

Anita Dremelj¹⁰⁸

BOURDIEU ON POWER, CULTURE AND SOCIOLOGY OF TASTE: THE CASE OF MARIJA JURIĆ ZAGORKA

Scientific paper

<https://doi.org/10.59014/LBXG3157>

Abstract

Refraining from reasoning in support of the universal taste and the experience of the beautiful, cultural sociology treats taste as socially contingent and constructed. The objective of this paper is to outline a social critique of different judgements of taste when it comes to different types of literary production based on the theoretical framework established by Pierre Bourdieu and on the example of the reception of popular literature, mainly historical romances written by Marija Jurić Zagorka. The methodological approach thereby applied includes the deconstruction of common distinctions based on Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, field and doxa, genealogy of highbrow taste in the era of so called highly textual modernism, critical analysis of gender discourse underlying cultural evaluations of literary production by women and for women, and the practicing of the ethnographic shift towards the reader in her context. This empirically contextualized analysis of literary tastes expressed by various recipients in Croatian cultural history has led to the results that reveal a long persistence of popularity and adoration of Zagorka's novels on the one hand and harsh, almost visceral, disgust with her production by official discourse on the other, confirming the thesis that judgments of taste are based on society (and class). However, these results do not suggest a linear (let alone causal) relationship between the class system and the system of cultural classifications as well as between consumerist desire and taste. Historical novels by Marija Jurić Zagorka, mainly written in the first half of the 20th century, contain a foundationally strong inscription of opposed social strata, thus providing a useful and relevant empirical basis for the analysis of complex processes of cultural modernization and accompanying changing forms of social power.

Key words: Bourdieu, popular literature, power, sociology of taste, Zagorka

108 Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, J.J. Strossmayer University in Osijek, anitadremelj@gmail.com, adremelj@ffos.hr

Bourdieu on taste and its sociology

Treating taste as socially defined is a *locus communis* in sociology (Gronow, 2000, 10). Different socio-economic groups have different tastes, and taste is consequently an empirical category. In his scientific reply to old questions of Kantian critique of judgement, Pierre Bourdieu (2011), perhaps unhumly, looks to the structure of social classes for a classification system that structures the perception of the social world and defines the objects of aesthetic pleasure, always thereby noting that social practices cannot be observed outside of their mutual relationships as well as of the totality of relationships. Bourdieu's approach thus presents an epistemological estrangement from the familiar world. Bourdieu's social critique of the judgements of taste argues that the taste of the upper class is presented as the only universal or legitimate taste in the spirit of Kantian critique. Sociological critique of *pure* aesthetics is particularly interesting, as it identifies the mechanisms of social emulation that constantly reproduce certain standards of good taste.

Such sociological critique of taste relies on the critique of modern consumer society that explains the dynamics of consumption and the desire of modern consumers to surpass past or traditional ways of consumption via the desire to imitate upper social strata and to gain a higher social status. Still, although taste and consumption are unquestionably relevantly connected, we should not assume a direct causal relationship between the two, in the sense that taste would generate consumption.

Thorstein Veblen (2008) discussed the classical economic definition of consumption, according to which offer creates demand. Veblen painted a far more complex picture of consumption, warning about our instinct to emulate others and compete with them to ensure our own survival. With this, Veblen rejects the notion of maximization of utilization or consumption as the satisfaction of needs, realizing thereby that economy should understand tastes. People imitate those in a higher social position, which leads to the creation of certain habits and preferences, which in turn creates the impulse to consume. Veblen linked his thesis about taste as an economic factor with the neoclassical hypothesis on insatiability: the ones who can afford luxury find themselves in a better social situation, which means that buying luxury goods guarantees a good social status. This in turn creates the demand for certain goods that are not necessities but

are desired because of the prevailing taste of the richest classes. Still, the aristocratic scheme of taste and consumption through the imitation of the taste of monarchy or royalty changed when industrialization paced up the exchange of goods and lowered the prices, making the luxury of the previous era a weaker social status indicator. The era of mass consumption brought a new type of consumption and taste, characterized by intense consumption and changing fashion, which can no longer be accurately or validly explained based on social status alone.

Some claim that people are driven to acquire goods by hedonism rather than by a pursuit of status (Gronow, 2000). Bourdieu (2011) also speaks of hedonist ethics of consumption, based on taking loans and wastefulness, which are contrasted with the classical bourgeois dedication to an ascetic present that is sacrificed for the future. A new consumer is never satisfied but constantly seeks novelty and tries to meet the need to consume. Here arises the need to differentiate taste as an attribute or feature of the consumer (person or group) and taste as an activity (Hennion, 2007). Such a pragmatic concept of taste finds its critical strength in the fact that individual tastes cannot be observed in or by themselves, but only as physical acts (Arsel and Bean, 2013).

In classic theoretical sociological contributions, consumption, especially mass consumerism, was already critically seen as a sign of bad taste. German formal sociologist Georg Simmel (1957), for example, studied fashion as manifested in quick changes of taste. Fashion is, according to Simmel, a means to fortify the sense of unity of social classes and their distinction. Members of upper classes signalize their superiority and initiate new trends, but these trends get to be imitated quickly, they become popular, and thus lose their differentiating function.

In the 1920s, theorists gathered around the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research started to criticize the cultural industry as uniform and offering a quick but temporary satisfaction of needs according to the pattern of repetition (Katunarić, 1990). The taste of the mass audience was mainly criticized as a means of repression that does not offer aesthetic or cultural satisfaction. The Frankfurt school also linked the question of taste with social divisions in the community, opening the possibility of identifying certain types of class tastes, whereby class dynamics was understood as the mechanism of structuring taste.

Still, by far the most widely quoted theory of class-based taste is the one by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1986; 1994; 2011; Slater, 1997), who identified distinctive class tastes of the French society in the 1960s based on the patterns of consumption and distribution of economic and cultural capital. The taste of the upper classes is seen as sophisticated and of subtle distinctions, giving intrinsic value to aesthetic experience. This taste forms a legitimate basis for *good* taste, legitimised and admitted by other classes (cf. Bennet, 1909). Middle-class taste on the other hand is characterized by the desire to compete in matters of social status. In contrast, the taste of the working classes is defined by the demand to choose necessities, not leaving much space for aesthetics.

Class theories of taste received substantial criticism, which argued that not every social action can be reduced to competition and that people, apart from the rat race for status, have other motivations, stating even that tastes and lifestyles can travel from the lower to the upper classes (Slater, 1997). However, neither the Frankfurt school nor Bourdieu treat the class-taste connection in a unilinear or monocausal way. Besides, the diffusion of the products of mass culture has made class differences less visible: products are consumed in a passive way in various social classes, with only small differences in brand or genre. The tastes of consumers are decreasingly under the influence of traditional social structures and are in postmodern culture seen as parts of the game with free floating signifiers that constantly redefine what they are and what they enjoy (Strinati, 2004).

In order to analyse the social critique of judgements of taste on the empirical example of Zagorka's popular literature, the focus of this paper is on the question of literary taste and the case of discrepant popular and critical reception of the works by Marija Jurić Zagorka. This requires a short recap of her work and life, provided in the following chapter.

Zagorka: adored and hated for a whole century

Her truly comprehensive opus and the circumstances of its publication and reception make Marija Jurić Zagorka a relevant figure in Croatian cultural history. Zagorka published for almost seventy years, from the late 19th to the mid-20th century: journal articles, articles about politics, fashion and culture, one-act plays, novels etc. (Lasić, 1986). Zagorka started

her career as a journalist, publishing her work in over thirty different journals and magazines in Croatia and abroad. She started the illustrated weekly *Zabavnik* (1918) and the first Croatian women's magazines *Ženski list* (1925-1938) and *Hrvatica* (1939-1941). After her first two novels, untypically gloomy *Roblje* (1899, instalments in *Obzor*) and *Vlatko Šaretić* (1903), there is a pause in her output until 1910, when the completely different crime novel *Kneginja iz Petrinjske ulice* was published. Here Zagorka develops and in a way rehearses her widely known narrative model and complex plot schemes that she playfully works with and that characterize her ensuing series of novels, which earned her great popularity. The novels include the series *Grička vještica*, starting with *Tajna krvavog mosta* in 1911, followed by *Kontesa Nera* in 1912, *Malleus Maleficarum* in 1912, two parts of *Suparnica Marije Terezije* and *Buntovnik na prijestolju* in 1918, and *Dvorska kamarila Marije Terezije* in 1926 as the seventh and final book in the *Grička vještica* series. Zagorka's other most popular novels include *Kći Lotrščaka* (1921), *Republikanci* (1924), *Plameni inkvizitori* (1928), *Gordana* (1934), *Kamen na cesti* (1937), *Vitez slavonske ravni* (1938), *Mala revolucionarka* (1939) and *Jadranka* (1943). There are thousands of pages that have never been published as books during her lifetime (*Tozuki, Crveni ocean, Vragoljanka s Trešnjevke, Pustolovine novorođenog Petrice Kerempuha* and *Nevina u ludnici*¹⁰⁹). Zagorka's one-act plays include titles like *Što žena umije* (1901), *U lovu* (1903), *Nesretna Ilica* (1903), *Ustrijelit će se* (1903), *Filip Košenski* (1904) and *Jalnuševčani* (1917). Zagorka's novels were also adapted for the theatre (*Grička vještica, Kći Lotrščaka, Suparnica Marije Terezije* and *Gordana*).

The above should be a sufficient illustration of the vastness of her opus. Imagining Zagorka produce these enormous amounts of text on a typewriter¹¹⁰ inspires a feeling of empathy from the modern viewpoint. Not only are the titles written by Zagorka numerous, they are also all enormously extensive novels. American magazine *mentalfloss* (Conradt, 2008) stated that *Gordana* is the sixth (out of ten listed) longest novel ever written. However, their list presents 9 out of 10 novels by their wordcount,

109 Published as a series of 112 feuilletons in Split (Slobodna Dalmacija's press) as the work of an anonymous author.

110 Zagorka bought a Remington typewriter, recently restored by Zoran Kirchhoffer and displayed at Zagorka's memorial apartment at Dolac 8 in Zagreb, where the Centre for Women's Studies has its offices today. The analysis of Zagorka's use of typewriter can be found in the paper by Sonja Kirchhoffer (2012).

and Gordana's length is expressed as 5200 pages – which leads us to the conclusion that the part called *Kraljica Hrvata* was probably left out, the last part of this huge novel originally published in instalments over a period of several years. The Guinness Book of Records mentions Proust's *In Search of Lost Time*¹¹¹ as the longest novel ever written, although it is only the fourth on the list by *mentalfloss*, but Gordana is still over three million characters longer. It is therefore highly possible that Zagorka's Gordana is the longest novel ever written.

Zagorka was exceptionally loved and popular, but at the same time faced bitter mockery and insults. Here are some examples of the dynamics of presence and adoration on the one hand and absence and contempt on the other. To illustrate Zagorka's popularity: there were long lines in front of newspaper stands, people waiting for them to open so they could buy a new instalment of her novel. The name of the award presented by the Croatian Journalists' Association, founded by Zagorka and her second husband, carries her name, as do many schools and streets (though since recently). Many reviews keep arriving at the conclusion throughout the 20th century that Zagorka is "again in vogue" (Hergešić, 1983, 399). Numerous publications of her novels also testify to her popularity. Hergešić (1983, 398-401) states that *Grička vještica* was published in 10,000 copies in 1963, and in an additional 10,000 as early as in 1964. A new edition of her collected works, the one that Hergešić wrote the preface to, was published in additional 10 to 15 thousand copies in 1972. In 1965, Bora Đorđević wrote a monograph-style story about Zagorka, and many of her novels were adapted for the theatre and television. The popular Zagorka received huge amounts of letters from her readers, and tourists would travel to Zagreb to see the grave of Nera, one of the most popular characters from her novel *Grička vještica* (Đorđević, 1979).

The conditions surrounding the publication of Zagorka's novel *Jadranka*, her last published novel, are an additional and powerful example of her vast popularity. During the period of the nationalist Independent State of Croatia, which shut down her women's magazine *Hrvatica* and took away the money from subscriptions, Zagorka was asked to compile a novel. She quickly gave them *Jadranka*, a novel written some twenty years earlier, to be published in the magazine *Nova Hrvatska* 1943-1945. The novel

111 <https://www.guinnessworldrecords.com/world-records/longest-novel>

is about German absolutism and the introduction of modern police in Croatia, the German *gendermerie*, and the carriers of the future German regime are treated with utter mockery in it, as complete incompetents. In other words, Zagorka made fun of the contemporary pro-German system in a novel that was commissioned by the very same system! Who can do that? Only someone who is “synonymous with popularity” (Kolanović, 2006).

Even today, more than a hundred years later, Marija Jurić Zagorka remains one the most widely read authors: Školska knjiga published luxurious editions of her works in the early 2000s, and EPH has been selling paperback editions at newsstands since 2012. In an interview, the editor of the EPH edition said that nearly a million copies have been sold so far, significantly more, for example, than the copies of the *Songs of Ice and Fire*, despite the popularity of the *Game of Thrones* (it was published by EPH at the same time as Zagorka). Again, the proof of Zagorka’s lasting popularity! We can see that Zagorka’s fame and popularity has never waned in the homes of her readers.

In popular culture, Zagorka has been featured on television (in the documentary-feature film directed by Biljana Čakić Veselić, produced by FADE IN, HRT, Zagreb film in 2008), on stage (the play *Zagorka*, directed by Ivica Boban, premiered at the Croatian National Theatre in Zagreb on 28 January 2011; plays performed by the Histrioni troop), in comic books (biographic comic book by Lea Kralj Jager), in tourist tours and sites (famous monument in Tkalčićeva street in Zagreb by Stjepan Gračan, guided tour *Zagorkinim tragom*) and dance performances (*Excuse me, do you know where Marija Jurić Zagorka street is* by UPPU PULS, Zagreb and city theatre Zorin dom, Karlovac).

She gained additional visibility when Šime Strikoman photographed around 200 persons gathered at the Zagreb market Dolac, all named after characters from Zagorka’s novels (Gordana, Siniša, Nera, Stanka, Mirena, Jadranka, Dorja, Damira etc.), from Zagorka’s apartment. Zagorka introduced some of these names to Croatia for the first time, like Gordana, or Jadranka as the translation of Italian Adriana. In a symbolic sense, she gained even more visibility when the room intended for use by media representatives in the Croatian Parliament was named *The Marija Jurić Zagorka Journalists’ Room*.

A cultural event called the Days of Marija Jurić Zagorka was first organised in 2007 (in honour of the 50th anniversary of her death), and has since transformed into an annual event, including a scientific symposium about her life and work that takes place every year.

Strangely enough, her basic biographic data have only recently become known. Based on her christening certificate, we know that she was born on 2 March 1873, although her grave says 1 March 1879 (if that were true, she would have finished elementary school at the age of 5 and gotten married at 12). The referential website of the Miroslav Krleža Institute of Lexicography contained this incorrect date under the entry *JURIĆ, Marija (Zagorka)* until several years ago too (Kragić 2005). This is how the story of unknown Zagorka begins, to be continued by the mention of her numerous pseudonyms (M. Jurica Zagorski, Iglica or Petrica Kerempuh), which make the job of cataloguing and editing of her opus quite demanding. Also, the conditions of publication of her work, as feuilletons in newspapers, creates additional problems when the title of a novel changes, making it hard to put it together. These are some of the reasons why her biography and bibliography have not been fully systematized yet, although everything we do know about her inspires fascination and compassion. Her life was full of difficulties and abuse, starting with the abuse her mother subjected her to as a child, her forced marriage to a Hungarian railway officer when she was only 17, the experience of the psychiatric ward where she hid when she fled from her husband in Hungary, her imprisonment by Khuen Hedervary for organising demonstrations, and the insults she received from her highbrow cultured colleagues. They slandered her harshly, but at the same time used her popular writing to drive up the sales of their newspaper, insisting however that her name remains hidden and secret, like for example in the small attic room of the journal *Obzor*, where she produced texts as a kind of madwoman in the attic (cf. Gubar and Gilbert, 2000).

Zagorka could therefore be described as a *public secret* (Jukić 2012, 355). Let us compare the results of the ethnography of reading with official discourse. Namely, if you visit libraries in Zagreb and browse through their shelves, you will discover that Zagorka's novels are worn, torn, dirty, full of coffee stains and various marginalia – simply widely read! Some other titles, including canon and obligatory school reading list titles, remain neat, clean, and tidy for the most part. Passionately and widely alive in

the minds of her audience, Zagorka remained invisible in many official records. For instance, the entry for “Jurić, Marija” in the Volume 4 of the Encyclopaedia of the Institute of Lexicography (1959, 55) says “see Zagorka”, and the entry for “Zagorka” in Volume 7 (1964, 737) says see “Jurić, Marija”, making circularly invisible the author who is at the same time the writer of the most extensive opus in the history of Croatian literature and one of the most widely read authors throughout the 20th century (Nemec 2004, 651).

Apart from these encyclopaedic entries, the disgust for Zagorka can be inferred from the statements her esteemed colleagues made about her (cf. Lasić 1986; Jurić, 1997), describing her as an old lady with no name or reputation, or a peasant from Zagorje infected by socialist ideas and feminist novelties (by Šime Mazzura). In his journal *Agramer Zeitung*, Oto Kraus calls on the Zagreb audiences to finally reject this woman, who attacks everything that is noble and cultured in Croatia, and writes pulp fiction for cowgirls. Zagorka is frequently omitted, disputed, or aesthetically discriminated as yielding to the most vulgar and lowest of tastes (Nemec, 2004, 651).

However, there are instances of adoration, friendship, and support for Zagorka expressed by Masaryk, Strossmayer, Kranjčević, Antun and Stjepan Radić, Milan Hodža and Fran Supilo. Stjepan Radić explicitly asks *Obzor* to put Zagorka in charge of reporting about his political activities because of her professional journalistic qualities and moral attitude (Hergešić, 1983, 376). Even though politically opposed to Radić, Frano Supilo admired her too, claiming in his congratulations to her after she received and rejected a great offer from Pester Lloyd (for her political stories from the joint parliament in Budapest in 1906) that she is a really fine *man* (Hergešić, 1983, 376). Duboyer, a journalist from French *Figaro*, commented after seeing Zagorka advocate for her country during the Friedjung process in Vienna that she is a monster of talent and excellence that made Croatian Parliament one of the most advanced ones in Europe (Jurić Zagorka, 1953, 32).

To conclude this lengthy exposition of love and hate for Zagorka, she was neither unknown nor known. The dialectic of adoration and disgust expressed for her can be associated with different social circles and strata,

and this discrepancy is related to high and low tastes, which are relevantly mapped as gendered. The following chapter elaborates on this argument.

The power-culture nexus and its gendering

We have exemplified various tastes based on the reception of Zagorka's work, and pointed to the social generative place of different tastes: high-brow, learned, disinterested and pure art taste on the one hand, and low-brow, popular, vulgar, pulp taste on the other. Every aesthetic perception could be described as relational, historical and closely connected with ethical and political dimensions of our social beings. There is also a gender dimension to the discourse that values different kinds of literary production (Felski, 1995). The conceptual apparatus developed by Pierre Bourdieu (2011) (disposition, distinction, habitus, cultural capital) is useful in understanding this field and its history.

The assumption is that the ways of seeing and consuming cultural products lean against certain economic and social conditions, or in other words are tightly related to different possible positions in the social space, which makes them a part of the systems of characteristic dispositions (habitus) of different classes. Namely, taste classifies and at the same time classifies the classifier, which means that social subjects differ according to the differences they make between the beautiful or good and ugly or vulgar. Their position in objective classifications is manifested in these distinctions. Cultural consumption in a wider sense fulfils the social function of legitimating social inequalities. Oppositions inscribed in the habits of cultural consumption (of Zagorka's novels in this case) contain economic and social determinants and are manifested in other ways of living as well. They can all be brought into correlation with class and gender. Highbrow culture has a function in class relationships and its products tend to be seen as sacrosanct, autonomous, removed from daily needs, characterized by an accentuated form and denied an extra-literary function. To clear the aesthetic disposition means to forget that the definition of art and through it of the art of living are a part of the class struggle. The science behind cultural consumption must step over the border that turns high culture into a separate free-floating world, as if promoting it ontologically.

The critique of the negation of lowbrow and vulgar (which is sensational, gives pleasure, mostly to women and the vulgar *populus*), namely of the negation which includes the confirmation of the superiority of those who know how to consume and produce art in a sophisticated, free, and disinterested way. They create the so-called ideology of natural taste and of disgust that establish the unity of different classes in their daily struggle – which is why it is important to remember this when interpreting popular culture and popular romance written by a woman primarily for women in case of this paper.

As this interplay is a part of wider social power relations, it is worthwhile to note that power is no longer seen as productive or coercive, but as a part of discourse, in the habitus. This is how Bourdieu sees it too (Swartz, 1997). The notion of cultural hegemony is useful here too (Gramsci, 1971), as it is necessary to surpass the thesis of the dominant class ideology as well as the notion of subject as exclusively interpellated from a certain place in ideological conjuncture, i.e. from a certain position that determines what can and should be said (Althusser, 1971). Within a certain ideological discursive formation, a person's way of speaking is normatively connected to their position, because it is the source of their viewpoint, which is in turn the foundation of the way of speaking and is shaped by norms. Gramsci's notion of hegemony tries to go around the assumption that the mode of production has precedence over ideology. There is a distinction between coercive and consensual control, whereby hegemony presents a cultural and ideological tool for maintaining domination by securing spontaneous consent of the subordinate. This perspective enables a different view of the dynamic relationship between consent and resistance, here primarily referring to the consumption of Zagorka's popular literature.

Accepted negative views of popular culture and its harmful effects on entire society (Dremel and Matić, 2014, 160) can be applied to popular literature: it reduces cultural and artistic quality and genius, and the level of civilizational development (it is regressive), it is susceptible to totalitarianism as it creates manipulable audiences, and the character of the production of popular literature is led by the logic of profit and bad tastes of wide masses, raising passive and authoritarian followers (Strinati, 2004). However, gendered mapping of such divisions is often overlooked (Felski, 1995). At the first glance, this critique applies to Zagorka's literature – her representations are stereotypical, romantic love plays a big part, and

heroines often end up in happily married ever afters. The narrative structure is simplified and the same narrative model mostly perpetuated. However, if we take into consideration the context of her readers, we see that a story that seems naïve from today's perspective presented a significant breakthrough for a woman in the early 20th century in Croatia. Practicing the so-called ethnographic shift towards romance readers at the time (Radway, 1991) leads to the recognition that reading popular romances meant modernization for women because they started to read, even if the narrative relied on the patriarchal discourse. Pejorative views of popular culture fail to see the possibility of appropriating a certain discursive position – even if it is consumerist or patriarchal – with the purpose of mobilizing action and change. This can only be done if the discourse and the nexus of power and culture are conceptualized as social practices leaned against the notion of hegemony (Bourdieu, 1977). Even though Zagorka negotiates with the dominant discourse – she actually does something similar to what Spivak (1988) refers to as strategic essentialism or Luce Irigaray (1985) as mimesis – she does it in order to be able to act towards changing the meaning of gender roles and norms.

To see this type of strategy as naïve or antifeminist from today's perspective means to forget that literature has a live communication with its audience, as well as to forget about the real position of women in early 20th century – namely, women in Croatia did not read at all until they started reading Zagorka's novels. The act of reading itself had an empowering effect on women, which is Zagorka's contribution to the modernization and democratization of Croatian society.

In lieu of conclusion: new and old visibilities

In *serious* academic circles, the relationships between women and social change were not visible. Marija Jurić Zagorka, as the first woman journalist in the region, as a loved and hated novelist, critically disputed in spite of her popularity, is a neuralgic place of this invisibility. Her visibility has recently increased, which means that there is a shift in the orders of discourse (Foucault, 1971), though we should not forget that there is a political element to it as well. The recent move from social history to the history of the social, whereby foundational categories are examined,

is an important stimulus for revealing women's history, experience and perspectives.

The research approach followed here demands an autoreflexiveness regarding identity politics and binary distinctions we cannot escape – but the categories of gender or of highbrow/lowbrow were used here in order to critically analyze gender discourse within a specific regime of truth and power (Foucault, 1994), because it participated in the production and petrification of socially active divisions. The only claim thereby made about the nature of reality and society is that our knowledge of them is a part of discourse. Future research is therefore called upon to reveal discursive mythical constructs that both literary discourse and the discourse of social science theory rely on.

Popular culture was treated as the place of possible resistance and productive possession of many meanings. Although sociological theory tended to treat popular culture as passivizing and reactionary, we find this to bear monologist reading of cultural history and suggest a shift from the analysis of meanings of texts to the analysis of the social function of text and reader reception. Zagorka's novels are thus not necessarily places of system reproduction but can be seen as relevant modernizing agents for women and thus as places where both resistance and reproduction are at play. This is of great relevance for sociological theory too because sociology was established as the voice of fact versus literature as the voice of fiction. This is also one of the boundaries that modernity helped establish. The meaning of modernity can thus be interpreted as resting on the exclusion of gender via symbolic ascriptions. The analysis of Zagorka's reception has shown that if her reader is seen as a victim, one cannot see the important role of the figure of woman consumer in the imagination of modernity (Felski, 1995).

New disciplinary objectification of Zagorka and her opus can be useful in establishing new visibility of the role of female experience in the constitution of modernity. Although the social position of women has changed considerably, we can still witness resistant forms of inequality at home and in public discourse (Koludrović and Kunac, 2000), as well as unrelenting sexism and multiply intersected deprivation of women in Croatia (Galić, 2012). It is therefore useful to take the case of Zagorka into consideration when studying the processes of gendering history and history of gender in

the Croatian context. This research aspect is also important when we look into and try to disturb the still present normative hierarchies in theory, research and politics. Despite abundant criticism that Bourdieu received (Swarz, 1997), his theory of culture and power at its core is an intellectual project that boldly attempts to transcend the classic polarity between cultural idealism and historical materialism by proposing a materialist but relevantly non-reductive account of cultural life that embodies power relations.

References

- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In: L. Althusser (ed.), *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Arsel, Z., Bean, J. (2013). Taste Regimes and Market-Mediated Practice. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39 (5), 899-917.
- Bennet, A. 1909. *Literary Taste. How To Form It*. <<https://ia801902.us.archive.org/9/items/in.ernet.dli.2015.202170/2015.202170.Literary-Taste.pdf> > (August 2022)
- Bourdieu, P. (2011). *Distinkcija: društvena kritika sudenja*. Zagreb: Izdanja Antibarbarus.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). *The Field of Cultural Production*. Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). *The Forms of Capital*. In J. G. Richardson (ed.). *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp.241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Conradt, S. 2008. *The Quick 10: The 10 Longest Novels Ever*. <<http://mentalfloss.com/article/18661/quick-10-10-longest-novels-ever>> (August 2022)
- Dremel, A., Matić, R. (2014). Discourse and/as Social Practice – the Analysis of the Problem of Resistance and Hegemony. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5 (22), 155-166.
- Đorđević, B. (1979). *Zagorka, kroničar starog Zagreba*. Sisak: Stjepan Skrbini.
- Felski, R. (1995). *The Gender of Modernity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press.
- Fort, B.; Rosenthal, A. (ed.). (2001). *The Other Hogarth: Aesthetics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Foucault, M. (1994). *Nadzor i kazna: radanje zatvora*. Zagreb: Informator.

- Foucault, M. (1971). *L'ordre du discours*. Pariz: Gallimard.
- Galić, B. (2012). Promjena seksističkog diskursa u Hrvatskoj?. *Socijalna ekologija*, 21 (2), 155-177.
- Gilbert, S. M.; Gubar, S. (2000). *The Madwoman in the Attic. The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.
- Gramsci A. (1971). *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gronow, J. (2000). *Sociologija ukusa*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk, Hrvatsko sociološko društvo.
- Hennion, A. (2007). Those Things That Hold Us Together: Taste and Sociology. *Cultural Sociology*, 1 (1), 97-114.
- Hergešić, I. (1983). Predgovor Sabranim djelima (1972). In: R. Bogišić (ed.). *Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti, knjiga 122: Josip Horvat, Josip Torbarina, Ivo Hergešić* (pp. 376-402). Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice Hrvatske.
- Irigaray, L. (1985). *This Sex Which is not One*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Jukić, T. (2008). Detekcija i melankolija: Zagorka, Freud, Deleuze. In M. Grdešić and Slavica Jakobović Fribeć (ed.). *Neznana junakinja. Nova čitanja Zagorke* (pp. 389-396). Zagreb: Centar za ženske studije.
- Jukić, T. (2012). Republikanci i revolucija: politika Zagorkine književnosti. In T. Bogdan, et al.. (ed.). *Perivoj od slave. Zbornik Dunje Fališevac* (pp. 355-364). Zagreb: FF press.
- Jurić Zagorka, M. (1953). *Kako je bilo*. Beograd: Izdanje redakcije Zabavnog romana.
- Jurić Zagorka, Marija. (1997). Što je moja krivnja. In V. Brešić (ed.). *Autobiografije hrvatskih pisaca* (pp. 451-499). Zagreb: AGM.
- Jurić, Marija. (1959). *Enciklopedija Leksikografskog zavoda SFRJ*. Svezak 4. Zagreb.
- Katunarić, V. (1990). *Teorija društva u frankfurtskoj školi*. Zagreb: Naprijed.
- Kirchhoffer, S. (2012). Je li Zagorka rabila pisaći stroj? In A. Dremel (ed.). *Širom svijeta. O Zagorki, rodu i prostoru* (pp. 213-239). Zagreb: Centar za ženske studije.
- Kolanović, M. (2006). Zagorka – sinonim za popularno. In Marija Jurić Zagorka, *Jadranka 2, Sabrana djela Marije Jurić Zagorke*, vol. 11. Afterword (pp. 575–594). Zagreb: Školska knjiga and Naklada Marija Jurić Zagorka.
- Lasić, S. (1986). *Književni počeci Marije Jurić Zagorke. Uvod u monografiju*. Zagreb: Znanje.
- Nemec, K. (2004). Stroj za proizvodnju priča. In Marija Jurić Zagorka, *Grička vještica 7, Sabrana djela Marije Jurić Zagorke*, vol. 7. Afterword (pp. 651-663). Zagreb: Školska knjiga and Naklada Marija Jurić Zagorka.

- Radway, J. (1991). *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy and Popular Literature*. Chapel Hill, London: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Simmel, G. (1957). Fashion. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 62 (6), 541-558.
- Slater, D. (1997). *Consumer Culture and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak?. In C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (ed.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271-313). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Strinati, D. (2004). *Introduction to Theories of Popular Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Swartz, David. (1997). *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tomić-Koludrović, I.; Kunac, S. (2000). *Rizici modernizacije: žene u Hrvatskoj devedesetih*. Split: Udruga građana "Stope nade".
- Veblen, T. (2008). *Teorija dokoličarske klase*. Novi Sad: Mediterran Publishing.
- Zagorka. (1964). *Enciklopedija Leksikografskog zavoda SFRJ*. Vol. 7. Zagreb.
- Kragić, B. 2005. Jurić, Marija (Zagorka). *Hrvatski biografski leksikon* sv. br. 6. Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža. <raspoloživo na: <http://enciklopedija.lzmk.hr/clanak.aspx?id=17485> > (kolovoz 2016.)

BOURDIEU O MOĆI, KULTURI I SOCIOLOGIJI: STUDIJA SLUČAJA MARIJE JURIĆ ZAGORKA

Sažetak

Zazirući od argumentacije koja propagira univerzalni ukus i univerzalno iskustvo lijepoga, kulturna sociologija tretira ukus kao kontingentan i konstruiran. Cilj je ova rada ocrtati društvenu kritiku različitih prosudbi ukusa po pitanju različitih tipova književne produkcije, na temelju teorijskog okvira Pierrea Bourdieua i na primjeru recepcije popularne književnosti, prvenstveno povijesnih romansi, koje je pisala Marija Jurić Zagorka. Metodološki pristup uključuje dekonstrukciju uvriježenih distinkcija na temelju Bourdieuove teorije kulturne reprodukcije, genealogiju visokog ukusa u doba modernizma, kritičku analizu rodnog diskursa u podlozi kulturnih evaluacija književne produkcije žena za žene i prakticiranje etnografskog zaokreta ka čitateljici u njezinom kontekstu. Ova empirijski smještena analiza književnih ukusa različitih recipijenata u hrvatskoj kulturnoj povijesti dovela je do rezultata koji otkrivaju dugu perzistenciju popularnosti i obožavanja Zagorkinih romana s jedne strane te intenzivnog, gotovo visceralnog, gađenja prema njezinoj produkciji u službenom diskursu s druge, potvrđujući tezu o društvenoj (i klasnoj) smještenosti sudova o ukusu. Ipak, ovi rezultati ne sugeriraju linearnu (kamoli kauzalnu) vezu između klasnog sustava i sustava kulturnih klasifikacija kao ni između potrošačke žudnje i ukusa. Povijesni romani Marije Jurić Zagorke, većinom napisani tijekom prve polovine dvadesetog stoljeća, sadrže fundamentalno snažnu upisanost društvenih slojeva, pružajući korisnu i relevantnu empirijsku osnovu za analizu složenih procesa kulturne modernizacije i pratećih oblika društvene moći.

Ključne riječi: Bourdieu, moć, popularna književnost, sociologija ukusa, Zagorka