that is a natural continuation to what is achieved in the dissertation thesis, namely: **putting nonclassical experimenting under the microscope in the name of the socioanalysis of self-inheritance.**

The problematic of nonclassical experimentation (Deyanov 2001) stands on the ‘nonclassical principle of observation’ and the problem of singular points as put in that principle’s context (Mamardashvili 1984). Retaining the intention of the theoretical and empirical analyses made in the dissertation, one can say that *both* every affection by the world and the others that is perceived by the agent *and* every socioanalytic session as a form of interaction is a ‘singular point that is pregnant with deviation, and before the act of logical inference happens, it is not determined how and in what direction it will happen’ (Mamardashvili 1984). The ‘indeterminacy’ carried by the singular point is not a restriction but a chance – both to the hurt person and to the socioanalyst.

Against the background of the context so defined, I will outline the problematic here in a very preliminary manner.

It needs repeating that nonclassical experiments don’t aim at reproducibility but stake on indeterminacy as a research chance to overcome limits – those of the very form of experiment and those of the experimenters and their experimental subjects themselves. *If in the experiments in practical logic and ethnomethodology the experimenters are the analysts, in socioanalysis it is far from being so.*

Both in preclinical conversations and in clinical sessions, the mission of the socioanalyst is to *assist*, as Bourdieu says, the hurt person. And to assist not just her self-analysis but her self-inheritance – or – *to assist the sufferer in her experimenting on her*

*own limits* in support of the effort to overcome the suffering in which her practical sense of regularity encloses her. In the socioanalytic intervention, therefore, the nonclassical experiment has *reversed functions*. In it, the experimenter is not the socioanalyst but the hurt person herself whose done actions and uttered words are mimetic acts of a future condition which – even though still nonexistent – is sensed in its possibility as the ‘true’ one. Hence the danger for the experimenter ‘to become a victim’, as Garfinkel would say, of the experiment. That’s why it is necessary to repeat again: for the success of the turning of self-correctivity into a reflex of the body, an *incorporated self-reflexive practice of socioanalytic assistance* is needed.

After all that has been said, it can be summed up that the dissertation thesis, the analyzes done within it and the achieved results are not a final but a beginning opening a horizon to a multitude of future empirical and theoretical studies in the sphere of the socioanalysis of self-inheritance – a sphere undoubtedly provocative to anyone analyzing the social.

## 6. List of contributions by the study

1. This dissertation thesis draws the outlines of a new theory that I define as **practical logic of molecular performative interactions**, delineating its theoretical horizon, empirical field and methodological instruments.
2. The dissertation thesis stages a necessary, but never conducted in the scientific community so far, **dialogue** between the visions of Bourdieu and of ethnomethodology on practical reflexivity.
3. In result of this dialog, a concept of **reflex reflexivity** is derived as a corrective turning of the habitus/the body to itself or to the concrete conditions, coming in response to a provocation on their part and establishing each next time as if for the first time a mode of relation between them.
4. In the context of the study of practical reflexivity, the dissertation thesis carries out a **content mirroring of the socioanalytic** turn of Bourdieu's reflexive sociology **in the praxeological turn in logic** both in him and in ethnomethodology, sublating this mirroring – by the concept of reflex reflexivity – into a united socioanalytic perspective oriented to a better understanding and overcoming of socially generated vulnerability.
5. The dissertation thesis, going beyond Austinian discursive performativity, propose a new concept for describing performativity, the so-called 'bodily performative', raising the question of the functions it has in the practical logic of molecular performative interactions. The solution given is that bodily performatives are inferences in practical syllogisms.
6. The study raises for the first time the problem of the functions of the third participant in the gift of Mauss and offers a solution in retaining analytically the multiplicity of social interaction and overcoming its conventional considering solely as a dyadic relation.
7. The analyzes done in the dissertation thesis make explicit the structural differences between the preliminary return gift and the preliminary gift that haven't been distinguished before. From the socioanalytic perspective, the preliminary gift is commented as a possible strategy of practical sense oriented to overcoming the agent's un-self-identity.

### Publications related to the theme of the dissertation thesis

1. Телесни дарове. 2003. В: *Нова хуманитаристика*. Сборник от студентски научни сесии. Издателство Изток-Запад. София [Bodily gifts. 2003. In: *New Human Studies*. A collection from student scientific sessions. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad.]
2. Символната ефикасност и условията за успешност на молекулярните перформативи. 2004. В: *Философски четения*. Пловдив 2004. Издателство ЛИК, 2005 [Symbolic efficiency and the conditions of possibility of molecular performtives. 2004. In: *Philosophical Reading Sessions. Plovdiv 2004*. Sofia: LIK, 2005]
3. Действието като извод в практическия силогизъм. 2007. В: *Философия*, 3 [Action as an inference in a practical syllogism. 2007. In: *Filosofia*, 3]
4. Един исторически казус под микроскопа на практическата логика: случаят „Хуго Капет“, 2008, В: *Социологически проблеми*, 1-2 [A historical case under the microscope of practical logic: the case of Hugh Capet. In: *Sociological Problems*, 1-2]
5. Противоречията на наследството на „отвътре изключените“: върху един емпиричен казус, 2011, В: *Социологически проблеми*, 3-4 [The contradictions of inheritance of those ‘excluded from within’: on an empirical case. 2011. In: *Sociological Problems*, 3-4]
6. Практико-логически функции на предварителния дар, 2016, В: *Хетеродоксии* /под печат/ [Practical logical functions of the preliminary gift. 2016. In: *Heterodoxies* (forthcoming)]
7. Символизмът на упълномощеното тяло, 2017, В: *Хетеродоксии* /под печат/ [The symbolism of the authorized body. 2017. In: *Heterodoxies* (forthcoming)]
8. Проблемът за рефлексивността: на границата между етнометодологията и социоанализата, 2018, В: *Социологически проблеми*, 1 [The problem o reflexivity: on the border between ethnomethodology and socioanalysis. 2018. In: *Sociological Problems*, 1]

### Literature used in the extended summary

- Аристотел, 1993. *Никомахова етика*. София. Издателство ГАЛ-ИКО
- Бурдийо, П. 1993. *Казани неща*. София. УИ „Св. Климент Охридски”
- Бурдийо, П. Вакан, Ж.Д., 1993а. *Въведение в рефлексивната антропология*. София, ИК Критика и хуманизъм
- Бурдийо, П., 1997. *Практическият разум. Върху теорията на дейността*. Критика и хуманизъм, София
- Бурдийо, П. 2001в. *Практическият усет. Свойствата на практическата логика*. Арив на ИКСИ
- Бурдийо, П. 2004. *Да се разбира*. В: Етносоциология: интердисциплинарен модул. Пловдив.
- Бурдийо, П. 2005. *Практическият усет*. София. Фигура
- Бурдийо, П. 2007. *Размишления по Паскал*. София. Панорама плюс
- Бурдийо, П. 2014. *Увод в социоанализата*. (непубл. превод на Т. Петков)., В: Социоанализа. Електронен рийдър за бакалавърска програма „Социология и науки за човека“ и магистърска програма „Социоанализа и междучовешки отношения“. Пловдив, Пловдивски университет, Философско-исторически факултет, Катедра Социология и науки за човека.
- Вацов, Д. 2016. *Това е истина!*. София, издателство на НБУ
- Вебер, М. 2004. *Науката като призвание*. В: Социологията като шанс. Сборник текстове под съставителството на Лиляна Деянова. София, 2004
- Гарфинкъл Х. 2005. *Изследвания по етнометодология*. Критика и хуманизъм.
- Гарфинкъл, Х., Сакс, Х., 1993. *За формалните структури на практическите действия*. В: Социологически проблеми, 1993/2
- Деянов, Д. 2001. *Увод в логиката и методологията на хуманитарните науки. Хуманитаристиката след смъртта на човека*. Пловдивско университетско издателство, Пловдив
- Деянов, Д. 2004. *Логика на молекулярните перформативи и нормализация*. В: Критика и хуманизъм, 2004/1, кн.17

Деянов, Д. 2005. *Бурдийо: онтологическото съучастничество като проблем пред рефлексивната социология*. В: Социологически проблеми, 2005/3-4

Деянов, Д. 2013. *Сингуларна точка и времеустойчива вечност*. В: Чужденецът и всекидневието. Сборник, посветен на 60-годишнината на Кольо Коев. Издателство на Нов български университет.

Деянов, Д. 2017. *Практическата логика на дара. Да се мисли с Бурдийо против Бурдийо*. В: Дар и култури за дарителство за образование: теории, институции, личности. Съставители Пепка Бояджиева и Росица Стоянова

Коев, К., 1996. *Видимостта: феноменологични контексти*. София, Критика и хуманизъм

Коев, К., 2012. *Обречени на смисъл. Всекидневността като дискурсивни възможности*. София” „Обсидиан”.

Коев, К., 2017. *Етнометодология и логика на всекидневното разбиране*. София, издателство на НБУ

Къф, Е. К., Шарък, У., Френсиз, Д., 2004. Етнометодологията. В: *Етносоциология: интердисциплинарен модул*. Пловдив [Cuff, E. C., Sharrock, W. W. & Francis, D.W. 2004. Ethnomethodology. In: *Ethnosociology: an interdisciplinary module*. Plovdiv.]

Леви-Строс, Кл. 2001. *Въведение в творчеството на Марсел Мос*. В: Дарът. София, Критика и хуманизъм

Мамардашвили, М. 1984. *Класически и некласически идеали на рационалности*. Тбилиси, Мецниереба

Минева, М. 2015г. *Витгенщайн и проблематизирането на философията. Граници и перспективи*. дисертация. София, Софийски университет, Философски факултет.

Минева, М. 2018. *Логически форми на индукцията и данните на социоанализата*. В: Социологически проблеми, 2018/1

Мос, М. 2001. *Дарът*. София. Критика и хуманизъм

Остин, Д. 1996. *Как с думи се вършат неща*. София. Критика и хуманизъм

Пенкова, С. 2012. *Социоанализа на граничността: върху два казуса от двете страни на българо-турската граница*. В: Миграции от двете страни на българо-турската граница: наследства, идентичности, интеркултурни взаимодействия. В. Ганева-Райчева, М. Елчинова, М. Златкова, Н. Вуков (съст.) София, ИЕФЕМ, 61-75 (електронно издание).

Пенкова, С. 2017. *Дискурсивна аналитика на емоциите: омразата като социоаналитичен проблем*. В: Езикът на омразата - хейтърският дискурс и отношението към Другия. Сборник с резултати от едноименния проект. Съст. и ред. Стойка Пенкова

Пенкова, С. 2018. *Неравенството в праксеологическа перспектива: всекидневните му формулирания като емпирични данни*. В: Социологически проблеми, 2018/1

Петков, Т. 2001. *От Бурдийо и Остин към логиката на молекулярните перформативи*. В: Критика и хуманизъм 7 (архив ИКСИ)

Петков, Т. 2017. *Феноменологическата психопатология през погледа на социоанализата на самонаследяването и практическата логика*. Ръкопис на дисертация. Пловдив, Пловдивски университет, Философско-исторически факултет

Сакс, Х. 2013а. *Вършенето „да се бъде ординерен“*. В: Социологически проблеми, 2013/3-4.

Сакс, Х. 2013б. *Всерелевантните механизми. Ситуираните дейности. Индикаторите*. В: Социологически проблеми, 2013/ 3-4.

Събева, Св. 2010. *Пречупената социалност. Преосмисляне на разбиращата социология*. София. Изток-Запад

Събева, Св. 2016. *Да слушаш страданието: социоанализата и „патосният“ обрат в понятието за опит*. В: Социологически проблеми, 2016/1-2

Събева, Св. 2018. *Прежалимите и непрежалимите животи: социоанализата в епохата на биовластта*. В: Социологически проблеми, 2018/1

Тенев, Д. 2013. *Отклонения*. Опити върху Жак Дерида. София. Изток-Запад.

Тенев, Д. 2018. *Модалност, модализации, модални преходи (наблюдения и хопитези)*. В: Социологически проблеми, 2018/1

Шовалие, С., Шовире, К., 2018. *Четири основни понятия в социоанализата на Пиер Бурдийо*. В: Социологически проблеми 2018/1

Bourdieu, P. 1980. *Le mort saisit le vif. Les relations entre l'histoire incorporée et l'histoire réifiée*. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, vol. 32-33 (avril-juin).

Bourdieu, P. 2001. *Science de la science et réflexivité*. Paris: Raisons d'agir.

Coulter, J. 1991. *Logic: ethnomethodology and the logic of language*. // G. Button (Ed.). *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Deyanov, D., Sabeva, S., Petkov, T. 2013. *The psychopathology of everyday life as a problem before socioanalysis*". Ed. D. St. Stoyanov, *Psychopathology: theory, perspectives and future approaches*. Nova Science Publishers, New York

Deyanov, D., Sabeva, S., Petkov T. 2015. *Bourdieu and Stanghellini: socioanalysis and phenomenological psychopathology*. In: Stoyanov, D. (ed.) *Towards a New Philosophy of Mental Health: Perspectives from Neuroscience and Humanities*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle (2015)

Lynch, M. 1993. *Scientific Practice and Ordinary Action. Ethnomethodology and Social Studies of Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Sacks, H. 1995. *Lectures of Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stanghellini, G. 2004. *Disembodied spirits and deanimated bodies. The psychopathology of common sense*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stanghellini, G. 2014. *The 'What' and the 'Who' in the constitution of psychopathological phenotypes*. *Folia Medica*, vol. 56, suppl. 1.

Von Wright, G.H. 1983. *Practical Reason*. In: *Philosophical Papers*, Vol.1.