

## EVERYDAY LIFE AS A POLEMICAL FIELD

(Todor Hristov, *The Sound and the Fury: Archeology of Domestic Quarrels*. Sofia: Sofia University Press, 2021)

If I were to present in general terms the problem area in which Todor Hristov's research has been focused over the years, I would point first of all to the uses of power in its various manifestations: from the "social legitimation of state power", through the "power effects of practices of the self", the treatment of truth beyond the knowledge-power complex, late-capitalist "bi-political apparatuses", to the exploration of the "polemology of everyday life" in the 2021 monograph *The Sound and the Fury: Archeology of Domestic Quarrels*.

Such a general enumeration gives a poor idea of the actual nature of Todor Hristov's research interests. In order to make the picture more distinct, the specific aspect on which he focuses in each of these fields must necessarily be added. I would label it as the *weak strength* of power practices, which mostly goes unrecognized by conventional scientific knowledge, but can have erosive consequences. For example, in the monograph *Impossible Knowledge: Conspiracy Theories, Power, and Truth* (2019), Hristov shows that debunking the "knowledge" of conspiracy theories as "social dysfunction" is fundamentally irrelevant and even counterproductive, insofar as it stabilizes them as entangled in the battle for truth (and thus essentially alternative) theories stifled by tyrannical power, and thus amplifies their popularity. Instead, the author suggests that we should be aware of the unintended power effects of conspiracy theories, which would mean focusing on their "dramatics and pragmatics", exposing them as "infelicitous parrhesiastic acts" and manifesting a practical rationality that requires understanding rather than debunking.

Similarly, the article "Practical Logic and the Everyday Rationality of Power" (*Heterodoxy* 1–2/20) raises the question of the ordinary exercise of power, in other words, of its treatment as a "radical phenomenon" in the sense of ethnomethodology. Considered in this way, it can-

not be abstracted from the actors' knowledge of the situation (being an element of the situation's own reflexivity – to use another ethnomethodological term) and in this sense its rationality "has the character of a tactical art, of artfully saying or doing things in a setting that cannot be mastered, clarified or anticipated".

This research stylistics finds its clearest expression in the monograph *The Sound and the Fury: Archeology of Domestic Quarrels* (2021). The book deals with speech in domestic quarrels. Or, to put it more concretely, the target of the study is "impossible statements", statements usually discarded as "meaningless voices, as noises". What are the discursive mechanisms that allow the impossible to be expressed, how do the participants in the scenes play with language to participate effectively in everyday struggles (however ephemeral they may seem) whose traces invisibly shape the history of social interactions and even predetermine their future? Or, more generally: is (from such a perspective) everyday life a field of stability and normality, or is there a deep polemic, a character of a "political phenomenon" hiding under this appearance? These are the key questions shaping the nature of the research which unfolds on an archive of material including scenes of scandal from literary works and recordings of conversations from therapy sessions. What the scenes under study have in common is the "privileging" of strange utterances, moving "on the edge of meaning". These are "singular statements" driven, however, by relations referring to "knowledge from the fields of medicine, psychiatry, public hygiene, sanitary science, pedagogy, psychology, sociology, ethnography" (p. 10). Guided by these interests, the study describes four modes of knowledge about domestic scandals, analyzed in four chapters, the titles of which are themselves an indication of the specificity of the respective mode: 'masculine domination' (Chapter Two), 'abnormality' (Chapter Three), 'dysfunctions' (Chapter

Four), and 'depth' (Chapter Five). Although these regimes were born in different historical epochs, they are, in the end, superimposed on one another, intertwining in a particular geology of human interactions and in one way or another shaping their voices even if they seem idiosyncratic and devoid of meaning.

Although the design of the study thus outlined, as well as the substantive analyses therein, are significant achievements of the author in their own right, the most significant contributions are contained in Chapters One and Six, as they pre-determine the theoretical value of the analyses already mentioned. Here I will comment on only two of these contributions in terms of two aspects common to them.

The discursive apparatus that T. Hristov develops in Chapter One is a synthesis of Foucault's ideas with borrowings from Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari and Louis Hjelmslev. The idea is to reframe Foucault's notions of 'statement' and 'performative act' to make them 'applicable to singular scenes'. Finally, in the "Summary", the author outlines three fields of relations (associative, correlative and supplementary) in which what is said in the domestic scandal fits "in order to be individualized". This forms the framework of the analytical apparatus already mentioned. It is, however, far from being a ready-made, universal tool for describing "small, molecular relations that remain below the threshold of what the participants in a domestic scandal say" (p. 9). It is a tool tailored precisely to T. Hristov's sensibility and, as can be seen from the concrete analyses, it is constantly animated by a rare ability ("to let realities work upon one") identified on another occasion by Weber. By this I emphasize the unique ability of Hristov to prepare his mental body for an unintentional entry into the analytical field, which I perceived already as a reviewer of his doctoral thesis.

Similar stylistics is applied in Chapter Six to Stanley Cavell's notion of 'passionate speech', which is reframed in the monograph to relate it to Michel Foucault's unrealized project of 'discursive dramatics'. Thus, Cavell's and Austin's idea of the performative act is linked to some notions of Lacan, Deleuze and Guattari in order to achieve an idea of passionate speech that applies not only to the marital but also to "public scandals, political conflicts, protests without clear demands, the New Age cult milieu, conspiracy theories".

It is no coincidence that I am stressing the similarity of stylistics of elaborating the conceptual resources of the monograph in Chapters One and Six. I will also note a second important aspect of this similarity, which reminds me of a suggestion by the early Harvey Sacks: the author has to demonstrate in detail the materials from which he constructs his apparatus, so that the reader – if well disposed – can replicate his efforts and be convinced that the tool actually works. Which would mean that the reader, as long as he is competent, could combine the materials in question in his own way and use them for his own purposes. This is what Todor Hristov generously offers us in the reviewed monograph.

In the conclusion, I will make a recommendation (or rather a wish) for the future work of the author. I expect him to test his analytical skills on actual speech conflicts that have developed both in a domestic context and in different institutional settings (e.g., the courtroom). The results, as he is no doubt aware, would be very different from those found in the fragments of literary discourses or during therapy sessions (with the therapist's participation). This, of course, requires the accumulation of an archive of actual conversations, which unfortunately is still lacking in Bulgaria.

*Kolyo Koev*

## **SOCIOLOGICAL PROBLEMS**

*Sociological Problems* is the only academic journal of the Bulgarian sociological community. Its leading principal is that sociology is “flexible” science and thus a key element of the sociological approach is *working on the boundaries*. This means that on the one hand sociology should be clearly aware of its own boundaries and on the other it should be open for interaction with other scientific disciplines. Projected on the policy of the journal this principal implies a special accent on *interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach*, which allows the formation of sociological enclaves” in other research areas and at the same time gives the chance of well know sociological themes to be seen with “other” eyes.

An important aspect of the publishing philosophy of the Journal is the awareness that we live in times when Bulgaria needs to catch up with the clear deficit of democratic political culture, which implies a profound rethinking of the role of sociological knowledge in the conditions of radical social changes. Therefore a key aim of the Journal is to provide space for intellectual debate, which will lead to the formation of a critical political public discourse.

### **Editorial manuscript processing**

1. Author submits manuscript
2. Managing editor screens manuscript and assesses adherence to aim and scope of Journal accepts or returns to author
3. Manuscript sent for double blind review to two reviewers
4. Reviewers rigorously assess manuscript and send review to the Journal
5. Editor in Chief decides whether to accept the manuscript or send it back to author for revision.
6. Author revise and resubmit the manuscript. Editor in Chief may return to one of the reviewers to determine whether the revisions respond to the reviewer’s comments
7. Editor in Chief confirms the final decision. If positive sends for publication.
8. Manuscript published.

Print ISSN – 0324-1572

Online ISSN – 2603-4131

## **THE JOURNAL'S ETHICAL PRINCIPLES OF AUTHORSHIP, REVIEW AND PUBLICATION OF MANUSCRIPTS**

The journal *Sociological Problems* is committed to publishing articles, reviews and surveys that meet the highest academic and ethical standards; this policy is ensured by the efforts of the authors as well as by activities of reviewers and publishers. The **Ethical Principles** presented here regulate the relations between the parties thus designated.

### **THE AUTHORS**

They offer original articles. This means the manuscript submitted to the journal's editorial office has not been published elsewhere in its present, or a similar, form. The author is obliged to alert the publisher if some significant part of the manuscript has already been published in a collection, a monograph, or in another journal; based on this information, the publisher will decide whether to publish the article. The submitted article cannot concurrently be offered for publication elsewhere.

Slandorous assertions and consciously misleading statements are considered to be unethical deeds on the part of the author and can serve as grounds for rejection of the manuscript.

In submitting the manuscript, the author guarantees that the text in question is not in violation of any other person's copyright. Authors are committed to include honest references. Any form of plagiarism is deemed unethical.

When an article has more than one author, there should be guarantee that each of them agrees with the submitted manuscript and consents to the co-authorship.

### **THE PUBLISHER**

The publisher is committed to publish the manuscripts in due time, and solely based on their academic merit.

The publisher is bound to respect the dignity of the author. The former must treat as confidential any information concerning his relations with the author in the course of the work involved in acceptance of manuscripts.

The publisher has no right to use for his own research unpublished information contained in the manuscripts without the authors' explicit consent.

The publisher is obliged to react to any unethical deed found related to the manuscript submitted for publication. In case of uncertainty with regard to ethical

problems found to arise with respect to the manuscript, the publisher must turn to the Ethics Commission of the Bulgarian Sociological Association.

### **THE REVIEWERS**

The reviewers are committed to evaluate the submitted manuscripts objectively and in accordance with academic standards. If they feel they are not competent enough to assess an article, they must refuse to do so. The assessments should be based on clear and convincing arguments.

The reviewers are committed to evaluating manuscripts only if they themselves are not in conflict of interests with the author or with some of the co-authors.

During the time they are working on the manuscripts, the reviewers treat these as confidential documents.

The reviewers have no right to use for their own research unpublished information contained in the reviewed manuscripts.