Dr Christopher Thorpe

University of Exeter

Introduction

Cultural Sociology of Cultural Representations of Italy

'A man to leave Italy and not write a book about it! Was ever such a thing heard of?'. So exclaimed the protagonist of Walter Savage Landor's epistolary novel, *High and Low Life in Italy*, published during the years 1837 - 1838[1]. Reinserted into its proper historical context, Landor's proclamation is ripe for hermeneutic reconstruction and can be read on various levels. On one level, it exclaims the importance of communicating to others the fact of one's having been to Italy; on another, it is suggestive of the transformation that time spent in Italy was held to affect in those who travelled there; and, on another level still, it suggests that the nature of the transformation affected in the traveller was significant enough to warrant book-length treatment. More broadly, the quote from Landor forms part of a much longer standing interest in and engagement with 'Italy' and 'Italian culture' on the part of the British. One that spans far back in time through to the present day. The history of English, and later British interest in, claims to know and represent Italy and the Italians is a rich, complex and ongoing one. Furthermore, how Italy has been understood and represented within English and later British culture in the past, continues to inform the structure and contents of how Italy and the Italians are understood and represented today, in the year 2022.

How are Italy and the Italians understood and represented in the present day? Now as in the past, the answer to this question is determined by differences in the socially-shaped dispositions of those doing the representing. Today, 'Italy' is made to mean different things by a wide range of social actors – individual and collective - and the audience-publics they produce representations of Italy for. For some, Italy is classical Rome and Renaissance art and architecture; Florence and Ferragamo; the jarring contradiction between *la dolce vita* on the one hand and organised crime syndicates on the other; the land where the spectres of corruption, fascism, and political populism loom ever large. For others, Italy is home to the world's most stylish and best dressed people; sunny weather and exquisite natural scenery; Campari, and the Sorrento coast; Italian football and Ferrari; a picturesque idyll and place to own a second home; the Roman Catholic Church and the Eternal City of Rome; the sinking city of Venice, and so on and so forth. And, for others still, Italy is ice-cream, pizza, and Pavarotti.

In short, Italy is some, another, and all of these things simultaneously, such that a more accurate response to the question 'how is Italy imagined in the present day?', might be to note that there is no such thing as 'Italy' – not in the singular at least. Rather, there exist multiple 'Italys', to which correspond a similarly wide range of cultural producers and publics, with each imagining the peninsula in distinctively different and patterned ways. Or so it would seem, at least. Likewise regards the people who populate the peninsula. Different visions of Italy invoke a correspondingly variegated cast of actors - 'the Italians' – who at specific times and under particular conditions, have been imbued with all manner of contradictory characteristics and traits, ranging from the 'diabolical' and 'dissembling' to the 'devoutly holy' and 'highly-cultured'.

Problematizing the ways Italy is represented does not end with noting differences in the social position of those doing the representing and the publics for whom the representations are intended. Rather, it comprises one manifestation of a similarly long-standing, socially-patterned phenomenon: namely, 'interest' in Italy and the Italians. It is neither natural nor obvious that Italy, her culture, and her people, have commanded so much attention within England and later Britain over the course of the last five-hundred years. How and why the structure of this interest, at times experienced as a burning desire to become one with and subsumed by the essence of 'Italianness', and at others a viscerally felt fear of and contempt for Italy and the Italians, has been reproduced and revised, often in only partially (un)intended ways, concerns processes that this study explores and explains.

The (re)making of interest in and claims to know and represent 'Italy' and the 'Italians' denotes a socially patterned process. One in which social-structural factors determine cultural interests and outputs. But the prioritising of social over cultural factors, risks failing to acknowledge the coercive and structuring effect symbolic representations of Italy have had on different social groups and the immediate and wider social contexts in which they are situated. This is the conception of Italy as 'culture structure'. As master signifiers, 'Italy', 'Italian culture', 'the Italians', have accreted a diverse range of intersecting meanings. Moreover, the meanings of Italy extend beyond serving as repositories of knowledge that agents reach for using the tentacles of a cold and disembodied reason. Rather, the signifiers 'Italy', 'Italian culture', 'the Italians', comprise compelling symbolic structures, shaped by and shaping powerful collective ideals, beliefs, values and emotions. The two-way process whereby symbolic representations of the 'Italian other' have informed and been used to navigate the social and cultural conditions in which actors are situated is of central concern to this study.

Aims of the study

The aims of this study are twofold primarily. The first set of aims are more general in orientation and the second are more specific. The general aims set the parameters within which the specific aims are nested. In seeking to realise the specific aims of the study, the intention is to advance the general aims to which they connect. The general aims centre on the task of developing a distinctly cultural sociological account of cultural representation. One intended to move beyond the limits of orthodox conceptions of and approaches to cultural representation within the social sciences broadly and (cultural) sociology specifically. Reformulated as questions to which this study responds, the general aims comprise the following:

- How does one culture represent (an)other?

- Why do particular representations emerge when they do, continue and / or change over time, and others are rejected and drop out of view?

- In what ways are representations of the cultural other shaped and shaped by social and cultural structures, dynamics, and processes?

Taken together, these questions comprise the broad analytical framework within which I develop an historical cultural sociological account of cultural representations of Italy and the Italians within English and British culture from the fifteenth century to the present day. Why cultural representations of Italy in England first and then Britain? The rationale for using the 'Italian case' is grounded in three main reasons. First, and as I have alluded to already , claims to know and represent Italy and the Italians within English and British culture have a long and unbroken history. As such, the Italian case provides a rich symbolic terrain for getting to grips with and exploring the analytical issues and questions captured by the general aims of the study. Second, the structure of Italy's symbolic representation within England and Britain is, and always has been, conflicted and contradictory: Italy has, and continues to be, represented both positively and negatively within British culture. Third, and because of this, the history of representations of Italy in England and Britain comprises something of an 'ideal-typical' case for exploring the processes by which actors – individual and collective – struggle to make, remake, and revise, claims to know and represent Italy and the Italians, while rejecting others.

This study uses the historical case of representations of Italy and the Italians within English and British culture to recast cultural representation as a cultural sociological object *par excellence*. A contested term among its proponents and practitioners, a pertinent definition of cultural sociology as it relates to this study is supplied by Inglis (2016: 1) who defines it as 'a set of mechanisms for rejuvenating existing fields of study, creating new problems, research questions and methods of analysis'. The emphasis on 'rejuvenating' and 'creating new problems' within 'existing fields of study', is an integral part of what this study seeks to achieve. Both as it relates to orthodox modes of thinking and theorising cultural representation within (cultural) sociology more generally, and the work of humanities scholars working in and around the Anglo-Italian interface specifically. On this framing, this study seeks to respond to the following more specific questions:

- How have Italy and the Italians been represented in England and later Britain, from the fifteenth century onwards?

- How and in what ways do representations of Italy and the Italians in the past inform and interact with the ways Italy and the Italians are represented and understood in the present day?

- How have representations of Italy and the Italians in England and later Britain shaped and been shaped by a wide range of social and cultural factors, processes, and dynamics?

To respond to these questions, I draw on resources from two 'opposing' sociological approaches to cultural analysis: Yale School Cultural Sociology (henceforth, referred to as YSCS) and Field theory. In doing so, the aim is to demonstrate how and in what ways representations of the Italian cultural other have been made possible and constrained by a range of social *and* cultural dynamics, structures, and processes. I shall address the differences in analytical orientation between these two approaches in a moment. For now, a further point to make concerns the broadly 'genealogical' approach used to frame the study. Most notably developed in and through the work of Nietzsche and Foucault, the genealogical method is one intended to 'destabilize' and 'disrupt'. As applied to this study, the intention is to destabilize, disrupt and problematize the coercive effects of two things in particular: on the one hand,

orthodox social-scientific conceptions of and approaches to cultural representation; and the 'taken-for-granted' structures of meanings and representations of Italy to have grown up and become established within English and later British culture.

A further way in which this study engages in genealogy involves reconstructing the history of cultural representations of Italy and the Italians through the refracting prism of the past. I do this by drawing on data generated from an in-depth reading of a wide range of scholarly texts e.g. monographs, edited collections, journal articles, etc. and non-scholarly texts e.g. novels, lifestyle magazines, television programs and filmic texts, etc. In each chapter, I identify and analyse continuity and change in the ways Italy was represented; the mechanisms by which this occurs; and the significance representations carried forward from the 'past' have had for shaping the 'present' in ways, that with the benefit of hindsight, we know now fed forward into and shaped the 'future'. The result is a cultural sociological analysis of the historical origins, development, and peculiarities of, the particular configuration of cultural representations which organise and determine how Italy and the Italians are understood and represented within Britain in the present day.

Who this book is for

This book is written for two main audiences: (cultural) sociologists and humanities scholars working in and around the Anglo-Italian interface. A central premise on which this study rests is that each can learn something from the other. This is so in two main ways, both of which relate back to and are intended to advance both the general and specific aims of this study. Cultural sociologists can learn from particular humanities-based conceptions of and approaches to cultural representation; and scholars within the humanities can learn from the ways cultural sociologists seek to (re)situate cultural representation in relation to a range of wider social and cultural developments, dynamics and processes.

In bringing these two audiences into dialogue this study conforms to a further way of conceptualising the broader intellectual remit of 'cultural sociology': namely, as a 'location where social scientific foci and methods particularly meet and meld with ideas from the humanities' (Inglis, 2016: 1). This study affirms and advances the conception of cultural sociology as a location for generating inter-disciplinary forms of dialogue and exchange between (cultural) sociologists and humanities scholars. Acknowledging this is important. It

sets the context in which scholars from both camps can learn from and supply the strengths and deficiencies of one another's work on cultural representation more generally and representations of Italy in England and Britain specifically.

The study of cultural representations of Italy is presided over, because it is constituted in and through the work of, the work of humanities scholars. Studies focusing on the reception, appropriation, and influence of Italian cultural forms in England and Britain, encompass various specific bodies of literature from a range of humanities disciplines and sub disciplines. These include but are not limited to: (comparative) English literature; social and cultural history; intellectual history; art history; travel writing and literature; religious history and studies; Italian and Anglo-Italian studies. Indeed, one of the things this study does, albeit more inadvertently so than explicitly, is draw to attention the processes by which cultural representations of Italy and the Italians within the literary arts in particular, coupled with the scholarly analysis of literary representations of Italy and Italian subject matter, have been marked off and sequestered by a range of humanities disciplines and sub-disciplines. In the following section, I identify and discuss strengths and weaknesses in the literature on cultural representations of Italy to date. I do this with the aim of demonstrating how and in what ways the cultural sociological model of cultural representation I am developing here can both learn from, as well as help supply the deficiencies of, existing research on cultural representation generally and representations of Italy and the Italians specifically.

What cultural sociologists can learn about cultural representations

This study is rooted in the view that (cultural) sociology stands much to gain from the approach to cultural representation characteristic of particular strands of humanities-based (sub) disciplines. Particularly as these relate to the conception of cultural representation as more than just a terrain on which to observe negative forms of discursive power and practices. In this direction, the drawing of a simple distinction between representations which depict the cultural other in a more or less positive and or negative light, is one used by humanities scholars working in the area of cultural representations of Italy. The pre-critical assumption on which the unproblematic use of this distinction rests is the view that cultural representations of the Italian cultural other cannot be explained or explained away by the notion that all and any act of cultural representation is reducible to negative forms of othering and symbolic violence, (un)intended or otherwise. Rather, in the existing literature on cultural representations of Italy

to date, both 'Italy' and the 'Italians' are understood as having been represented both positively and negatively at different times, in different contexts, by individuals from a range of groups. In and of itself the drawing of this distinction could hardly be considered radical. But it is one which has no corollary within the social scientific literature on cultural representation, such a distinction being rendered largely redundant, in an intellectual context that regards cultural representation as an expression of negative forms of power.

The drawing of the distinction between positive and negative representations and the assumptions on which it rests forms a central plank on which this study rests. As we shall see, the distinction between positive and negative representations is an important one for understanding how representations of Italy and the Italians have been shaped by and shaped a wide range of social and cultural processes, including but not limited to, those centring on collective identity formation, cultural transformation and reparation, social reproduction and stratification, and so on. Relatedly, cultural representations which cast the (Italian) cultural other in a distinctly positive light, comprise the meaningful backdrop against which actors, individual and collective, have sought out, sought to affirm, and sought affirmation from, the (Italian) cultural other. Often despite, and at times in spite of, the predominance of negative representations of the (Italian) cultural other. On this view, cultural representation is a terrain on which to observe simultaneously, processes of cultural affirmation *and* cultural denigration, and the characteristically complex and co-constituting, intended and unintended, ways in which these processes occur.

A concern to track the processes by which the (Italian) cultural other and elements of other cultures, are both positively and negatively understood and represented, is something that (cultural) sociologists can learn from. More broadly, the indebtedness of this study to the work of scholars in a wide range of humanities (sub) disciplines, in particular cultural historians, is extensive. As Murkeji (2016: 215) rightly notes, 'the debt never properly acknowledged is to the work of cultural historians whose accounts of past ways of life seem close to good ethnographic sociology'. But this is only one side of the story. A rejuvenated account of cultural representation involves melding insights from the approach of humanities-based approaches to cultural representation as much as it requires cultural sociology to bring its own particular strengths to the analysis. I now turn to examine the limits of the work on cultural representations of Italy to date and how this study contributes towards overcoming them.

Limits of the existing research

As viewed through a cultural sociological lens, clear limitations exist in the literature on cultural representations of Italy and the Italians. These patterned and patterning limitations, and the forms of disciplinary 'gaze' in which they are rooted, can be categorised and compressed in the following ways:

- *Temporal.* To date, there exists no analysis of cultural representations of Italy and the Italians which spans the timeframe adopted by this study. Rather, studies focussing on the reception, influence, and representations of Italy, Italian culture, etc. operate within a range of historically specific and delimited timeframes (Chaney, 1985, 1988; Brand, 1957; Black, 1992, 2003; Norwich, 2003; Holland, 2018). One outcome of the increasingly specialised division of intellectual labour is the tendency for historically-oriented scholars to 'define themselves by the particular time and place they study, and organize their careers around that temporal and geographic specialization' (Lachmann, 2013: 7). Burke (2003: 59) echoes this view, noting that 'past-facing' scholars 'view the whole past through the particular period in which they have specialised' (Burke, 2003: 59). The result is a situation in which the kinds of longue durée-inspired study undertaken here, the focus for which involves tracing out and tracking much long(er) term trends, processes, and patterns, comprise exceptions to an increasingly steadfast rule. Thus, while the tendency within sociology is to retreat into the present (Inglis, 2013), humanities-based scholars working at the Anglo-Italian interface appear content to remain in the past, such that the likelihood that scholars from either camp converge and collaborate grows ever less likely.

- *Empirical*. While studies of the reception, influence, and representations of Italian 'cultural' forms span a wide range of empirical objects and terrains, they do so in characteristically very narrow, and highly focussed ways. There exist a broad range of empirically rich, in-depth studies of the influence, reception, and representation of, Italian cultural forms within particular fields, including but not limited to: poetry (Sells, 1955; Reiman and Powers, 1977; Vassallo, 1984; Cesare, 1991; Schoina, 2009); literature (Marshall, 1934; Churchill, 1980; Barnes, 2014); architecture (Farber and Reed, 1981; Harris, 1994); political models and theory (Ward, 1964; Turner, 1986). While empirically rich, the narrowness in focus on cultural forms, within specific

'fields', pertaining to delimited periods, hinders the task of seeing and making connections between seemingly disparate but connected spheres of cultural influence and the forms of interest and representations of Italy corresponding to them.

- *Analytical*. The use of 'internalist' and 'externalist' forms of explanatory reasoning is a pervasive feature of the literature on cultural representations of Italy (Camic, 2013: 185). Internalist reasoning involves explaining the appeal, or not, of Italy and/ or Italian cultural forms with reference to some *internal* attribute(s) of the phenomenon in question. Externalist reasoning involves forms of explanation rooted in *external* factors. Internalist reasoning is used to explain the view of Italian courtiers as self-evidently the most 'civilized' in Europe (Einstein, 1902); the rising appeal of Italy throughout the eighteenth century as inherently scenically beautiful and picturesque (Manwaring, 1965); the Italians as 'naturally' sartorially more sophisticated than the British (Richards, 1995; Jones, 2003; Tankard, 2003). Externalist reasoning is used to explain changes to the meanings and representation of Italy, as the result of the commencement and/or cessation of religious wars (Einstein, 1902; Churchill, 1980); the rise of 'romanticism' (Brand, 1957); the influx of Italian exiles to England (Sponza, 1988). In both cases, the result are forms of explanation which are limited because they are analytically one-sided and reductive.

- *Theoretical*. The absence of, or a piecemeal and unsystematic approach to theory, is a characteristic feature of the literature. Whereupon the purpose of the analysis is to reconstruct how 'Italy' and or the Italians were 'understood' within a particular field and historical period, the use of theory either to frame and explore the significance of the 'data', is either absent or secondary to the analysis (Brand, 1957; Hertel and Pfister, 2008; Schaff, 2010; Yarrington *et al*, 2013; Holland, 2018).

Gaining ground with cultural sociology

This study puts to work cultural sociological modes of analysis and methods in the spirit of *rejuvenating* the existing research on cultural representations of Italy and the Italians. Drawing on a wide range of scholarly works, it brings these into a single analytical space with the aim of subjecting them to a form of *synthesizing* operation. One intended to bring into view and

track the operation and interplay of a range of short(er), medium, and long(er)-term social and cultural processes and dynamics, many of which otherwise remain imperceptible when viewed from the limited and limiting perspective of a temporal or empirical particularity. The issue here is one of perspective. Like the individual spots of colour in a pointillist painting, the perception of which change when viewed from afar, re-viewing the data and 'fields' in which they are situated from a longue-durée historical perspective, serves to generate both partially and wholly new, problematics, and questions, at the same time as (partially) problematizing (wholly) established responses to them. It does this in the following ways:

- *Temporal*. The study identifies blind spots and gaps in the existing literature on cultural representations of Italy. In generating the data for this study, it quickly became apparent that research on the subject has grown up and become concentrated around particular time periods, objects, themes, and events. One advantage of long(er) term historical studies such as this, is that they enable for particular periods, objects, and themes, to be (re)viewed from the perspective of the whole. Viewed in this way, from the point of view of the whole, those parts of the wider historical story which are only partially developed, or, in some cases, altogether absent, are brought into view. Of the gaps identified in the literature, the almost total absence of scholarly analysis of representations of Italy from the second half of the twentieth century onwards is the most obvious, which I reflect on in greater depth in chapter seven[2].

- *Analytical*. By reconstructing and placing 'alongside' one another, different periods in the (hi)story of Italy's representation, similarities, and differences in and between periods are highlighted and reconstituted anew as analytical problems in and of their own right. Much of the literature on Italy's influence and representation is subject to periodization, and is divided up and out into different periods e.g., Elizabethan, Romantic, Victorian, etc. One (unintended) consequence of periodization is that it compounds a particular view of history as comprising a series of relatively self-contained and autonomous periods, of which each is characterised by its own internal logics and dynamics. I am thinking here of Foucault's archaeological method in particular, and the discontinuous and disjunctured vision of history it works to create. While broadly adhering to the periodization built into the existing literature, this study critically reconsiders the relationship between periods, reviewing them as key sites for

observing continuity and change in ways that problematize important aspects of the distinctions on which they rest.

- *Methodological*. Re-narrating the (hi)story of representations of the Italy and the Italians within England and Britain is a generative move in and of itself. In adopting a genealogical approach to the data, the past is used to destabilize and problematize the taken for granted and apparently self-evident structure of interest in and representations of Italy and the Italians from the second half of the twentieth century onwards through to the present day.

- *Theoretical*. Reframing the data using cultural sociological concepts enables for new analytical problems to be formulated and for existing solutions to established problematics to be (re)problematized. Regards the latter, this is particularly the case as it relates to prevailing explanations of the shift in attitude towards the oppression of the Italian people by occupying French and Austrian forces during the nineteenth century, a subject addressed in chapter five. Regards the former, the issue of why Italy and the Italians have not been represented as negatively as we might expect them to have been following on from the two World Wars is a question that to date has never been posed and as such no attempt has been made to address.

Reconsidering cultural representation

To date, there exists no (cultural) sociological account of cultural representations of Italy and the Italians in Britain. Given the long-standing interest in and influence Italian culture has had on English and British culture, why, to refer back to the opening line from Landor, has such a book never been written? A pertinent question indeed, and one that cuts to the very core of the intellectual concerns driving this study. Why do we need such an entity? I can think of many intellectually valid reasons as to why cultural representation should be a domain of enquiry (cultural) sociologists direct their attention towards. To give just one example, it strikes me that in an increasingly global predicament, understanding the sociological processes by which cultural others and other cultures are presented to and represented by a range of social actors, is an increasingly pressing one. But perhaps rather than framing the question as one of 'why?', a more instructive move is to pose the question as one of the form: why not?

Why has cultural representation *not* been of greater concern to (cultural) sociologists to date? In responding to this question, a response that could be enlarged to include a far broader ranging discussion than it is appropriate to do so here, we might begin by noting that it is not that cultural representation has been wholly neglected by (cultural) sociology to date, so much as the tendency has been and remains for (cultural) sociologists to outsource cultural representation to other disciplines. To date, (cultural) sociology has been content to align itself with, rather than to think critically about, the consequences of doing so. As I suggest in the following section, this has meant operating with an overly restrictive and restricting conception of cultural representation. It is worth to take a moment to reflect on how and why this situation has come to pass.

The Saidian paradigm

A key text for the development of scholarly conceptions of and approaches to cultural representation is Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978). Arguably, *the* classic study in cultural representation, *Orientalism* signified a defining moment in the constitution of cultural representation as 'scholarly object' not just within the humanities, but within anthropology and sociology too[3]. Bringing into conversation Foucault's (post-)structuralism with Gramsci's theory of hegemony, Said deployed a composite conceptual framework and methods with which to identify and deconstruct the discursive regime of Western European and North American representations of the 'Orient' and the forms of violence, actual and symbolic, implicated in and justified through their realization.

Some forty years on, and in ways that Said could never have fully anticipated at the time, the conception of cultural representation to have grown up in the wake of *Orientalism* has ossified into what Joffe (2007: 78) refers to as a 'stifling orthodoxy thanks to having permeated countless fields'. An orthodoxy further characterised by what Lewis (2007: 777) defines as an 'all -engrossing emphasis on domination, submission...and the evils of discourses, regimes, hegemonies, global capitalism, neoliberalism, and other phenomena of the human world'. Understood in this way, scholarly conceptions of and approaches to cultural representation typically involve the analyst tracking down, bringing into view, and deconstructing the discursive forms and forms of relations through which one culture is constructed and subject(-ed) to forms of negative power, oppression and domination, by an-other.

First published in 1978, Said's *Orientalism* takes the particular case of Occidental representations of the Orient and uses it as a basis on which to launch a series of universalising claims. Since, then, the critical conception of cultural representation developed by Said has become what Crane (2010: 170) refers to as a 'free-floating paradigm'. Elsewhere, I have referred to this 'paradigmatic' approach to thinking and theorising cultural representation as the 'Saidian paradigm' (Thorpe, 2019). A central contention of this study is that the Saidian paradigm *is* the dominant intellectual framework organising how cultural representation is conceived and understood within various humanities disciplines and sub-disciplines (Roddan, 2016), anthropology (Lewis, 2007; 2008), cultural studies (Hall, 1997; 2013), and, albeit largely indirectly, within sociology and the social sciences more broadly (Steinmetz, 2007; Guhin, and Wyrtzen, 2013; Go, 2012, 2016).

As it relates to thinking and theorising cultural representation within these (sub) disciplines, the Saidian paradigm has achieved hegemonic status. In the 'caricatured version' of *Orientalism* embedded in the practical consciousness of many scholars (Iskander and Rustom 2010), representations of the cultural other operate as discursive formations which map squarely onto and work to reproduce the binary logic of dominator/ dominated (Thorpe, 2019). On the relatively few occasions whereby the Saidian paradigm has been extended to the analysis of cultural representations of and among European cultural others, the emphasis has been on demonstrating representations of the cultural other as a privileged site for observing the negative effects of discursive forms of power masquerading as the 'truth' about the Other (Khare, 1990; Cassano, 2012; Chovanek and Molek-Kozakowska, 2017; De Donno, 2019).

Rooted in a nexus of tightly tied claims and assumptions, the Saidian paradigm has become the orthodox*ic* mode of thinking and analysing cultural representation. Notwithstanding the analytical and worldly gains yielded by the Saidian Paradigm, this study is premised on the view that the hegemony of the Saidian Paradigm, rather than the Saidian paradigm *per se*, has served to hobble social scientific understandings of cultural representation. The result is a conception of and approach to cultural representation that is analytically reductive, normatively over-determined and empirically limiting. In order to destabilise and move beyond the coercive effects of the Saidian paradigm, it is necessary to excavate and elevate to a discursive level, various claims embedded within it, together with the assumptions on which they rest. Of these, the following are key:

Analytically limiting. Following the Kantian bifurcation of reality, the notion that we are condemned not to know reality in itself, but only a second-hand version of it - as 'mere' representation - has comprised a lynchpin notion in the development of 'critical theory'[4] more broadly, and the 'sociology of culture' specifically. Embedded within these intellectual traditions is the conception of culture as an ideological veil. In this limited and limiting conception of culture, one reaffirmed in *Orientalism* through the work of Marx, Foucault and Gramsci, the notion of 'culture as representation' is folded into and made synonymous with the notion of 'culture as misrepresentation' (Ahmad, 1992).

This highly partial and analytically limited coupling of culture and representation is significant for this study in various ways. Firstly, because culture is more than just discourse (Steinmetz, 2007). Secondly, claims to know and represent the truth about Italy, (in)form the basis for struggles in and between groups to represent the Italian other both *negatively* and *positively*. And thirdly, because attempts to positively champion the (Italian) cultural other, comprise the basis on which actors struggle to distinguish their own cultural dispositions and tastes while classifying negatively those of wider social groups, those struggles occurring at the intra-, as opposed to inter-cultural, level. The move of reviewing cultural representation as concerning processes that occur at an inter-, as opposed to intra- cultural level, is an important one, allowing us to cast light on the ways actors actively seek to make sense of, identify, and define themselves, in relation to: adjacently positioned groups; the social contexts in which they are situated; and the society to which they belong but seek to differentiate and distance themselves from.

Normatively overdetermined. The emphasis on discourse as necessarily negatively constraining detracts from instances in which the cultural other and other cultures are represented in some or another way as 'superior' to those being represented. In the archetypal case-study that is Said's *Orientalism,* the 'enemy' is Western colonial discourse and its enactment through discursive regimes brought to life and sustained through actors, institutions and cultural texts. But what happens when the members of one culture look to and actively seek out the (Italian) cultural other as a source of spiritual, existential, cultural or social salvation? When those doing the representing actively position themselves and the culture to which they belong, as in some way 'lacking' and / or 'inferior to', the (Italian) cultural other subject to representation? As we shall see, Italy, Italian culture, and the Italians, have been made to signify all manner of different meanings and ideals towards which actors have sought to orientate themselves and

identify with, typically in the name of self-, collective, and national, realisation, edification, and salvation.

Empirically limiting. The Saidian paradigm exerts its constraining effects by limiting the range of cultural others and other cultures deemed (il-)legitimate for social-scientific analysis. That Said's *Orientalism* opens with a line taken from the work of Karl Marx is highly instructive in this direction: 'they cannot represent themselves; they must be represented'[5]. Only cultures and cultural others deemed sufficiently oppressed or disempowered comprise legitimate objects for analysis. As such, interest in the representation of and between Western European cultural others, of which Italy comprises but one example, have been almost entirely neglected on the grounds that the cultural others in question are understood to be 'big enough and ugly enough', to represent themselves. Testimony to this general rule, is provided by the only very small number of studies which take representations of Western European others as their focus (Khare, 1990; Cassano, 2012; Chovanek and Molek-Kozakowska, 2017).

Cultural sociology of cultural representations of Italy and the Italians

While acknowledging the strengths of the Saidian paradigm, this study seeks to destabilise and disrupt its hegemonic status as the dominant(ing) mode of thinking cultural representation. To do this, I use resources taken from 'cultural sociology'. As intellectual (sub-)field, cultural sociology is characterised by a diverse range of analytical perspectives, conceptual vocabularies, and corresponding methodological tools and techniques (Inglis, 2013; Spillman, 2020; Jaworsky *et al*, 2022). The term, 'field of cultural sociology', is significant in another way too, capturing the influence of two major thinkers in particular, and the intellectual 'schools' that have grown up around their respective bodies of work. The term 'field' is a cornerstone concept in the work of Pierre Bourdieu, whereas the term 'cultural sociology' was coined by Jeffrey Alexander together with his associates (Alexander, 2003).

Over the course of the last thirty years or so, the respective accounts and analysis of cultural phenomena, characteristic of Bourdieu and Alexanders' work, has formed the basis for the reclassification of sociological treatments of culture more broadly, into what are typically represented to be two opposing 'traditions' or 'schools' (Santoro and Solaroli, 2015)[6]. The particular conception of and orientation towards cultural analysis contained within Bourdieu's Field Theory represents one of a range of traditions referred to, particularly by proponents of YSCS, as the 'sociology of culture'. By contrast, the conception of and orientation to 'culture' characteristic of the work of Alexander and his associates is referred to as 'cultural sociology',

or more specifically, Yale School Cultural Sociology (Inglis, 2016; Smith, 2021). Fundamentally, the dividing line between 'sociology of culture' and 'cultural sociology', of which Field Theory and YSCS can be considered exemplars, centres on differences in the analytical weighting and autonomy attributed to 'culture' and cultural phenomena within the respective 'schools', or 'programs' (Kane, 1991; Olick, 2018).

Proponents of YSCS are critical of the analytical weighting and conception of culture characteristic of the research traditions labelled 'sociology of culture', which they designate as 'weak programs' (Alexander, 2003). That they are considered 'weak' is attributable to the perceived failure of these programs to acknowledge and allocate analytical autonomy to 'culture' broadly, and 'meaning' specifically. From a weak program perspective, culture - broadly conceived as patterned structures of ideas, values and beliefs - is reducible to and ultimately determined by 'harder' social and material factors. By contrast, proponents of the YSCS reject the reductive account of culture characteristic of so-called 'weak programs', of which Bourdieu's Field Theory, from a YSCS perspective at least, is understood as being the best of an analytically flawed and reductive bunch. Proponents of YSCS instead argue for and allocate analytical autonomy to the symbolic meanings of cultural forms and phenomena. On this view, meaning is neither (necessarily) 'passive', dependent on, nor determined by, harder 'social structural' and 'material factors', but instead produces determinate causal outputs, which feed forward and/or back into the social and material dimensions of group life in a range of more or less conservative and / or transformative ways (Alexander, 2003).

This study draws on, adapts, and puts to work analytical frames, theoretical concepts, and methods taken from the sociology of culture and cultural sociology respectively. Of the former, it draws on Bourdieu's work on Field Theory and the work of scholars who have sought to develop field theory in and across a range of empirical terrains; of the latter, it draws on the work of Jeffrey Alexander and his associates who have sought to develop YSCS in and across a range of empirical terrains. How and in what ways these programs are as opposing as they are typically represented to be, coupled with the issue of how and in what ways they might be gainfully combined, are issues I reflect on and consider in the concluding chapter. These issues, however, are *not* the primary aim of this study. Neither is it the case that I seek to explicitly integrate the two throughout the study. Rather, this study brings YSCS and Field theory into the same sphere of analytical orbit with the aim of developing a longue durée-inspired cultural sociological account of representations of Italy and the Italians in England and Britain. Insofar

as I seek to do this, I use methods and modes of analysis from YSCS and Field theory to go beyond the conception of cultural representation embedded within the Saidian Paradigm in the following ways:

Positive and negative representations. The distinction between 'positive' and 'negative' representations is central to the analysis undertaken in this study. How and in what ways Italy, Italian culture, and the Italian people, have been represented positively, negatively, and in some cases, ambivalently, varies historically. But that at all times there have existed both positive and negative representations of Italy and the Italians, is indisputable because it is empirically demonstrable. As such, this study casts light on the ways positive and negative representations connect up to and interact with one another in complex and co-determining ways.

Making good the Italian other: The move of dividing up and out positive from negative representations is important in another way. Particularly as it relates to a powerful but chimerical idea embedded within the Saidian paradigm: namely, that if it were possible to extricate representations of the (Italian) cultural other from the relations of power from which they emerge, then the image of an-other culture would be purged of the negative effects they otherwise acquire and are distorted by. Not so, however. Regardless of whether the other is represented positively and or negatively, power is at play. Negative representations of the cultural other require to be made bad, no less than positive representations require to be made good. As this study demonstrates, actors possessed of varying amounts and types of 'power', have sought to represent the other positively at the same time as others have sought to represent the other negatively. Indeed, another way in which this study might have been framed would have involved trying to explain why at any given point in time, particular actors have sought to represent Italy positively, despite, or in spite of, the attempts of others to represent Italy negatively.

The other as a force for social good: The case of representations of Italy in England and Britain, brings into sharp relief a further scenario that the Saidian paradigm is inadequately equipped to conceive and as such typically works to supress. Namely, a situation where those representing the other, actively position themselves in a relationship of subordination, or inferiority, to the other subject to representation. This is the (Italian) cultural other as both positive ideal and object of collective expressions of veneration, admiration, emulation, edification, salvation, and so on and so forth. Despite Britain's economic, political, cultural, and imperial dominance throughout much of the period covered by this study, Italy and the

Italians have been positively idealised. Similarly in the present day, notwithstanding the many social and political problems that plague the Italian peninsula, an overwhelmingly positive and idealised vision of Italy and the Italians persists within mainstream British culture (chapter seven).

A further part of what is so instructive about the case of cultural representations of Italy in England and Britain, concerns the collective representation of the (Italian) cultural other as a force for social and cultural 'good' – as a structure of meaning generating visions of the 'good society' and 'good life'. As meaning structures, ideals, and the idealisation of, Italy and the Italians, have long served as compelling points of reference, both inciting and cited in the name of instigating and justifying social, political, and cultural change. Symbolic representations of Italy have been central to both struggles to preserve, and struggles to change existing social, political and cultural conditions, rather than being determined by them. Furthermore, and as we shall see throughout this study, claims to know and represent the 'truth' about Italy and the Italians, have been central to processes of individual and collective self-understanding and realisation; reflection and reparation; edification and expansion; assertion and affirmation; and so on. A focus on these forms of self-directed activity, operating at the individual, collective, and societal levels, comprise key processes that this study excavates and explores.

Extending the range of cultural others: The study contributes towards enlarging the range of cultural others and representations thereof, deemed legitimate objects for (cultural) sociological analysis. This is an important task for breaking out of the limiting effects of the Saidian paradigm, implicit within which is the concern to understand the negative effects of the 'cultural self' for the 'cultural other'. But the need to understand exactly how and in what ways the cultural self has been made possible, let alone made good by the (Italian) cultural other, is surely just as an important one. Presumably Britain's decision to leave the European Union in 2016, will continue to have all manner of negative cultural consequences. Switching from a European to global frame of reference, the need for (cultural) sociological forms of analysis capable of elucidating the processes by which the cultural self-constitution and identities of a range of intra-, inter-, and supra-, national actors, and the relations between them, are enabled and constrained by the structures of meanings in which they are positioned, seems evermore pressing.

Analytical and theoretical division of labour

This study combines modes of analysis and methods from YSCS and Field Theory. What it does *not* do is seek to integrate the two – not explicitly at least. Rather, the approach I adopt here deploys a particular analytical and theoretical division of labour rooted in broadly three organising principles. These comprise: the analytical limits of Field theory for theorising social conditions and cultural production prior to 'modernity'; the analytical merits of the concept of 'cultural trauma' for theorising periods of social and culture change; and the nature of the data themselves – particularly as they pertain to the 'classing' of Italy from the late eighteenth century onwards, and, in more recent times, the commodification of culture and the marketisation of representations of Italy specifically. It goes without saying that the data do not speak for themselves; rather they are spoken by the analyst who is actively and necessarily implicated in narrating the (hi)story told by the data in particular ways and not others.

Inasmuch as this study brings together two different sociological approaches to cultural analysis, it does so with a view to harnessing the respective strengths of each in the name of a single unifying goal. Namely, to carve out an intellectual space in which to think critically with, and think critically against, orthodox social scientific understandings of and approaches to cultural representation. As part of a response addressed to his critics, Said (2003 [1978]: 340) noted that '*Orientalism* is a partisan book, not a theoretical machine'. I say: this book is theoretically explorative *not* partisan. The aim is not to pit against or promote either YSCS or Field theory and the analytical traditions on which they draw and elaborate. The aim is instead to explore how and in what ways the two can be used, independently and alongside one another, as conceptual vocabularies with which to loosen the grip of the Saidian Paradigm at the same time as providing the resources with which to rethink cultural representation along historical cultural sociological lines.

What we gain and what we lose by putting to work YSCS and Field theory in the particular ways I have elected to do throughout this study, is a matter I reflect upon in the concluding chapter. Implicit in this, however, is the recognition that the (hi)story of Italy's representation could have and, in the future no doubt will be, told differently from the way it is here. I could, for example, have reconstructed the whole (hi)story using YSCS concepts and methods. That I elected not to, is largely because I wanted to bring together into the same analytical sphere, or space, two (putatively) opposing sociological approaches to the analysis of culture with the aim of demonstrating their respective strengths and weaknesses for theorising cultural representation.

YSCS and Field theory are characterised by differences in analytical orientation and emphases and as such are attuned towards different aspects of the social and cultural dimensions of human life. Broadly speaking, YSCS allocates analytical primacy to cultural factors for explaining social forms and phenomena, whereas Field theory allocates primacy to social factors for explaining cultural forms and phenomena. Either way, the task confronting us here remains the same - to use YSCS and Field theory to critically reconsider how and in what ways cultural representations of the Italian cultural other have informed and been informed by a range of core (cultural) sociological dynamics, problematics, and processes. As I use YSCS to get to grips with these, I do so by considering how and in what ways cultural representations of Italy have…

- …been used to repair tears to the social fabric incurred by *cultural trauma*

- …been used to alter and been altered by processes of individual, collective, and national, *identity formation*

- …been used to mark out and been marked by *symbolic boundaries* in and between actors

- …shaped and been shaped by changes to a range of *culture structures*

- …been affected by and affected processes of symbolic *purification* and *pollution*

- …been made and remade by *ritual-like practices*

- …formed and informed processes of *iconicity*

- …shaped and been shaped by the increasing *social structural differentiation* of society and the emergence of the *civil sphere*

As I use Field theory to get to grips with a range of core (cultural) sociological dynamics, problematics, and processes, I do so by considering how and in what ways…

21

- …interest in, knowledge of, and claims to represent, Italy have become *classed* and formed part of the *class-based habitus* dispositions of particular groups and fractions of groups

- …interest in, and claims to know the 'truth' about, Italy and Italian culture inform the *cultural taste dispositions* of socially dominant groups

- …interest in, and knowledge of, Italy have been *mobilised* and advanced the *social mobility* of individuals and groups

- How ways of seeing and representing Italy characteristic of particular class-based groups have been *(mis-)recognised* as *legitimate* and *legitimating*

- …collective classifications of Italy have been structured by and informed the *structural differentiation* of and between *fields*

- …collective classifications of Italy and the Italians have shaped and been shaped by *classification struggles* within fields

- …collective classifications of Italy have shaped and been shaped by the *commodification* and *marketisation* of *cultural production*

Structure of the study and chapters

Chapter one identifies and explicates the analytical, theoretical, and methodological terms and parameters of the study. It begins by identifying various key analytical terms, before turning to explicate how YSCS and Field theory have been used and adapted to theorise cultural representation. This is done by identifying how conceptual resources taken from YSCS and Field Theory respectively, organise and drive the analysis undertaken in each chapter. The final section of the chapter discusses the conceptual approach used to theorise mechanisms of continuity and change. The chapter draws to a close with a description of the data and the lack of data pertaining to developments dealt with in chapter seven.

Chapter two spans the period 1450 to the 1630s, a period during which the meanings of Italy began to diversify in new and significant ways, both at the time and in terms of the centuries which followed. It begins with an account of the institutionalisation and influence of humanism in England, and the symbolic significance this had for the reframing of Italy as the seat of classical civilization and learning, and positive representations of a diversifying range of aspects of Italian civilization more broadly. The concept of 'cultural trauma' is used to frame England's break with the Roman Catholic Church and the significance of this for the reconstitution of Catholic Italy as sacred evil. The second part of the chapter examines the development of anti-Catholicism, charting its development in and through texts issued by a lowly differentiated cast of symbol producers made up of religious figures, dramatists and playwrights, travellers, and diplomats. As part of this discussion, the re-drawing of symbolic boundaries between Italy-past and Italy-present is emphasised. The chapter concludes by highlighting the ongoing significance of representations from this period for the symbolic interpretation of Italy and the Italians in the ensuing centuries.

Chapter three centres on the period from the regicide of Charles I in 1649 through to approximately 1760. The first half of the chapter uses the concept of 'cultural trauma' to reframe the events of the English regicide and civil wars. The focus then turns to the selective use of imperial Roman symbolism for the re-presentation of Britain and the British empire as the greatest civilization and imperial power alike that the world has ever known. The second half of the chapter uses the concept of 'ritual-like' to reconsider the significance of the Tour of Italy. As part of this discussion, the concept of 'iconicity' is used to discuss the exalted status of Renaissance art, artefacts, and architecture, among the British upper-class, together with the establishment of classicism within the visual and plastic arts and architecture. The final part of the chapter reflects on the re-signification of Catholic France as sacred evil, and the influence of this for representations of Italy and the Italians-present throughout the eighteenth century more broadly.

Chapter four focuses on the period between 1760 and 1830. Field theory is used to explicate the emergence of the gothic and romantic visions of Italy. These are explained as being rooted in and refracting two distinct but overlapping processes: the division between middle-class gothic authors and aristocratic and upper-middle class romantic poets; and the dividing up and out of the restricted and commercial literary fields, fields in which writers and poets drawn from these diverging class-based groups and fractions therein, were positioned. The chapter begins by delineating: the rising social structural salience of the English middle class; the

nature of the relations between the middle and upper class; and the founding of the commercial field of literary production along the lines of subscription production. The discussion then turns to address the representation and aestheticization of Nature and natural phenomena within philosophical and aesthetic discourse. These developments set the scene for reconstructing the most salient attributes of the gothic vision of Italy and the Italians, the structure of the novelistic field from which it emerged, and the position-takings of the writers who dominated it.

The second part of the chapter focusses on the rise of the romantic vision of Italy, one framed as both a reaction to and partially rooted in: the rise of the gothic vision of Italy; the dominance of classicism within the literary and visual arts; and wider changes to English society of which 'industrialism' and the 'professionalisation' of the literary arts were key. The focus then turns to discuss the romantic reclassification of 'Art', and the social category of the 'Artist', developments which are considered in relation to: the formation of the restricted literary field; the boundaries erected around it; and the dominant poetic influences circulating within it. The final section of the chapter depicts the defining features of the romantic vision of Italy, which it does using excerpts taken from the poetic works of its foremost proponents, Lord Byron and Percy Shelley. The chapter concludes by reflecting on the significance of the romantic and gothic visions of Italy for the 'classing' and 'fielding' of literary representations of Italy, both during the timeframe covered by the chapter and subsequently too.

The temporal focus for chapters five and six converges on the decades spanning the 1830s through to the first decade of the twentieth century. Chapter five deploys YSCS concepts to frame the analysis; chapter six uses Field theory.

Chapter five begins by depicting in broad brush strokes various key social, economic, cultural, and political changes and transformations to British society, changes referred to by commentators at the time as 'industrialism'. The chapter then uses the concept of 'cultural trauma' to examine differences in the symbolic narration of 'industrialism' and the significance of these differences for understanding the resignification of Italy-past as 'salvation', and Italy-present as 'liberation'. As part of this discussion, changes to the meanings of the terms 'culture' and 'society' are identified and their significance for retraining attention towards Italy-past and Italy-present is also explained. The second half of the chapter deploys the concept of 'civil sphere' to interrogate and explain the shift in symbolic re-evaluation and re-presentation of Italy and the Italians-present in increasingly empathetic and positively evaluative terms. With reference to a variegated range of actors and texts, processes of psychological identification

and moral extension, and the significance of these for explaining Britain's decision to actively intervene in the struggle for Italian liberation and unification, are identified and demonstrated. The chapter concludes by reflecting on the diversification of representations of Italy as a symbol of liberty and liberation throughout the nineteenth century.

Chapter six uses Field theory to identify and explicate how the transformations to English society described in chapter five, fed into, informed, and were informed by, changes to the organisation and structure of the literary field. The emphasis here is on examining how and in what ways the differentiation and diversification of the social bases, structure, and struggles within, the literary field, corresponded to the differentiation and diversification of literary visions of Italy and the Italians, past and present. The first half of the chapter identifies and explicates: the habitus and distribution of capitals characteristic of writer-artists within the restricted literary field; the diversifying nature of struggles to assert the autonomy of the literary arts and the writer-artist therein; and the evolving literary movements in and through which those struggles were formed and informed. Particular attention is paid to the patterned role played by structures of gender and sexuality for shaping the disposition of writer-artists both towards and away from particular position-takings, the movements associated with them, and the diversifying range of established, partially revised, and wholly new visions of Italy, past and present, arising from them. These points are further considered in relation to the rising social structural salience and complexity of the commercial literary field and the relations of emulation and differentiation conjoining it to the restricted literary field.

The second part of the chapter brings to life the analysis developed in the first half of the chapter, which it does with reference to a wide range of writers, literary movements, and literary texts. The intention here is to provide a worked example of the patterned and patterning processes set out in the first half of the chapter. The chapter concludes by reflecting on the analytical gains made throughout the chapter, and the wider significance both in terms of how Italy was represented prior to the nineteenth century and in the timeframe to have elapsed since.

Chapter seven draws into its purview representations of Italy during the second half of the twentieth century through to the 'present day'. The first part of the chapter performs three main tasks. It begins by discussing the paucity of research on cultural representations of Italy in British culture both during, and following on from the cessation of, World War Two; considers the relative decline and relativisation of the symbolic significance of Italy and the Italians throughout this period; and reflects on the direction the analysis might have otherwise taken

had particular data been available and had I used YSCS concepts to reconstruct and analyse those data. The second and more substantial part of the chapter uses Field theory to explain how and why visions of Italy have become increasingly subject to and informed by processes of cultural commodification, heteronomization and de-autonomization. Using examples taken from a wide range of cultural products produced within a wide range of fields, the analysis draws to attention the increasing bifurcation and polarisation of representations of Italy produced in and across the commercial and restricted fields of cultural production.

The concluding chapter reflects on the specific and general aims of this study. The first part of the chapter reconsiders the key findings of the study in light of the limits of the existing literature on cultural representations of Italy. The focus here is to identify and highlight various connections, continuities, and changes to, the structure and evaluative dimensions of representations of Italy both within and between periods that have hitherto been concealed from view. The second part of the chapter identifies three main avenues for future research into cultural representations of Italy leading out from the findings generated by and throughout the study. It does this by re-emphasising the respective analytical and conceptual strengths of YSCS and Field theory for further pursuing these avenues, but more broadly too, as intellectual frameworks with which to construct a rejuvenated cultural sociological account of cultural representations of potentially all and any cultural other(s).

---

[1] Landor's, *High and Low Life in Italy*, was serialised in the *Monthly Repository* during the years 1837 – 1838.

[2] There exist a few notable exceptions to this general rule which I identify and refer to in chapter seven.

[3] When Siedman (1996: 315) noted that '[Edward] Said has, sad to say, little influence in sociology', he was right on one level and wrong on another. Said's work, and the paradigmatic approach to cultural representation inspired by it, namely, the Saidian Paradigm, has developed in and across disciplines in such a way that has led sociologists to imagine cultural representation as being of less than primary concern for them, the emphasis on meaning, together with the kinds of intellectual tools and perspectives necessary for grasping it, having characteristically been set aside and downgraded in favour of forms of analysis which take 'harder' material, social and organisational factors, as their proper focus. In this sense, in terms of closing down (cultural) sociological engagement with the subject of cultural representation, Said's work has greatly influenced sociology albeit largely indirectly than directly. The evidence for this *is* the conspicuous absence of (cultural) sociological studies that explicitly seek to broach the subject of cultural representation.

[4] On this view, one referred to by Ricoeur as 'the hermeneutics of suspicion', cultural texts are ideological and shot through with relations and expressions of power.

---

[5] The line, 'they cannot represent themselves; they must be represented', is taken from *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, published in 1852.

[6] For programmatic and manifesto-like statements in which the distinction between sociology of culture and cultural sociology is drawn and explained see: Alexander, J. with Smith, P. (2003) 'The Strong Program in Cultural Sociology: Elements of a Structural Hermeneutics', in J. C. Alexander *The Meanings of Social Life: A Cultural Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.11. – 26; Alexander, J. C. and Smith, P. (2010) 'The Strong Program: Origins, Achievements and Prospects', in L. Grindstaff, M.C.M. Lo and J. R. Hall (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Cultural Sociology*. London: Routledge, pp. 13 – 22; Alexander, J. C., Jacobs, R. N. and Smith, P. (2012) 'Introduction: Cultural Sociology Today' in J.C. Alexander, R. N. Jacobs and P. Smith (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Cultural Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3 - 23; Alexander, J. C. and Smith, P. (2018) 'The Strong Program in Cultural Sociology: Meaning First', in L. Grindstaff, M.C.M. Lo and J. R. Hall (eds) (Second edition) *The Routledge Handbook of Cultural Sociology*. London: Routledge, pp.13 – 22.