Structure, culture, contingency?

How to explain change?

Hedwig Richter

Which factors lead to change or trigger certain dynamics? What do ideas, conflicts or actors contribute to change? What is the role of institutions and »organizational fields« (DiMaggio 1983)? What prevents change and what causes barriers? Do structures still matter? What about social mechanisms? And on the other hand: Are, perhaps, dynamics and change mainly generated contingently?

At the Second Annual Seminar of the *Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology* in February 2010, thirty PhD candidates and a number of distinguished scholars engaged in these questions.[1] It turned out that scores of the presentations centred on the challenge given by the cultural approach and its accompanying »turns« in different disciplines. The five contributions chosen for the here presented issue reflect this emphasis. The fruitful and inspiring fashion[2] of the various »turns«, also in the field of »Dynamics and Change«, allowed to indicate the complexity of the topic and the contingency of knowledge. Thus, this issue will not present revolutionary methodological or theoretical innovations. But it can be illustrated once more how interesting the cultural turn still is, especially for younger scholars. Although the end of the cultural turns has been adjured for years by its objectors, the culturalistic approach is still amaz-

1 Cf. the conference report by Tobias Graf et al. *Dynamics and Change. 2nd Annual Seminar, Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology*. 8.1.2010-10.1.2010 (sic! 8.2.-10.2.2010), Bielefeld. H-Soz-u-Kult, 6.4.2010 (http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=3058. All quotations of the seminar can be found in this paper.

2 Cf. about fashion and history Kocka 2008; Stamm-Kuhlmann 2004.

DOI:10.2390/indi-v2-i1-25 ISSN 2191-6721

ingly fresh and fertile (see e.g. Biernacki et al. 1999; Verheyen 2010; Welskopp 2010; Rubin 2009; Stollberg-Rilinger 2008; Reckwitz 2008).

In these contributions for *InterDisciplines* one can find, apart from this general tendency, three further similarities which try to describe and analyze dynamics and change:

The first point is the close connection between change, conflict and stability. Starting with Auguste Comte, social ›change‹ for a long time was regarded to be contrary to ›order‹. Today there is a consensus that order and change are complementary perspectives, and that they depend on each other. Stability and order require change. Processes of social change are therefore often explained by discrepancies and tensions. The Conflict Theory interprets competition or structural inequality as major motors for change and hence for the order of society. Helmut Schelsky, in turn, points out that social order cannot be imagined without questioning conventional structures (Schelsky 1980). The cover of the present issue emblematizes this close connection. It shows a scene from the *National Ballet of China's* program in honor of the sixtieth anniversary of the People's Republic of China. By referring to the revolutionary events it is manifested how important change is to establish a new order – an order, whose definite regime and problematic stability is clarified via the propagandistic aesthetic. But at the same time the picture also symbolizes: If dynamics and change fail to appear, staging and propagandistic activism do replace them.

By analyzing the importance of dissatisfaction, the sociologist Olga Galanova shows how strongly ›order‹ and ›disorder‹ are interwoven. The permanent critical reflection challenges institutions to the fast and effective development of their functions according to new requirements. Also Jan-Markus Kötter in his contribution »Stability and threat to the order of the church« gives a fine example of the interlacement of stability on the one hand and the challenge of order on the other hand. Personalization in the church in Late Antiquity led to great tensions; but at the same time personalization reduced the complexity of the theological debate. Furthermore, as »personalization in tradition, denotation and expectation allowed for a constant self-reference of the order within the

church, this constituted the actual factor of stability« (51). In Anna Zaytseva's article about the interdependence of work norms and sanctioning behavior, dynamics and change are produced by tense competition. Zaytseva illustrates – as Ralf Dahrendorf has it – the »antagonism between rights and offers (*Antagonismus von Anrechten und Angebot*), between demanding and saturated groups« (*zwischen fordernden und saturierten Gruppen*, Dahrendorf 1992: 8).

The militant dancers on the cover point to the often problematic power of this »antagonisms«. A title like »Dynamics and Change« easily evokes positive connotations. But instead, change is often effectuated by brutal rivalry, even war, chaos, and violence. Hedwig Richter in her examination of voting practices in the 19th century shows the overwhelming impact of brutality and war to establish a new election order and broaden the suffrage. If conservative societies like that of the planters in South Carolina tried to prevent change for decades, and if performances and activism do not work anymore, the result is a total breakdown of the old system – and even deeper social change.

There is a second tendency mirrored in all five texts of this issue: To explain and analyze processes and changes, the contributors use diverse theories and methods. Martin Diewald, a quantitative working sociologist, in his keynote speech about »Social mechanisms explaining stability and change« gives an idea of how reasonable it may be to play theories and methods off against each other. Instead, Diewald recommends to quest for common grounds. Diewald defines mechanisms as causal links between an initial constellation and an outcome. They are the focus of a more modest approach of understanding change without involving ›grand theories‹ but while offering a taxonomy of possible explanations that can be applied to individual cases. Diewald opted for using mechanisms as tools for individual studies rather than trying to construct a »general grammar of the social« from them. In the discussion after the lecture it became clear that due to its middle range and its sensitivity for empirical diversity the mechanism approach might provide a common ground for empirically-minded sociologists and historians alike to explain change.

The contributers of this *InterDisciplines* issue try to combine the advantages of the cultural approach and those of the structural one. The historian Hans-Christian Petersen picks this idea out as a central theme in his study on inequalities and differentiation in the urban space. At the same time he underlines that this connection of different approaches is typical for a development which for years has been found all over the world (Eley 2005; Mergel 2005: 360). As a matter of fact, this syncretism often merges very contradictory methods and theories, and one can accuse it of being somewhat arbitrary (Kocka 2008: 143). But the syncretism is without any doubt helpful for concrete research practices; it helps with achieving an informed analysis which aims at including different aspects of the empiricism.

The eclectic approach correlates with another trend: instead of only one factor now multifactorial developments explain change and explicate transformations. For example, there is the question of the influence of ideas, of worldviews and orders of knowledge. Jan Assmann at the Annual Seminar indicated the impact of tradition in his opening keynote lecture about »Cultural memory and the dynamics of change and fixation«. For Assmann the crucial question is not concerning ›dynamics‹ or ›change‹ as such, but in which way dynamics and changes are mediated by cultural memory. »Writing creates history where myth was.« Therefore, it is the cultural memory that constructs dynamics and change. But this prospect has been seen by some as being too one sided. The contributors to this issue, for instance, point to the importance of actors, of structures or of socioeconomical terms. Kötter as well as Zaytseva connect the level of actors with the level of structures. By analyzing the entanglement of micro and macro level and by investigating in how far they are causally combined, the contributors are just very much in line with the trend.

The authors focus on topics which have been neglected for quite a long time. Petersen quotes Christoph Cornelißen, who speaks of the »return of social history« (Cornelißen 2008). Thereby, classical questions of social history can be targeted again. Petersen gives a good example of that. [3]

Obviously this is part of the cultural turns: everything can be incorporated, dichotomies and grand theories are eyed with suspicion and distrust, no either-or, no hierarchies, no ›good‹ versus ›bad‹ approaches.[4] In this sense, Ute Daniel calls for skepticism towards the »world of ›facts‹«. She advises to »sample the pleasures« of the inevitable relativeness of science and to give up on »the ritualistic forms of evidencing and proofing through accumulation of footnotes« (Daniel 2001: 16). This gaily abandonment of seeking the truth and this eclecticism – which is our third point – consistently gets contingency on board. At the Annual Seminar there was an intensive debate about the role of contingency in processes of change. In his keynote speech »Contingency and the impossibility of calculating change« Arnd Hoffmann offered valuable definitions of key concepts for getting change into perspective. Based on Niklas Luhmann and Reinhart Koselleck, Hoffmann argued against a historiography that interprets dynamics and change as an inevitable outcome of structural constellations. Instead, contingency, as experienced by historic actors, has to be taken into account. Actors perceive reality in the horizon of other possibilities, and they also consider the behavior of other actors. Tracing change requires that the view of historic subjects has to be taken into account.

The inclusion of contingency is noteworthy. The former disregard of this factor derived from the fact that in the end contingency somehow counteracts analysis and explanation. Because the concept describes »some-

3 It is of note that also Hans-Ulrich Wehler (2006) explains how fruitful it could be to embrace like the British cultural anthropology »hard social, economical and political structures«.

4 It seems to be a justified question if this access may sometimes end up with an »intelectual suicide« (Daniel 2001: 16).

thing given (something experienced, expected, remembered, fantasized) in the light of its possibly being otherwise, it describes objects within the horizon of possible variations« (Niklas Luhmann 1984, quoted in 1995: 106). Thus, the authors use the concept of contingency thriftily and apply it only to three fields: They refer to the diversity of empiricism, to the influence of actors (as mentioned before) and – connected to both – to the fundamental influence of negotiations. All of these three points are typical for a cultural perspective.

Especially the impact of individual actors is stressed in later theories, like Dahrendorf's conflict theory, that is meant to explain change. Galanova states that she does not want to start »from the unquestioned fact of the social order«, but instead from the actors whose respectively individual communication produces order in the semantic field of dissatisfaction. Thus, the new balance of order is a product of negotiations; through processes of negotiation the order gains legitimacy and therefore validity. Anna Zaytseva, who in her study on a hotel comes »closer to the diversity of empirical evidence«, can exemplify very similarly in how far norms can be regarded as social constructs emerging through interactions and negotiations (32). Contingency arises from the consideration that things are constructed; the construction reveals its character through the view of actors and their negotiations. Hence, also Kötter states that church order was also a personally transmitted illusion of concord, permanently threatened by disruption. All in all, the contributors show: There is hardly any order without change – and no order without a process of negotiation.

Hans-Christian Petersen demonstrates by the example of a city – St. Petersburg in the second half of the 19th century – in how far the socially underprivileged have not merely been the victims of unequal social circumstances and other factors. Petersen's focus on actors can reveal in what way these people also »struggled individually and jointly against their situation on the margins of society by interpreting and adopting social space« (104). Thereby, Peterson also wants to keep an eye on structures. And because at the same time he makes the question of social inequality the focus of his study he can fathom how advantageous it may

be to use both the cultural perspective and classical questions of social history.

Petersen's and also Richter's contributions, which in spite of a decided cultural approach allude to the impact of structures, point out to one of the leading questions of the Annual Seminar: Can we dispense with structures? Certainly there are research projects that are not in the need of an analytical frame of structures – but the incorporation of structures can be an important enrichment. Given the culturalistic arbitrariness, structures can help to ground the research question and to make it relevant for broader questions and the broader scientific discourse.

References

Biernacki, Richard et al. 1999. *Beyond the cultural turn? New directions in the study of society and culture*. Berkeley

Burke, Peter 2004. *What is cultural history?* Cambridge

Cornelißen, Christoph 2008: Die Sozialgeschichte kehrt zurück. *Der Tagesspiegel* (30.9.2008)

Dahrendorf, Ralf 1992. *Der moderne soziale Konflikt*. Stuttgart

Daniel, Ute 2001. *Kompendium Kulturgeschichte. Theorien, Praxis, Schüsselwörter*. Frankfurt/Main

DiMaggio, Paul and Walter W. Powell 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* (4): 147-160

Eley, Geoff 2005. *A crooked line. From cultural history to the history of society*. Ann Arbor

Kocka, Jürgen 2008. Bewegung in der Geschichtswissenschaft. *Merkur. Deutsche Zeitschrift für europäisches Denken* (62) Issue 705: 142-147

Luhmann, Niklas 1984. *Soziale Systeme*. Frankfurt/Main (engl. 1995)

Ogburn, William F. 1922. *Social change. With respect to culture and original nature*. New York

Reckwitz, Andreas 2008. *Unscharfe Grenzen. Perspektiven der Kultursoziologie*. Bielefeld

Rubin, Eli 2009. *Synthetic socialism. Plastics and dictatorships in the German Democratic Republic*. Chapel Hill

Stamm-Kuhlmann, Thomas 2004. Wo bleibt die Aufklärung? Unser entspannter Umgang mit der Wirklichkeit. *Zeitschrift für Religion- und Geistesgeschichte* (56): 97-109

Schelsky, Helmut 1980: Zur soziologischen Theorie der Institutionen. *Die Soziologen und das Recht. Abhandlungen und Vorträge zur Soziologie von Recht, Institution und Planung*. Opladen, edited by idem: 215-247

Stollberg-Rilinger, Barbara 2008. *Des Kaisers alte Kleider. Verfassungsgeschichte und Symbolsprache des Alten Reiches*. Munich

Verheyen, Nina 2010. *Diskussionslust. Eine Kulturgeschichte des »besseren Arguments« in Westdeutschland*. Göttingen

Wehler, Hans-Ulrich 2006. *Eine lebhafte Kampfsituation. Ein Gespräch mit Manfred Hettling und Cornelius Torp*. Munich

Welskopp, Thomas 2010. *Amerikas große Ernüchterung. Eine Kulturgeschichte der Prohibition*. Paderborn

The interdependence of work norms and sanctioning behavior

An example of the rotation system at an international chain hotel

Anna Zaytseva

Introduction

The debate on norms in social sciences is extremely heterogeneous: it confronts us with partly contradictory theoretical premises explaining the origin of norms. To illustrate the point, let me introduce some major issues in dispute. Norms can be viewed as constraints on action or as flexible constructs emerging in the course of interactions. The classic example of norms as hard constraints is Parsons' concept of norms (Parsons 1937; 1952). Rational choice approaches and game theories also belong to this group (e.g. Coleman 1990; Hechter & Opp 2001; Voss 2001). In contrast, norms can be viewed as social constructs emerging during interactions and having a great degree of flexibility (e.g. Garfinkel 1959; 1976; Fine 2001). Another disagreement concerns the question of whether there is a consensus on norms or if their ambivalent characteristics inevitably cause conflicts. On the one hand, we can witness a clear trend in theoretical concepts towards normative consensus: starting from Parsons' concept of norms, which presumes a total consensus that emerges due to the internalization of cultural values shared by all society members, to contemporary approaches that understand norms as »rules, about which there is at least some degree of consensus« (Horne 2001: 5). However, on the other hand, approaches that claim the conflictual nature of norms can also be found (e.g. Popitz 2006; Burns & Flam 1987).[5]

5 The characteristics of normative conflicts will be elaborated in the following with regard to the thesis on the interdependence of norms.

Simultaneously, a variety of concepts of norms share the view of normative behavior as behavioral regularity supported by sanctions in the case of deviant actions. Some other approaches supplement the definition by the ›oughtness‹ characteristic of norms, which rests on some kind of standard value that is (without further justification) considered valid and, to some extent, socially shared (Hechter & Opp 2001: 404). In the following, I will limit my analysis to sanctioning because this characteristic seems to be particularly problematic for the definition of norm-following behavior.

The idea of sanctions as the basis of norm-following behavior in the contemporary social science debate is developed within the instrumental concepts of norms: rational-choice and game theorists stress that actors calculate the costs of sanctions. Sanctions are normally classified by two types: ›internal‹ and ›external‹. The rational motives of behavior are associated with external sanctioning. Instead, intrinsic sanctions »involve elements of the actor's personality« (Giddens 1976: 109) and are normally connected with norms internalized by actors in the course of socialization. The idea of internal sanctioning is elaborated in Parsons' concept of norms.

However, defining norms by means of sanctioning, which is also often taken as its empirical measure, seems to be insufficient as a way to understand empirical evidence of norm-following behavior. In turn, in sociological debates more and more often attempts have been made to rethink the concept of sanctions and their interrelation to norms. For example, Beckert calls into question whether sanctions can generally be considered an integral characteristic of norms:

> we cannot reduce social norms to economic acts of maximization but rather must grant them an autonomous status which excludes the explanation of norms within the economic model of behavior. This exclusion does not claim that sanctions have no significance for maintaining norms but only *denies the possibility of reducing norms to sanctions* (Beckert 2002: 35, italics by the author).

A similar view is held by Lindenberg, who claims that norms cannot be grasped »as simple instruments of control in which concrete instructions are enforced by […] sanctions« (Lindenberg 2008: 79).

My argumentation that sanctions cannot be regarded as an integral characteristic of norms is based on the analysis of the qualitative data from my case studies. First, it seems to be problematic to assume that interaction between groups is completely transparent.[6] For example, in work organizations employees may demonstrate shirking-behavior in those areas of their activity where managers will never notice it and, therefore, cannot impose sanctions.

Second, it turns out to be misleading to define power in terms of a group's resources related to the higher status in the organizational hierarchy and sanctions as a privilege of those who have more resources. Rather, if we take the example of a work organization once again, both managers and employees may impose sanctions and influence the process of the emergence of norms. This thesis results from understanding the genesis of norms as the process of communicating, negotiating and learning[7] norms in which employees are much more than simply passive norm-followers. These are employees who actively implement norms into practice: they have the power to decide whether to follow a norm or not as well as in which form to apply a norm. This points to the fact that

6 In this connection Beckert claims: »a purely instrumental attitude towards norms would not lead to the desired results of action because, especially in big groups, sanctions could not be optimally imposed because of incomplete possibilities of mutual observation of the action of every other actor« (Beckert 2002: 260).
Similarly, Popitz explains the limits of sanctioning by »the paradox of punishment«. In his view, since actors' behavior is not completely transparent, sanctioning is imposed only in few cases of deviance. This allows a norm system to keep existing. Otherwise, the overload of sanctioning would lead to the collapse of the whole system (Popitz 2006).

7 I borrow different approaches such as ethnomethodological studies, symbolic interactionism, and the framing approach of Lindenberg to depict the process of the emergence of norms (Lindenberg 2006; 2008; Garfinkel 1959; 1976; Fine 2001).

they may impose sanctions towards managers. The sanctions of employees take different forms: from complaints and threats to shirking-behavior and quitting organizations. At first glance, this idea may seem to overlook hierarchical relations, but it gains in importance when one considers that employers are highly dependent on the norm-following behavior of employees. Managers only make decisions and formulate organnizational rules, i.e. they give an impetus for newly emerging work norms, but their implementation and establishment results from employees' reactions to newly emerging work norms.[8]

Third, my major argument that sanctions cannot be regarded as an integral characteristic of norms refers to considering them to be embedded in a system of interdependent norms. This approach presumes that several norms are normally brought into play in one setting simultaneously. Contradictions between norms mean that certain norms can be followed only if others are infracted (e.g. Esser 2000: 133).[9] Therefore, one can analyze a deviant form of behavior and resulting sanctioning only in connection with a system of interrelated and competitive norms.

The three comments were provided to illustrate some gaps in the general definition of norms and its inadequacy if one tries to apply it to processes observed in the everyday practices of work organizations. In this paper I will concentrate on the second and third aspects – the flexible understanding of power relations and the phenomenon of the interdependence of norms which seem to be significant for rethinking the interrelation between norms and sanctioning. I assume that deviant behavior is inevitable within a system of competitive norms where employees impose sanctions when they resist following contradictory norms. I will

8 I make use of micropolitical theory and social rule system theory to illustrate a flexible understanding of power relations between distinct groups of actors. Furthermore, the idea of sanctioning by employees is mentioned but not elaborated in the work of Popitz (2006).

9 Based on this assumption, I designate such norms as contradictory or competitive. The theoretical foundation of the idea of interdependence of norms is tackled in the subsequent section in more detail.

illustrate the interdependence of norms by an example from my case study.

Simultaneously, it seems to be a challenge to find a concept of norms that would link theoretical and empirical aspects of norm-following behavior in one framework or context. From a variety of approaches to norms I use social rule system theory which seems to be particularly appropriate for understanding the interdependence of norms.[10] It was developed as a link between concepts orientated toward social agents (e.g. phenomenology, ethnomethodology, symbolic interactionism) and such theories as structural functionalism, structuralism, and system theory. At the same time, social rule system theory is an empirically oriented theory which focuses on the practical implementation of norms in concrete social settings.

The topic of my paper is discussed by three major steps. First, I will elaborate what I understand by the interdependence of norms and normative conflicts. Being interested in processes through which norms are established, I concentrate on the theoretical issue of emergent qualities of normative structure. Therefore, second, I will make use of the concept of the dual interrelation of structure and action, in order to clarify a general mechanism of the construction of norms. It will be taken as a basis for the explanation of the emergence of competitive norms within one setting. Third, I will illustrate my assumptions by using an example from the case study of an international chain hotel in Germany. This empirically demonstrates how the interdependence of distinct norms results in sanctioning behavior on the part of employees.

10 The concept of norms by Burns et al. is a part of social rule system theory. Norms are considered a type of a social rule. However, in the scientific debate there is no consensus on this question: some link social rules with norms (Esser 2000), whereas others contrast them (Gloy 1975). In my study, I do not differentiate between social rules and norms, as it is the case in social rule system theory. Instead, I consider norms to be including social rules at the different stages of their emergence.

The interdependence of norms: definition and theoretical framework

The interdependence of norms enables the integration of the different types of norms in the course of their emergence. A certain norm goes through interaction with other types of norms, so that the constellations or, in other words, systems of interdependent norms are established.

The idea of the interdependence of norms was mentioned in sociological discussions but not elaborated in detail. It originates from Durkheim's thesis that every norm presumes a parallel adherence and violence (Durkheim 1933; 1950). Popitz writes about conflicting norms that inevitably emerge, since individuals are simultaneously embedded in several contexts with different roles (Popitz 1980; 2006). Symbolic interactionists point out the ambiguity and variability of norms in one setting which causes normative conflicts. The resolution of conflicts arising through different norms is achieved by negotiating a »working consensus« (Strauss 1971; Fine 2001). In the contemporary debate on norms, the need to analyze the interdependence of norms is recognized by the contributors to the rational choice approach: »norms do not exist in splendid isolation; instead they are linked in various ways to other norms« (Hechter & Opp 2001: 401). Furthermore, some empirical studies investigate the impact of conflicting values due to different systems of norms on organizational commitment (e.g. Hult 2003). Thus, the idea of interdependent norms is closely associated with normative conflicts.

The thesis of the interdependence of norms is greatly elaborated within social rule system theory (Burns & Flam 1987). Following this theory, the implementation of social rule systems and changes in them are the object of struggles between agents who regulate differences in interests. According to Burns and Flam, »rules reflect in large part the crystallization of power exercised in establishing and developing the particular rule systems« (Burns & Flam: 75, 79). They are designated as »grammas of social domination« with different types of roles for the distinct groups of actors. Both – different roles performed by actors and the discrepancies in power associated with them – may lead to the formation of contradictory rule systems that provoke conflicts.

Thus, social rule system theory provides us with two important contributions to the understanding of the interdependence of norms. First, the process of the emergence of norms is connected with conflicts when competitive norms come into play within one system.[11] Therefore, following this approach, norms are embedded in the system of interdependent, partly competitive norms. Second, this theory elucidates situations in which competitive norms may come out within one system: every group of involved actors may refer to different norms, in order to assert their own position. Additionally, in the course of my empirical study I was able to identify further factors explaining the emergence of conflicting norms within one work organization. It is related to a situation in which a newly introduced norm is inconsistent with already existing norms. This phenomenon can be grasped by the dual interrelation of structure and action – a theoretical framework clarifying emergent qualities of normative structure.

Emergent qualities of normative structure

The concept of the dual interrelation of structure and action may be found in the structuration theory of Giddens or in the micropolitical theory (Giddens 1984; Ortmann 1988). In my approach it serves to illustrate two aspects: First, how available normative structures influence the emergence of new normative structures (existing norms create a framework for actions, so that the process of constructing new norms can be started), and second, how new normative structures are estab-

11 In this regard, my view of norms differs from the assumptions of classic rational choice theories and game perspectives. In their interpretation, norms are understood as a coordination instrument that imposes restrictions to non-cooperative behavior of individuals. Therefore, they connect the genesis of norms with the establishment of a normative consensus. Following social rule system theory, I claim that a normative consensus is just momentary, since norms result from ongoing power struggles. It is presumed that norms need to be negotiated on a constant basis.

lished (newly emerging norms).[12] In this way, the concept of the dual interrelation of structure and action provides us not only with knowledge about emergent qualities of normative structure, but it is also linked with the idea of interdependence of norms. I differentiate between two types of norms that were identified in the context of work organizations. On the one hand, there are norms which are strongly correlated to organizational structure (I designate them as indirect existing norms). For example, a developed hierarchy in the work organization will result in the preservation of a norm of inequality. On the other hand, the second type of norms presumes a process of the emergence of work norms resulting from interactions between distinct groups of actors through communicating, negotiating and learning. These norms may be exemplified by newly emerging work norms initiated by managerial decisions, and I designate them as direct operational norms. At the same time, both types of norms are interdependent. Indirect existing norms provide actors with a framework for the negotiation of newly emerging work norms. Therefore, direct operational norms are activated by means of interpretative schemes resulting from indirect existing norms. In turn, newly emerging work norms may change already existing norms that are related to organizational structure.

In summary, the first type of norms turns out to be the footing that provides actors with a framework for starting a process of constructing new norms. The second type of norms exemplifies newly emerging norms that are practically applied in a concrete situation. At the same time, both groups are intertwined in the dual interrelation of structure and action. It turns out to be important to differentiate between indirect existing norms related to organizational structure and direct operational norms practically applied for the explanation of normative conflicts that emerge

12 When linking norms to the concept of structure, it is important to differentiate between distinct theoretical traditions. Here, norms as structures are understood not as constraints on human behavior, as assumed in classic rational choice theory or game theories, but rather, following the ethnomethodological approach, they are flexible guidance instructions for actions.

when competitive norms are identified in one setting. In the following, I will provide an empirical example from my case study where a norm resulting from a managerial decision is inconsistent with indirect existing norms related to the organizational structure of the work organization.

An empirical example: the introduction of the rotation system

Description of the study

The focus on how norms are interrelated in the course of their implementation is embedded in the general research question of my study on the emergence of norms. The topic is exemplified by the system of interdependent work norms. This means that I investigate emerging work norms by their interrelation to other types of norms, e.g. professional norms or justice norms. In the course of my empirical study I combined participant observation and semi-structured interviewing. Bringing together both methods promotes a fuller understanding of my research question through the comparison of doing (information gained from observations) and talking (reflections of actors expressed in interviews).

The research question is illustrated on the basis of several case studies conducted at hotels of the same international chain. In my study I attempted to identify recent changes in the operation of hotels that were connected to the introduction of new organizational rules. The focus of my observations was on contradictions and the clash of different norms, explicit or latent, designated as conflicts. Afterwards, I conducted interviews about the observed situations regarding the introduction of organizational rules. Here it was important to get the interpretation of those situations from three major groups of actors involved in the hotels' organization: First, managers who initiate and give instructions for changing organizational rules; second, supervisors who control work operation and the implementation of organizational rules; and third, employees who apply these changes. In the following, I will limit my analysis to the case of one international chain hotel in Germany which empirically demonstrates the thesis of the interdependence of norms.

Empirical field: the characteristics of the international chain hotel in Germany

The investigated hotel belongs to the category of luxury business hotels in a large city in Germany. It has 380 rooms with price rates varying between 220 and 8,500 Euros. With regard to its position on the market, the hotel has a long history and an established reputation. It is an attractive employer for beginners of professional careers in the hospitality business. Getting a job at this hotel is considered evidence of good qualifications. Personnel reserve here consists of a large number of trainees who complete an internship during vocational education. The studied hotel receives more applications for jobs than it actually can employ and therefore does not face the problem of labor shortage due to recruitment difficulties.[13]

The configuration of positions at the hotel includes four levels. At the top are key managerial positions such as general director and executive manager. At a lower level are distinct departments which are headed by the managers of the middle level. The biggest departments are operating departments, i.e. those which provide guests with services: the housekeeping department, the food & beverage department together with the kitchen, and the front office. These departments were the focus of my empirical study. In the following, I will concentrate on the housekeeping department in which the rotation system of work was introduced. Additionally, there are a number of departments that fulfil a supportive function towards operational departments, i.e. they provide resources necessary for the operation of the hotel. These include, for example, the purchasing department, the human resources department, the accounting department, and the public relations and sales department. Since the hotel has been in operation for many years, it has a high proportion of permanent staff, including departmental heads. The positions of top-

13 It is worth noting that the staff situation is different at small German hotels which often experience serious recruitment difficulties because of labor shortage.

managers, however, are subject to fluctuation more often than the positions of the middle management. This causes considerable changes in the management style of the hotel.

The studied hotel was not fully staffed during the time of my research stay. The shortage of personnel resulted from the policy of the top-management to reduce the number of staff as a consequence of the financial crisis. For example, in the housekeeping department, of 25 positions of room attendants available according to the budget, only twenty positions were occupied during my research. A large part of work in the housekeeping department is accomplished by means of personnel from an outside cleaning company. The management of the housekeeping department has a long history of cooperation with the outsourcing company. Employees from the outside are paid not by the hour but by the number of rooms cleaned. It allows the supervisors and managers of the housekeeping department to control the quality of rendered services. Additionally, the cleaning company has its own supervisors who check the work of their personnel in the first place. Only afterwards is the room checked by the supervisor from the permanent staff of the hotel. Generally, the practice of hiring casual staff from outsourcing companies characterizes the labor market of low qualified employees in the hotel industry of Germany. It allows managers to bring about a shift to flexible employment and to reduce personnel costs.

With regard to the organizational structure, the hotel is characterized by many hierarchical levels. Practitioners of the hotel industry state that hierarchical structures generally prevail in the organization of the hotel industry:

> As for the structure at a hotel, there are real hierarchies, perhaps even more than in other firms. You start small and at the bottom, and then you go up. As you go up, someone else is beneath you whom you trample on. You are trampled on again by someone from above, but you trample on someone below. This is the case at many hotels (Expert Interview No. 4).

Hierarchical structures are inevitably connected with status differences. In the case of hotels it is intensified by the obligation to wear a uniform which symbolizes a certain status (e.g. Whyte 1948: 12, 33). Hierarchical structures result in the formation of two internal labor markets at hotels – for low skilled workforce and highly qualified employees, whereas mobility between these two markets is limited (Durst 1993: 103). For example, promotions for room attendants are in most cases possible only within the housekeeping department, and even at large chain hotels the number of such promotions is low (Hieming et al. 2005: 162). In this context, the idea of careers in the hotel industry as an open road to the top, which is often put forward by the management as a motivation tool, cannot be applied to all groups of employees. Another example of inequality at hotels concerns the position of guests with an ascribed privileged status. Therefore, rank differences are established not only between the different groups of personnel, but also between employees and guests. Furthermore, the hierarchical organizational structure generally contributes to the establishment of low solidarity at hotels. Status characteristics limit the field of actions, which are strictly subordinated to the logic of hierarchy and underlie the restricted voice-possibilities of employees. In the following, I will use a concrete example to illustrate how the organizational structure of a developed hierarchy facilitate the establishment of the norm of inequality and how this complicates the introduction of the rotation system associated, in turn, with the norms of cooperation and equality.

The Example of Introducing the Rotation System

Conflict potential

The case is about the introduction of a structural change of organizing work operation in the housekeeping department of the German hotel. Before the introduction of the new organizational rule, room attendants – at least the group of permanent personnel – were assigned to a certain section on one floor. This practice may be designated as the system of fixed sections, i.e. they used to clean the same rooms every day. This was altered for the rotation system by the distribution of work tasks: now room attendants were supposed to clean different rooms every time. In

this regard, both the group of permanent staff and the group of personnel from the outside cleaning company got similar ways to organize work flow – according to the rotation principle.

This change was based on the decision of the departmental head, who was able to make the decision without confirmation by the top-management. The autonomy in making this decision is explained by the fact that such changes do not comprise a money factor, and therefore the decision of how to organize work operation is delegated to the level of departments. The arguments the departmental head offers in favor of the new organizational rule are, to a great extent, consistent with the formal organizational discourse of the hotel. The housekeeping manager introduced this change under the motto »teamwork instead of individual work« (from the informal conversation with the housekeeping manager). The orientation towards teamwork is in line with the company's policy of setting lean structures in the organization of hotels belonging to the chain. It means that the introduction of the rotation system is aimed at reducing competitiveness among employees and facilitating cooperation and equality. Room attendants are supposed to understand that the profit of the hotel results not from cleaning separately allocated rooms but from the common product created at the hotel: »money from one and the same pot« (ibid). Another point made by the departmental head was that the quality of cleaning increases when different room attendants get an impression of the same room. On the one hand, employees identifying deficits of work done by their colleagues may learn from each other. On the other hand, employees indignant about the behavior of those who work unthoroughly may develop sanctions against ›black sheep‹. In this case, the manager hopes to reduce control inputs within the department under the condition that employees check on each other.

In addition to the mentioned arguments of the departmental head in favor of the change, a conflict potential related to the established internal hierarchies can be indentified. From interviews and informal conversations with employees and supervisors it turned out that frequent conflict situations between room attendants had preceded the introduction of the rotation system:

> Some believed that they are better than others and there was a lot of fuss about this which is in fact nonsense. Everyone has strong and weak points (from the informal conversation with the supervisor).

The background of this conflict is related to the fact that room attendants who have been working at the hotel for a long time feel superior towards other employees, in particular towards those from the outside cleaning company. The system of fixed sections allowed employees with long job tenures to demonstrate the high quality of their completed work which, at the same time, for them served as a criterion of their superiority. In this way they constructed the internal hierarchy among the different groups of room attendants which inevitably resulted in frequent conflicts.

Thus, an important reason that leads to the introduction of a new organizational rule in this case turns out to be the necessity to regulate the conflict situation within the department in which such established internal hierarchies exist. In the following, I will depict the responses of employees to the introduction of the rotation system.

Sanctioning behavior of employees in the context of interdependent norms

The reactions of employees to the introduction of the rotation system varied, depending upon their job tenure. Room attendants who were new or had been working at the hotel for a middle-length term (2-5 years) tended to accept the change without problems. Those who had been employed at the hotel for a longer period of time tended to resist the change. For example, a room attendant with a long job tenure believes, in contrast to the departmental head, that the rotation system impedes providing the good quality of cleaning rooms. What seems to be more important, her reasoning about the changed rule comprises clear indicators of the construction of a hierarchy between room attendants who work on a permanent basis and casual staff from the outside cleaning company:

> We have also an outside company here. And they don't do things like we do, they don't work like we do. They are also not there every day. One will be here and there. I think it suffers from this a little bit. Not everybody does this the same way. I think it's a pity – that's what I have said (Interview N09_HK14).

The stressed »we and they« hierarchy points out the informally established norms of inequality between employees. This can be explained by the fact that by their interpretations of norms room attendants with long job tenures tend to repeat and confirm organizational structures that facilitate inequality. They reproduce hierarchies at the level of employees and informally try to establish the norm of inequality in social relations between different groups. However, the introduction of the rotation system deprives the room attendants with long job tenures of an instrument to demonstrate their superiority and puts them on the same level with employees from the outside cleaning company. Therefore, the norms of cooperation and equality associated with the rotation system simultaneously presume the infraction of the established norm of inequality in social relations between room attendants.

Generally, this case illustrates that, under the influence of hierarchical organizational structures at the hotel, the norm of inequality tends to be constructed and provides appropriate interpretative schemes for the actors. Therefore, the norm of inequality at the investigated hotel turns out to serve for employees as a framework for the construction of other norms. It means that a certain group of actors, e.g. room attendants with long job tenures, interpret other norms while taking »rank inequality« as a starting point. In turn, this may explain why the introduction of the new organizational rule by the department head does not receive positive feedback from them but rather leads to a sanctioning behavior by these employees. The rotation system resulting from the managerial decision presumes the norms of cooperation and equality which contradict the norm of inequality established under the organizational structures of the hotel. Thus, the context of the hotel and the appropriate norm of inequality are inconsistent with the norms of cooperation and equality. This inevitably leads to a conflict between competitive norms within a work

organization that is, in turn, connected with the resistance of employees to the new organizational rule. Their hostile reactions could be understood as sanctioning behavior within a system of competitive norms when the implementation of norms of cooperation and equality would mean the infraction of established inequality norms related to internal hierarchies. Employees impose sanctions by refusing to follow contradictory norms. Therefore, a system of competitive norms provokes sanctioning behavior on the part of employees.

The case of the introduction of the rotation system illustrates very well that different groups of norms may co-exist in one setting. On the one hand, there may be identified norms that are established under the influence of organizational structures. On the other hand, in the course of my study I also observed norms that directly result from managerial decisions but are inconsistent with given organizational structures. In my empirical case, both groups of norms come into conflict.

In the following section I will concentrate on the analysis of the interdependence of norms. I will illustrate how managerial decisions contrasted existing professional norms and how justice norms at the hotel lead to the emergence of competitive norms. Here, the introduction of additional types of norms into the analysis of the case is worth explaining. On the one hand, this is in line with my approach to norms as a constellation of interdependent, partly competitive norms. It presumes that operational norms in a work organization are not isolated but related to further norms. On the other hand, the contradictions between different types of norms can be particularly well illustrated by contrasting direct operational norms with indirect existing norms related to given organizational structures, such as professional norms.

Professional norm of flexibility

Work organizations and corresponding systems of norms are not isolated but embedded in a context of further norms. For example, the environment of large chain hotels comprises specific professional norms. In the following, I will elucidate inconsistencies between the professional norm of flexibility and the direct operational norm resulting from mana-

gerial decisions that lead to the emergence of a system of competitive norms within one work organization.

The knowledge of professional norms in the industry of large international chain hotels may provide new insights for the analysis of the introduction of the rotation system at the German hotel. Professional norms seem to be strongly formed under the influence of organizational structures observed at hotels. They have a strong impact on interpretative schemes which are used for the negotiation of newly emerging work norms. Therefore, they may be considered norms that create a framework for starting the construction process of newly emerging work norms.

As mentioned before, empirically observed professional norms may be matched and, to a great extent, explained by typical organizational structures of international chain hotels. This can be well illustrated by one of the most developed professional norms at hotels – the norm of flexibility related to a frequent change of jobs. In the following I will argue that its establishment is strongly influenced by the conditions of low wages and high turnover rates in the hotel industry. At the same time, it is interesting that in organizational discourses the norm of flexibility is often justified by the need of ›gaining experience‹. As one expert interviewee claims, work experience at different houses is an important element of a career in the hotel industry. Simultaneously, the respondent emphasizes some degree of irrationality of the norm of flexibility connected with additional costs for frequent re-employment and training:

> It is mostly a problem for the enterprises, because certainly they have to train new employees, and it costs. But on the other hand, it is also demanded, partially. This is contradictory in itself. After vocational training it is common to work in several different hotels in order to gain experience (Expert Interview No. 4).

This ambivalence in the interpretation of the professional norm of flexibility calls into question whether it is only for gaining experience, as proclaimed in the organizational discourses. I assume that the prevalence of the norm of flexibility may be further explained in interrelation to the

organizational structures of hotels. On the one hand, for the group of employees the norm of flexibility mitigates the negative consequences of the level of low payment because the frequent change of jobs allows them to gain increases in salary. On the other hand, for the group of managers the norm of flexibility seems to legitimize the high turnover rates in the hotel industry which, in reality, are related to low payment and difficult work conditions. The frequency of guests' visits can hardly be planned: it is not arranged in the form of long-term contracts but rather proceeds through individual contingent requests. Thus, the unpredictable character of hotel operation makes hotels, to a high degree, dependent on the occupancy rate and economic cycles. These characteristics result in the establishment of practices of temporary staffing. At the same time, flexibility in the behavior of employees at the workplace, i.e. flexibility as a norm, is expected both with regard to working time and in interactions with guests. The latter is connected with a prevailing situation-dependent form of decision making when decisions are often supposed to be made in the course of direct interactions with guests. Additionally, the system of guests' needs at luxury hotels is expected to be so complex that it is hard to anticipate and, therefore, to formalize a wide spectrum of services. Altogether, these features point out the situational dependence of hotels – their specific structural condition that facilitates the norm of flexibility in different aspects of hotel operation.

Furthermore, the organizational structure influencing the expansion of the norm of flexibility may explain why low significance is attached to solidarity at chain hotels. To summarize briefly, the polarized personnel structure – meaning that both qualified and not-qualified employees are involved in the operation of hotels – work inputs in the form of soft skills that are difficult to measure, and prevailing individualized contracts may explain the low level of unionization in the hotel industry. Taken together, these structural conditions seem to impede the development of solidarity among employees.

Thus, the investigated hotel is a work organization with strong hierarchically determined constraints that, due to the particularities of work operation, requires the professional norm of flexibility. At the same time,

it is characterized by low group solidarity, which is intensified by the expansion of the norm of flexibility, when the frequent change of workplaces does not allow employees to identify themselves with one work organization. In the following, I will attempt to identify justice norms that are in line with given organizational structures and related professional norms of the investigated hotel.

The system of professional norms, justice norms and direct operational norms

The role of justice norms cannot be neglected, since they have the character of a generalized expectation imposed by the environment. Work organizations are confronted with this expectation and have to adjust to it. As my empirical evidence proves, different groups of actors frequently apply to justice norms in the course of negotiating the content of newly emerging work norms. In this connection, I will concentrate on the justice norms which are apparent at the investigated hotel. I will examine what kinds of justice norms are formed under the influence of the organizational structure. Furthermore, I will investigate if competitive justice norms can be identified. For this purpose, I will compare justice norms related to professional norms and justice norms associated with managerial decisions.

For my analysis of justice norms I will follow the classification of Wegener (1995). At the level of society, he differentiates between four justice ideologies and related justice norms: First individualism; second etatism; third ascriptivism; forth fatalism. An individualistic justice norm is characterized by social inequality and distributive principles according to market mechanisms. Therefore, competition orientation and work performance as a belief that a person has his or her own impact on making progress in life are inherent to this type of norm. At firms, individualism presumes that hierarchically determined constraints are weak and group solidarity is low (Wegener & Liebig 2000: 184). Etatism is considered to be the opposite of individualism because it presumes the intervention of the state in the distribution of goods. This justice norm is often combined with egalitarian principles such as equal opportunities in line with the individual needs of group members. At the firm level,

Lengfeld and Liebig designate the justice norm of etatism as collectivism which is characterized by strong group ties but less by developed hierarchical constraints than ascriptivism (Lengfeld & Liebig 2002: 253). In ascriptivism, the social order is defined through given social positions and rigid rule systems. At the firm level, it takes the shape of a justice norm with strong group ties and strong hierarchical structures (ibid). Fatalism tends to be identified in societies where actors show weak solidarity among groups as well as where there is a developed hierarchical organization of social positions. The members of such societies »blame the ›system‹ for their unfortunate situations. Feeling they are at the mercy of a society that denies them justice, they tend to accept their situation *fatalistically*« (Wegener 2003: 214, italics in the original). At the firm level, this justice ideology is close to the norm of bureaucratism:

> only high-ranking company officials are granted legitimate decision-making authority, they have the ultimate power to define what is considered just. The ideology is thus also characterized by an element of fatalism (Lengfeld & Liebig 2002: 252-253).

Thus, it turns out that in organizations with a developed hierarchy authorities tend to influence the interpretation of justice norms to a great extent.

Now let us have a look at how this classification of justice norms can be applied to the investigated hotel. The professional norm of flexibility is associated with individualistic justice norms. This is inherent to the nature of market-oriented firms such as large chain hotels. The norm of flexibility presumes that actors believe that success in their career directly depends on their own input. For example, promotions at large chain hotels are supposed to be the result of good work. At the same time, the personality of employees and their soft skills will be appreciated more than their qualifications regarding education and work experience:

> a receptionist does not need to have experience, he is only supposed to be able to treat people well, to enjoy working with people, to be able to smile. We can teach the rest (Interview N09_FO21).

In this regard, one can identify the idea, at least frequently mentioned in the organizational discourse of hotels, that reaching higher positions is possible even with minimal human capital if one demonstrates good work results. However, if employees do not have a feeling of being encouraged for their input, their preferred strategy is to choose an exit-option and to change the workplace. This behavioral pattern is legitimized by the norm of flexibility which impedes the formation of self-identification with one concrete work organization. Therefore, the belief in one's own progress in life and career success in combination with low group solidarity observed at the hotel indicate the established individualistic justice norm.

However, there is one characteristic in the structure of the investigated work organization that is inconsistent with the understanding of hierarchy within a firm according to the individualistic justice norm. As discussed in the previous sections, strong hierarchy and rank inequality can be identified at the investigated hotel, whereas weak hierarchically determined constraints are supposed to characterize the context of individualistic justice norms. This serves as evidence that individualistic justice norms co-exist with some other justice norms. For example, weak group solidarity together with a developed hierarchical organization of social positions may indicate those fatalistic justice norms that are designated as the norm of bureaucratism in work organizations. Therefore, parallel to individualistic justice norms the norms of bureaucratism are apparent at the hotel. When comparing to what extent they are consistent or competitive, it turns out that they are not much different: both presume inequality and do not imply high solidarity among employees. However, in work organizations where the norm of bureaucratism is apparent, hierarchical authorities have strong influence on the interpretation of justice norms, whereas individualistic justice norms would rather be associated with more leeway in the negotiation of justice norms between managers and employees. Thus, at the investigated hotel the norm of bureaucratism and the individualistic justice norm are formed under the influence of given organizational structures and do not lead to

conflicts but rather supplement each other. In this regard, one may state that these norms are only partly competitive.

However, inconsistency between justice norms turns out to be serious in the case of the introduction of the rotation system with the purpose to facilitate more cooperation and equality. This norm, based on a managerial decision, seems to be in line with egalitarian justice norms. However, the latter cannot be related to any organizational structures of the investigated hotel. Instead, egalitarianism completely contradicts the individualistic justice norm and the norm of bureaucratism. For this reason, in the case of the introduction of the rotation system, we can witness the formation of a system with a number of competitive norms. I assume that contradictions between the indirect existing norms related to given organizational structures and the direct operational norms resulting from managerial decisions significantly impede the acceptance of the change in the work organization.

Normative conflicts may serve as an explanation of difficulties connected with the introduction of new organizational rules. Therefore, taking into account existing organizational structures and corresponding norms in the course of the implementation of changes may be of practical importance for managers in work organizations. A classic explanation in sociological debates on hostile reactions of employees to the introduction of new organizational rules is related to the idea of routines (e.g. Giddens 1984). Routines allow employees to identify themselves with their work situation and, therefore, provide them with emotional stability. Changes in work operations disrupt established routines. Additional efforts of employees for the construction of new routines result in resistance to changes. A further explanation elaborated in this study stresses the emergence of normative conflicts when a newly introduced norm is inconsistent with already existing norms. A system with competitive norms results in sanctioning behavior of the employees who resist following contradictory norms.

At the theoretical level, this phenomenon may illustrate a shift to considering double interrelation between structure and action for the depiction of newly emerging norms and the analysis of contradictory norms in one

setting. This presumes that I supplement the thesis of the interdependence of partly competitive norms with one more explanatory factor. On the one hand, the groups of actors, in the course of negotiating the content of a norm, may simultaneously refer to different norms. On the other hand – and this is the message of my paper – competitive norms emerge if indirect existing norms that are related to prevailing organizational structures and provide actors with interpretative schemes are inconsistent with introduced direct operational norms.

Conclusion

Rethinking the concept of sanctioning does not mean that its role for understanding norm-following behavior should be completely neglected. Rather, it seems to be important to bring the concept of sanctioning closer to the diversity of empirical evidence which demonstrates that norms are not isolated but interdependent. Within a system of competitive norms, sanctioning behavior turns out to be the strategy of employees who cannot simultaneously follow contradictory norms.

Additionally, sanctioning in interrelation to norms appears to be a complex phenomenon. In this context, the question arises whether one can regard sanctions as an integral characteristic of norms. This issue has to be considered in the case of identifying empirical indicators of norms. Can we automatically speak of norms if responses to deviant behavior are observed in the form of sanctioning? But this means that we would ignore norms which are not supported by sanctions or cases where sanctioning is not easy to follow. At the same time, it seems to be important to extend the understanding of sanctioning behavior, particularly in organizational contexts where interactional groups, both managers and employees, may impose sanctions. This assumption is based on the idea that the emergence of norms results from ongoing power struggles between different groups in order to regulate differences in interests.

In summary, due to its multidimensional nature it turns out that sanctioning could be considered as a separate object of examination. For empirical research on norms it is difficult to regard sanctioning as a definitional attribution of norms and a major empirical measure. One pos-

sible way to investigate the interrelation between norms and sanctions could be to depict sanctioning as a mechanism that is flexibly applied by different groups of actors in the course of the emergence of norms.

References

Beckert, Jens 2002: *Beyond the market. The social foundations of economic efficiency*. Princeton

Burns, Tom R. and Helena Flam 1987: *The shaping of social organization. Social rule system theory with applications*. London

Coleman, James S. 1990: *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, Mass.

Durkheim, Émile 1933: *The division of labour in society*. New York

Durkheim, Émile 1950: *The rules of sociological method*. Glencoe, Ill.

Durst, Anneliese 1993: *Bedienen zwischen dienen und verdienen. Eine berufssoziologische empirische Untersuchung zur Dienstleistungsarbeit im Gastgewerbe*. Bielefeld

Esser, Hartmut 2000: *Soziologie. Spezielle Grundlagen*. Vol. 5: *Institutionen*. Frankfurt/Main

Fine, Gary Alan 2001: Enacting norms. Mushrooming and the culture of expectations and explanations. *Social Norms*. New York, edited by Michael Hechter and Karl-Dieter Opp: 139-164

Garfinkel, Harold 1959: Aspects of the problem of common-sense knowledge of social structures. *Transactions of the Fourth World Congress of Sociology*. Vol. 4: *The sociology of knowledge*, edited by Kurt Wolff: 51-65

Garfinkel, Harold 1976: *Studies in ethnomethodology*. New Jersey

Giddens, Anthony 1976: *New rules of sociological method. A positive critique of interpretative sociologies*. London

Giddens, Anthony 1984: *The constitution of society. Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley

Gloy, Klaus 1975: *Sprachnormen I. Linguistische und soziologische Analysen*. Stuttgart

Hechter, Michael and Karl-Dieter Opp 2001: What have we learned about the emergence of social norms? *Social Norms*. New York, edited by idem: 394-415

Hieming, Bettina et al. 2005: *Stellenbesetzungsprozesse im Bereich »einfacher« Dienstleistungen. Abschlussbericht einer Studie im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Arbeit*. Berlin No. 550 (17.11.2008)

http://www.bmwi.de/BMWi/Navigation/Service/publikationen,did=107898.html

Horne, Christine 2001: Sociological perspective on the emergence of norms. *Social norms*. New York, edited by Michael Hechter and Karl-Dieter Opp: 3-34

Hult, Carl 2003: Organizational commitment and conflicting values: the impact of systems of norms in six western countries. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* (44): 408-443

Lengfeld, Holger and Stefan Liebig 2002: Industrial relations and justice ideologies in the firm: A justice-based explanation of work council effectiveness. *Social Justice Research* (15): 245-270

Liebig, Stefan 1997: *Soziale Gerechtigkeitforschung und Gerechtigkeit in Unternehmen*. Munich

Lindenberg, Siegwart 2006: Prosocial behavior, solidarity, and framing processes. *Solidarity and prosocial behavior. An integration of sociological and psychological perspectives*. New York, edited by Detlef Fetchenhauer et al.: 23-44

Lindenberg, Siegwart 2008: Social norms. What happens when they become more abstract? *Rational Choice. Theoretische Analysen und empirische Resultate*. Wiesbaden, edited by Andreas Diekmann et al.: 63-82

Ortmann, Günther 1988: Macht, Spiel, Konsens. *Mikropolitik. Rationalität und Spiele in Organisationen*. Opladen, edited by Willi Küpper and Günther Ortmann: 20-23

Parsons, Talcott 1937: *The structure of social action*. New York

Parsons, Talcott 1952: *The social system*. New York

Popitz, Heinrich 1980: *Die normative Konstruktion von Gesellschaft*. Tübingen

Popitz, Heinrich 2006: *Soziale Normen*. Frankfurt/Main

Strauss, Anselm et al. 1971: The hospital and its negotiated order. *Decisions, organizations and society*. London, edited by Francis G. Castles et al.:103-123

Voss, Thomas 2001: Game-theoretical perspectives on the emergence of social norms. *Social norms*. New York, edited by Michael Hechter and Karl-Dieter Opp: 105-136

Wegener, Bernd 1995: Gerechtigkeitstheorie und empirische Gerechtigkeitsforschung. *Soziale Ungleichheit und soziale Gerechtigkeit*. Opladen, edited by Hans-Peter Müller and Bernd Wegener: 195-218

Wegener, Bernd 2003: Solidarity, justice, and social change. Germany's ten years of unification. *Political culture in Post-Communist Europe. Attitudes in new democracies*. Aldershot, edited by Detlef Pollack et al.: 207-233

Wegener, Bernd and Stefan Liebig 2000: Is the »Inner Wall« here to stay? Justice ideologies in unified Germany. *Social Justice Research* (13): 177-197

Whyte, William Foote 1948: *Human relations in the restaurant industry*. New York

Stability and threat to the order of the church

Some thoughts on the personalization of the church in Late Antiquity[14]

Jan-Markus Kötter

»The See of the Holy Apostle Peter has never granted the Alexandrian Peter communion, nor will it ever do so.«[15] When Pope Felix III used these words in conversation with Emperor Zeno to express his rejection of Peter Mongus, the Bishop of Alexandria, he was at the same time referring to a progressed personalization within the order of the church in Late Antiquity. By comparing the Apostle Peter with Peter Mongus, the Pope gave a distinctly personalized image to the two dogmatic groups of his days, Chalcedonians and Miaphysites: Felix did not confront Zeno with a choice between the Church of Rome or that of Alexandria, with the alternatives of the Chalcedonian Creed and *heresy*;[16] he presented the Emperor with a choice between two persons.

14 This article is based on the lecture »Der Einfluss des Todes kirchlicher Akteure auf die Entwicklung der Reichskirche der Spätantike«, given on 10th February 2010 at the 2nd Annual Seminar of the *Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology*. Whereas the paper concentrated on personalization as a threat to order, subsequent discussion of the topic made it apparent that personalization also could establish order. In the following I shall attempt a synthesis of both points of view.

15 Coll.Berol.33 (81, 20-22): »sedem beati apostoli Petri Alexandrino Petro […] communionis numquam uel praebuisse uel praebituram esse consensum«. On the letters of Pope Felix to Emperor Zeno cf. Caspar's as of yet unsurpassed analysis Caspar 1933: 26-43.

16 *Orthodoxy* and *heresy* are relative terms. No protagonist of the church would ever have labelled himself a *heretic*. Both categories are depen

For the Pope, the two Peters fulfilled two entirely different functions. This transcends the mere establishment of a personalization of opinions within the church in Late Antiquity: While the Apostle Peter is seen by Felix as the guarantor of the *orthodox* tradition by the Church of Rome, Peter Mongus is regarded as betraying this *true faith*. While from a Roman point of view the Apostle Peter was an important factor of stabilization for the normative order of the church, Peter Mongus was a source of division and trouble, a factor of destabilization: His *heresy* threatened the order of the church.

What, then, did the personalization of church structures in Late Antiquity lead to: to greater stability or to a permanent threat to the church? To have it right away: A decision between these two shall not be attempted here. Historical evidence argues for personalization being capable of fulfilling both functions. However, the question arises which of the two functions prevailed in a given situation. Regarding the ambivalence of the phenomenon, the problem of the relation between the two potential effects of the personalization is still to be solved. How is it describable that concentrating on certain persons could be an element both of stabilizing and threatening the order of the church?

To solve this question, by way of example, we will look at the first phase of the reception of the Synod of Chalcedon until the start of the Acacian Schism in 484.[17] A short chronological outline is meant to shed light on how the personalization of the order could manifest itself at all. Based thereupon, in a more general theoretical analysis, the mechanisms of the formation of normative ecclesiastical orders will be scrutinized. In the course of describing these mechanisms, personalization will be accorded its specific place within the processes of the creation/stabilization and the threat/destabilization of the order of the church. In a final con-

---

dent on the point of view of the person ascribing them. Thus, in the following both categories will be placed in Italics.

17 A broad overview on the differentiated history of the Acacian Schism cannot be given here. For an in-depth insight please see Schwartz 1934: 161-210, as well as my own doctoral thesis, which is in preparation.

clusion, an attempt towards a synthesis of the two differrent modes of functionality of personalization will be undertaken, thereby divesting them of their seeming contrariness.

Personalization and the failure of the reception of Chalcedon

A number of dogmatic-hierarchical conflicts, entangled with each other in various ways, led to controversy regarding the reception of the Synod of Chalcedon in 451, particularly with respect to the triad of the Churches of Rome, Constantinople and Alexandria. These conflicts reached a climax in the years from 482 to 484 when Bishop Acacius of Constantinople acknowledged Peter Mongus, an anti-Chalcedonian, as Bishop of Alexandria, while Rome attempted to install the Chalcedonian candidate John Talaia.[18] It was this matter of personnel within the Egyptian church leading to the churches of Rome and Constantinople falling out with one another. This resulted in a disruption of the unity of the church, the so-called Acacian Schism, which was to last until 519.

It is telling that it was a dispute about persons, here about Mongus and Talaia, which was the cause for this disruption of unity. The dogmatic-hierarchical conflicts in the years after 451 had taken on a strong personal character: conflicts between individuals and about individuals. The Synod of Chalcedon had failed at solving the long-smoldering controversy on the description of the relationship between »God the Father« and »God the Son«.[19] This debate was closely linked to the hierarchic

18 The acceptance of Mongus by Acacius took place on the basis of Emperor Zeno's Henoticon, which was to become one of the central topics of discussion in the following years. On the developments surrounding Mongus and Talaia, which also possessed political implications Pietri 1987: 277-295.

19 Especially Alexandria and Antioch carried out their disputes in conspicuous severity, not without repeatedly involving Rome. In the course of the contentions two – generally refuted – extreme positions emerged: Nestorius of Constantinople emphasized the separation of the two natures of Christ, whereas the monk Eutyches preached the extensive identity of »God the Father« and »God the Son«. For an overview on dogmatic history Bienert 1997: 206-224.

claims by the bishops of the different main churches of the Empire. In the continuation of the Christological controversy after Chalcedon the personalization of dogmatic and hierarchical positions within the church gained more and more prominence.

Hereby the Church of Rome distinguished itself by a particular interest in the dogmatic decisions of Chalcedon, particularly as their content and form had to a large extent been directly taken from a letter of instruction from Pope Leo to his colleague Flavian of Constantinople.[20] Thus, it is by no means astonishing that in the discussion on Chalcedon this so called tomus Leonis – and with it Leo himself – virtually became synonymous with the synod. At least it was him who provided the foundation of the decrees of faith in 451. Furthermore, he was particularly responsible for the ascription of *heretical* tenets to prominent members of the Eastern church, especially to Bishop Dioscorus of Alexandria who, as a result, had been relieved of his office at Chalcedon.[21] As the Chalcedonian dogma served a Roman tradition, one was hardly to expect that Leo's successor would depart from any of his decisions.

To a large extent, the Popes refused to make any concession regarding the acceptance of the dogma of Chalcedon, due to their strongly personalized understanding of their office: The fact that the Bishops of Rome consistently based their persistence on the legacy of Leo goes to demonstrate that it was not possible for them to recede behind the positions of

20 Tomus Leonis: ACO II,2,1: 24-33; *definitio fidei* of the Synod of Chalcedon: ACO II,1,2: 128-130. The main Chalcedonian tenet of »one […] Christ […] in two natures« explicitly conforms to the Roman positions voiced by Leo.

21 The acceptance of Chalcedon included that of the tomus Leonis, the rejection usually its condemnation. So, ecclesiastic discussion is often only, or mainly, concentrated on the tomus, e.g. in some negotiations between Rome and Alexandria in 497: Coll.Avell. 102. In the course of the Acacian Schism, for Rome the explicit acceptance of Leo and his tomus became a prerequisite for ecclesiastical communion: Coll.Avell. 60,7; 116b,4.

any given precursor in office.[22] The Popes saw themselves as standing in a chain of episcopal succession going back to its founder, the Apostle Peter, and connecting all of his successors and thus all of their own predecessors: It was this chain that guaranteed the unbroken transmission of the *true faith* by the Popes, from the time of St. Peter down to the present.[23] In this view, it was simply impossible that any predecessor had been partisan to *heretical* doctrine. Thus, Leo's profession of faith was also that of St. Peter and, subsequently, that of the Church of Rome itself. Leo's successors had no choice but to defend Chalcedon and, in consequence, their predecessors in office.

This also served the Bishops of Rome to support other bishops defending the Leonic-Roman doctrine of Chalcedon. This was particularly important in Alexandria, where the council encountered massive opposition, leading Chalcedonian patriarchs Proterios, Timothy Salophakiolos and John Talaia to being dependant on the support of the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, as well as on imperial power.[24] Domestic Egyptian opposition made their position tenuous: Proterios was murde-

22 As demonstrated in 514/5 in a letter of Pope Hormisdas to Emperor Anastasius, in which he defended the Roman position of the previous years in general and his predecessor Symmachus in particular, under whom the relationship with the purple had sunk to a new low: »hoc opus supernae clementiae, haec et decessorum nostrorum fuit semper oratio, quos etiam rerum actus paternae traditionis ministros et rectae fidei declarat fuisse custodes« (Coll.Avell. 108,2 [500,14-17]).

23 This led to the impossibility of any criticism of any predecessor in office, as it was the position of these predecessors that avouched their own *orthodoxy*. Within such common ecclesiastical notions the Church of Rome was additionally distinguished by the fact that its bishops styled themselves as ›haeres Petri‹. It was under Pope Siricius at the end of the fourth century that this term virtually became part of the papal nomenclature.

24 On the relationship between Rome and Alexandria see Blaudeau 2006. Rome forbid its allies to make any concessions towards their mutual enemies, cf. Ps.Zach.h.e.4,10 and Coll.Avell.61,3. However, the papacy hereby hardly contributed towards a détente of the situation in Alexandria; cf. also Grillmeier 1990: 8-38.

red in 457, Salophakiolos was interim defrocked and Talaia was forced into exile in 482 after having lost imperial support.

A particular problem for the Chalcedonian bishops lay in the establishment of opposing anti-Chalcedonian hierarchies: In Egypt the expression of dogmatic dissatisfaction with Chalcedon was given voice in a personal form by the investiture of own bishops Dioscorus, Timothy Aelurus and Peter Mongus. Both groups used their opponents' debilities to gain influence for their own respective hierarchies. Thus, Proterios had succeeded Dioscorus, who had been condemned in 451. After the murder of Proterios, the anti-Chalcedonians appointed Aelurus as bishop, who failed to gain Emperor Leon's recognition and was duly replaced by the Chalcedonian Salophakiolos. In the course of troubles in the wake of Emperor Leon's succession, Salophakiolos was temporarily deposed from his see from 475 to 477 in favor of Aelurus, but on the latter's death succeeded in regaining office. However, even before his return to Alexandria his opponents had consecrated Mongus as Aelurus' successor. Mongus then remained in hiding until Talaia, who had succeeded Salophakiolos, on his part lost the support of the capital in 482 and was forced to flee Egypt.[25] So it was obviously situations of personal upheaval that lead to accelerated dynamics concerning church-unrest in Egypt.[26]

Not only the respective own *orthodox* positions were tied to particular individuals, but also divergent positions of doctrine. Hereby, the personalization followed principles similar to those of *orthodoxy*, thus *heresy* being inheritable. Peter Mongus, whom Pope Felix had identified as the opponent of the Apostle Peter – and in consequence also of Pope Leo and of Felix himself – had to be regarded as a *heretic* simply by the fact

25 The state of the sources is fragmentary. Cohesive accounts can be found in Zacharias Rhetor and – partly depending on him – Evagrius: Ps.Zach. h.e.3,10-5,7; Evagr.h.e.2,8-11; 3,11-13.

26 It was by no means incidental that just contended episcopal elections so often led to bloody conflict within respective parishes. The Church of Rome was not except from such altercations, as witnessed by the elections of Damasus (366), Boniface (418) and Symmachus (498).

that he had succeeded Aelurus. The latter was reckoned the successor of Dioscorus, who had been condemned at Chalcedon for supporting the *heretical* teaching of Eutyches, who had opposed the *orthodox* teaching of Leo. Therefore, just as Felix in his role as Bishop of Rome was per se a representative of Leo's *orthodoxy*, in the eyes of Rome Mongus stood for *heresy*. Analogous to the episcopal succession within the Church of Rome, seen as the guarantor of the *true faith*, there arose a genealogy of Eutychian *heretics*, reaching from Eutyches over Dioscorus and Aelurus to Mongus.[27] Persons thus served to dissolve the temporal boundaries of dogmatic-hierarchical controversy.

Thoughts of this type guided the actions of all parties: In a similar manner, the enemies of Rome traced the Roman position back to the second *arch-heretic* of the time, Nestorius. It was his christological teaching on the separation of the natures of God they allegedly retrieved in the tomus Leonis, resulting in them regarding anyone who argued for its acceptation as being a follower of Nestorius and thus a *heretic*.[28] Consequently, the fact that the restoration of the unity between Rome and Constantinople in 519 was accompanied by Leo's inclusion into the diptychs of Constantinople must be regarded as a success for Rome. Simultaneously, we have a condemnation of Rome's opponents, of the opponents of Leo and, in consequence, of the opponents of St. Peter himself. This did not at all take the shape of a concrete refutation of deviant teachings, but rather of simply anathematizing the individuals in question.[29] Through

27 For a classic example see Coll.Berol.34 (83,30-33): »quia dum per synodum Calchedonensem […] Eutychen atque Dioscorum constet esse damnatos et eorum sectatores plurimis illarum partium documentis Timotheus et Petrus extitisse monstrentur«.

28 Cf. the assessment of Chalcedon – and thus of the tomus Leonis – by the moderate (!) anti-Chalcedonian Zacharias Rhetor. He declared that the council in 451 had exacerbated the Nestorian *heresy*: Ps.Zach.h.e.3,1.

29 A good example of extent to which dogmatic positions became personified is to be seen in the Constantinopolitan parish in 518. After the death of anti-Chalcedonian Emperor Anastasius and the succession of Justin, a Chalcedonian, voices were raised demanding Patriarch John to throw the Miaphysite Bishop of Antioch, Severus, out of the church and include

the genealogical transfer of the concepts of *orthodoxy* and *heresy*, the judgment against the Eutychian anti-Chalcedonians had already been pronounced and justified in 451.[30]

In the notion of succession included also a hierarchical component of the disputes on dogma and personnel, concatenating the two levels. It was not merely accidental personal-constellations or historically barely tangible tensions between individual bishops that let these phenomena of personalization gradually gain influence on the level of hierarchy pertaining to the stability and instability of the ecclesiastical order. It is, indeed, hardly deniable that personal tensions between Simplicius of Rome and Acacius of Constantinople contributed to the fact that the estrangement of the two churches could actually result in the schism of 484.[31] And the dynamic changes in the personal situation in Egypt further influenced the course of the reception of Chalcedon. However, the actual structural problem of the personalization of hierarchic claims lay aside of such contingent constellations.

The Church of Constantinople was to feel the effects of this structural problem in form of the Acacian Schism. Acacius had admitted Mongus to the communion. Although the Constantinopolitans so far had been

---

Leo in the diptychs in his stead. Cf. Coll.Sabb.27 (ACO III: 72,5; 75,3). Neither here nor in the subsequent fulfillment of these demands did a discussion of dogmatic positions play any extensive role.

30 One of the fundamental tenets of Rome was to fall back to synodal decisions once these had been taken. As early as 475, Pope Simplicius had ascertained that any renegotiation of the subjects raised by Chalcedon was not only unnecessary, but downright dangerous, as it would open the door to a deluge of new negotiations, only leading to a growing obfuscation of doctrine: Coll.Avell.56,10.

31 Even early on Acacius had shown no particular enthusiasm in relating any proceedings in the East to Rome. In the beginning, Simplicius merely showed himself to be irritated by this fact: Coll.Avell.58,1. However, after having only found out about the acknowledgement of Mongus by a letter of the Emperor and, thus, having only been able to prevent a premature recognition of Talaia at the very last minute (Coll.Avell.68,2-3), the relationship of Acacius with Rome became irrevocably poisoned.

regarded as being Chalcedonians, this provided the Church of Rome with the possibility of declaring Acacius, a hierarchic competitor for the leadership of the church, a *heretic*: Mongus was considered to be a successor of Eutyches; with Acacius now associating himself with Mongus, it was a simple task to brand Acacius on his part as a partisan of Eutyches, too.[32] This engendered a problematical situation particularly for Acacius' successors, as Rome demanded their predecessor's removal from the diptychs of the church. In the personalization of doctrine, the bishops of the capital were now regarded as *heretics* by Rome until they had dissociated themselves from their predecessor Acacius.[33]

It was entirely legitimate to accuse Rome of the fact that the Acacian Schism was merely a controversy on names.[34] In this respect, the dogmatic-hierarchical personalization of positions within the church not only accounted for the casus belli, but also for the duration of the schism. For, just as Rome refused to denounce Pope Leo, the successors of Acacius were not the least inclined to abandon their predecessor. The deletion of Acacius' name from the diptychs would have amounted to an admission of his *heresy*. And within the concept of episcopal succession it was obvious to the bishops of the capital that the burdening of their own episcopal list with a *heretic* would mean a setback for the already contested hierarchical claims of the Church of Constantinople.[35] The main

32 Accordingly, the genealogy of *heretics* from Coll.Berol.34 (cf. note 14) continued up until Acacius.

33 In Coll.Berol.44 (111,27-29) this was made clear to Phrabitas of Constantinople as follows: »ut si mallent beati Petri apostoli communionem fideli corde suscipere, responderent uel se uel dilectionem tuam ab Alexandrini Petri Acaciique deinceps recitatione futuram modis omnibus alienam«.

34 Cf. e.g. Coll.Avell.101,10. The appellation of the schism as the *Acacian* expresses precisely that – »nicht mit Unrecht«, as Schwartz (1934: 161) observes.

35 The importance of maintaining the purity of the own succession is demonstrated in the example of Antioch: As the greatest *heresies* of the church seemed continuously to originate from this city, the Church of Antioch had to cope with a significant loss of influence in the course of

impediment for a rapprochement of the two churches was thus to be found in the person of Acacius – and led to some absurd situations: As the Chalcedonian Bishop Euphemius of Constantinople remained loyal to Acacius, he was not recognized as a bishop by the Roman church – although Rome acknowledged him as being *orthodox*.[36]

The reception of Chalcedon was strongly personified. This was true both for opposing doctrinal positions and for the closely connected question of leadership within the church of the Empire. It should be obvious that the category *person* was one of the fundamental categories of Late-Antique ecclesiastical thinking: The church thought, argued and acted on a personal basis. Insofar, actual individuals as well as the personalization of dogmatic-hierarchical positions strongly influenced both the stability and the instability of the order of the church.

Personalization as stabilization of the church order

The personalization of ecclesiastical positioning not only stabilized the order of the church but, rather, was elementary for such orders to be able to develop at all. The church in Late Antiquity was entirely established on individuals. The fact that it thought, argued and acted in personal categories was closely connected with the outstanding status of the bishops: The ecclesiastical system of Late Antiquity was undoubtedly an Episcopal one.[37]

Though a continuous episcopal succession from the apostles to the present was fictitious – with the monepiscopate only developing in the course of the second century – it had still achieved in permeating ecclesiastical thought in Late Antiquity so completely that the office of a bishop had become a capstone within the church. In the segmentation of

---

the last decades. It was heavily burdened by the condemnation of a number of churchmen it had produced, cf. Grillmeier 2002: 187-192.

36 Cf. Theod.lect.Epit.442.

37 The synodal system of the time did not make any fundamental change to this conclusion, as a synod was dependant on the reception of the individual churches and thus of the bishop.

the ecclesiastical landscape the bishop personified his respective parish, a respective church within the Empire. In principle, he was sovereign in his actions, both internally and externally:[38] Internally, the bishop's leadership within the parish was so uncontested that his church could virtually be equated with his person, respectively his office.[39] Externally, this led to the contact of two churches being identical to that of its two bishops.

The importance of this clearly defined élite for the stability of the order of the church becomes obvious when observing the process of the creation of ecclesiastical communion. This communion represented the actual core of all church order, constituting order per se, as it created the generally aspired unity between the churches of the empire.[40] In spite of its importance, the creation of the *communio* was not itself complicated: It was based merely on the professed unity of the bishops involved, finding its performative expression in an inter-episcopal sacral community, extended to mutual intercession prayers. The communion was so obviously concentrated on the episcopate that even secession from the union of the church did not establish the *heresy* of a parish, but only of its

38 Certain hierarchical statuses had developed, such as the metropolitan structure sanctioned at Nicaea in 325. Further differentiation culminated in the establishment of the five patriarchal churches in 451. However, such hierarchization did not correspond to the genesis of mechanisms of assertion within the church. Besides, even the pentarchy of patriarchal churches merely constituted a segmentary system of five independent great churches, cf. Martin 1979: 456-457. Thus, the hierarchization diverted the problem of segmentation to another ecclesiastical level, without fundamentally altering the individual bishops' independence.

39 On the sources of this episcopal authority Rapp 2005.

40 In the aspiration to achieve *una ecclesia*, even the goals of the church and the empire converged. Conflicts between emperors and churchmen, but also between different churchmen, arose from the fact that this goal was fed from different sources – the actors were not led by the same guiding differences.

bishop.[41] As contact between churches could only be produced and communicated through their respective bishops, and with the entire order of the church pertaining to the episcopate, it is understandable why the Egyptian anti-Chalcedonians set such great store by establishing their own hierarchy. Every church needed a bishop.[42]

Independent of the fact that a non-episcopal system was never even up for discussion in Late Antiquity, the episcopal personalization of the ecclesiastical order had stabilizing effects even beyond its just described mere technical aspects: The personalization of order within the church led to a reduction of ecclesiastical complexity. This was responsible for the establishment of ecclesiastical orders in the first place.[43] Additionally, it was responsible for orders, having been established and founded, to be stabilized and secured.

The personalization of church positions created a frame of reference for the respective positions of the successors in office. Initially, this personalized reference system merely had an internal effect: By way of the episcopal succession, every bishop stood in a direct line with his predecessors. As this chain of succession had the ideological function of per-

41 This, at least, is true for the time examined here, when neither Egypt nor Syria had yet become characterized through specific and enduring ecclesiastical developments. Regarding Peter Mongus, Pope Felix determined that it was not possible for a heretic to be the Bishop of a catholic church: Coll.Berol.33 (81,22-23).

42 This is made obvious by the polemical labeling of the rigorous anti-Chalcedonians, who refused to seek communion with their former leader Mongus after his reconciliation with Acacius: They appear as *akephaloi*, as *headless ones*.

43 For a church order to be created it was necessary to overcome the rift between two possible supporters of the communion. This rift, among other things, consisted of a theological complexity making an actual *communio* of the church improbable. It was the personalization of doctrines that gave order to the diversity of potential positions, prohibiting the theoretical limitlessness of theological statements. Personalization curtailed the number of maintainable positions, thus providing individual protagonists with the possibility to invoke the same traditions at all.

petuating the *true faith*, the direct relationship with his predecessors engendered in the bishop a responsibility for any position once taken by them. How important such traditions pertaining to specific sees were, can be observed in the tomus Leonis. The position of the predecessors guided the successors' choices, thus limiting – if not inevitably, then at least with greater probability – their potential courses of action.[44] The succession made bishops primarily into office holders who, through their commitment to their predecessors, were more reliable in finding their specific positions than if they would have been at liberty to do so individually. Thus, the personalization of church structures fortified the order of the church against potential proliferation of individuals trying to shape it, thereby providing it with greater reliability.[45]

These internal guidelines, imparted in personalized form, also exerted influence on the external inter-episcopal level. The personalized reference system of episcopal predecessors entailed a prestructuring of the contacts of bishops among one another. This found its expression already in the fact that the phenomenon of personalization facilitated a general denotation of dogmatic-hierarchical opinions – these having been accepted or rejected. As a result, the personalization was capable of establishing an orientation along common basic principles within the

44 Luhmann 1984: 194: »Sinn läßt keine andere Wahl als zu wählen. Kommunikation greift aus dem je aktuellen Verweisungshorizont, den sie selbst erst konstituiert, etwas heraus und läßt anderes beiseite.« As within the predecessors' line of tradition the possible updating of certain alternatives will be more probable than that of others, the freedom of individual bishops' positioning is limited.

45 Already in the fourth century, Pope Liberius justified his actions in a dispute in the matter of Athanasius of Alexandria with the position of his predecessor Julius: »ego Athanasium non defendi, sed, quia susceperat illum bonae memoriae Iulius episcopus, decessor meus, uerebar, ne forte in aliquo praeuaricator iudicarer« (Ep.pro deifico, in HIL.coll.antiar. B VII,8,1). Similar references to predecessors can be found with Popes Simplicius (Coll.Avell.60,7) or Gelasius (Coll.Avell.95,56-57). This phenomenon will hardly have been restricted to Rome, as demonstrated by the defense of Acacius by his successors. Thus, any freedom of choice between given positions was constricted by predecessors.

fragmented nature of the minutiae of ecclesiastical discussion.[46] Moreover, the simple conjoint invocation of a previous authority meant a release from the necessity of entering into the debate regarding the actual content of any specific theologumenon. Thus, personalization in many cases precluded any forthright theological dissent, as, according to experience, differing positions in doctrine often only became discernible after having been elucidated.[47]

Simultaneously, personalization structured the order of the church: Everyone involved was able to relate this order to commonly known individuals and positions, thus enabling everyone to gauge himself and his counterparts in reference to these individuals and positions. As a result, certain mutual expectations originated regarding respective positioning. This reduced the risk of any arbitrariness of dogmatic and hierarchical statements of individual bishops. For the individual protagonist, the personalization of positions in the church constituted an interlacing of tradition and expectation, limiting the otherwise basically unlimited choice in positions. On the one hand, after all this guaranteed the establishment of a consensually perceived order. On the other hand, it guaranteed that this order did not simply dissolve directly after its emergence.[48]

---

46 Traditions differed to such a degree that not even the Synod of Nicaea – invoked by all groups – would have been capable of achieving any deeper agreement as far as content is concerned. Moreover, the continuous exhibition of the palpable contents of respective *orthodoxies* would quickly have overtaxed the church.

47 It was precisely this argument that Simplicius brought forth against plans of the East for a new imperial synod: »nullus ad aures uestras perniciosis mentibus subripiendi pandatur accessus, nulla retractandi quippiam de ueteribus constitutis fiducia concedatur, quia, sicut saepius iterandum est […]« (Coll.Avell.56,10 [128,8-11]). On the other hand, the opponents of Chalcedon accused the synod of 451 of introducing illegitimate reforms to the traditional creed, as can be witnessed in 475 in the Encyclical of Basiliscus (Euagr.h.e.3,4) or in 482 in a petition by Egyptian monks on behalf of Peter Mongus (Coll.Veron.1 [3.17-21]), see also note 17.

48 The perpetuation of order was achieved by invoking certain past authorities. Contrary to ever new debates on content, this remained possible at

As personalization in tradition, denotation and expectation allowed for a constant self-reference of the order within the church, this constituted the actual factor of stability. It was the continuous referencing – both expected and implemented – of episcopal statements to traditional and personalized positions that enabled any construction of order. And this is what stabilized it by a repetition of the request for and the granting of communion within the fold of the church. Via an expected reference to personal authority, working with the codes of personalization, these repetitions reduced the complexity of difference within the church. This took place to such an extent that slight deviations in single positions did not necessarily lead to a disruption of the conjoint order, as long as it was stabilized by personalized patterns of expectation. Thus, marginally different positioning could still be perceived as expected repetition of order, could still be integrated into the order of the church, as long as they referred to the right personal authorities.[49]

As unstable and fragile the church in Late Antiquity may appear: Without the multi-layered effects arising from the phenomenon of personalization expounded above, even an order with a limited scope would scarcely ever have occurred.

Personalization as destabilization of the church order

Still, a general unity within the church in Late Antiquity was never achieved, as this would be highly dependent on a general consensus. And,

---

all time, being less susceptible to dissent. On the reduction of possible positions cf. additionally note 31.

49 Neither a synod as a collective personal authority nor a bishop as a palpable personal authority could generate order by themselves. According to Coleman, order is rather generated by individuals on a micro level: Coleman 1994: 1-23. On this individual micro level the perception of those positions supported by the authorities was per se subject to mediation, with positions being subject to interpretation. Thus, recipients could hardly ever mean exactly the same thing. In this respect, only the displacement of differences through the invocation of a commonly approved synodal-personal macro level made any ostensible common ground possible.

although the personalization of both structures and opinions enabled and advanced the achievement of such a consensus, it was by no means a guarantee for it.

In the personalization of its structures the stability of the order of the church was dependant on agreement between bishops. While the objection of a simple provincial bishop would hardly have led to the disintegration of the entire order, after 451 the mutual goodwill of the five patriarchs in Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem became all the more important.[50] This means that the order was concentrated on the consensus of a few essential supporters, which, in view of the segmentation of the church in Late Antiquity, was by no means to be taken for granted.[51] Transmitted by persons, the different regions of the empire maintained differing ecclesiastical traditions. Therefore, no positioning of the bishops was ever without an alternative. On the contrary, the number of theoretical alternative positions actually rose with every single conflict. True, the choices open to the bishop embedded in the chains of succession were not limitlessly open or even arbitrary, but remained tied to his respective predecessors. However, each bishop was individually called to decide which dogmatic-hierarchical proposal of

50 The theological debate could of course continue to be led by simple provincial bishops. The synodal-personal reception, however, was mainly focused on the patriarchal level: As the episcopate oriented itself on the patriarchs' positions, the acceptance or rejection by any of these five central bishops concerned any approving or opposing position of large sections of the church in general, see also note 25.

51 The concentration on a small number of supporters led to a great susceptibility to accidental factors. This means that dissent between the persons responsible for the preservation of order could arise at any time. This had to be all the more disruptive for the entire system, as the group acquiescent of consensus was already rather small. It is, therefore, more astonishing that the order of the church came into being at all instead of failing sooner or later.

sense he chose to actualize. As a result, a challenge of the order of consensus was possible any time.[52]

Furthermore, the personalization of church positions also provided instruments to express the disintegration of the order. The referring of ecclesiastical notions to certain persons – the tomus Leonis immediately comes to mind – enabled a simplified denotation of complex theological constructs, thus opening an easily negotiable path for the understanding between bishops. At the same time, however, the same mechanisms were also capable of easily expressing dissent. As a result, the system of reference, established by way of the personalization of doctrinal positions, could be used both for integration as well as for demarcation. This likewise engendered a theological reduction which, in the positive sense of stability, had led to a bridging of minor differences in doctrine. On a negative note, however, the highlighting reduction of theological complexity resulted in theological prejudice. Thus, with the denotation now reduced and shortened to a personal level, the opposite side's actual ecclesiastical positions became increasingly irrelevant for any debate. In the same way that personalization was capable of leveling certain limited differences, it simultaneously also eclipsed potentially connecting factors.[53] As a result, any agreement became more improbable.

Additionally there was a hierarchical problem: As the process of the inheriting of church positions did not cease in times of dissent, the *heresy*

52 However, such rejection preferentially took place in situations of radical change in personnel. In such situations, the protagonists seem to have been well aware of the extent of the threat to the order of the church. In the face of his approaching death, Salophakiolos asked the Emperor to guarantee him a Chalcedonian successor: Ps.Zach.h.e.5,6; Euagr.h.e.3,12.

53 Both sides accused each other of adhering to Nestorian or Eutychian teachings, although all relevant protagonists of the time opposed both Eutyches and Nestorius. Even the anti-Chalcedonian Bishop Aelurus of Alexandria was not in *communio* with any radical Eutychian monks, cf. Ps.Zach.h.e.5,4. Grillmeier concludes that in fact there was still a basis for a common theology which, however, became eclipsed through a *Bewußtseinsverengung* on the different views on the number of natures in Christ, cf. Grillmeier 1990: 35; also idem 1991: 107; Wirth 1990: 85-86.

of any given bishop through internal succession within his see became a threat to the rank of his diocese within the order of the church. This did not merely pertain to individual bishops, but rather to the chain of succession in its entirety. The correlation of the two levels, of hierarchical status and *orthodox* soundness, additionally aggravated schisms. This becomes particularly obvious by the fact that even the Chalcedonian successors of Acacius were not prepared to anathematize their predecessor.[54]

That, in the face of the stabilizing effects of personalization, fractures of the church order could occur at all is again partially the result of certain effects of personalization. The ordering power of the common invocation of certain authorities, which in turn prevented the necessity of discussing the content of complex theologumena, induced a progressive differentiation in the repetitive order of the church. The bishops professed the upholding of similar positions, without actually having to defend the same content. In view of the segmentation of the church, their repetition primarily established an illusion of common positioning. Thus, the repetitive order established a variability of positions that could hardly be perceived as differentiation by the protagonists themselves, due to the personalized and reduced denotation of conjointly invoked authorities.[55]

54 Only when John of Constantinople, probably on orders by Emperor Justin, removed Acacius from the diptychs in 519, the road was open to an end of the schism. How central the compliance to this demand was for the Church of Rome can be seen by the fact that the Roman legates emphasized that his removal had taken place in their presence when reporting to the pope: »Acacii praeuaricatoris anathematizati nomen de diptychis ecclesiasiticis sed et ceterorum episcoporum, qui eum in communione secuti sunt, sub nostro conspectu significamus erasa« (Coll. Avell.223,6 [684,13-16]).

55 It was sufficient for Rome that an Alexandrine patriarch invoked Chalcedon and the tomus Leonis and supported the consequences in personnel of this invocation, i.e. the condemnation of Dioscurus. Growing interior reservations against the Roman-Chalcedonian radicalism in the actual situation in Egypt could hardly be noted in far-away Rome itself. However, these were also secondary, as long as the exterior semblance of accord was upheld.

Therefore, both due to and in spite of personalization, the order of the church was never rigid – though it often appeared so to contemporaries and historians alike, because the expectational structure of the church order covered differences for a long time and therefore was capable of integrating them into the repetition.[56]

This also explains the fact that a disruption of the order of the church was repeatedly capable of surprising contemporaries and, in most cases, may be supposed to actually have hardly been intended by them in the first place. The cause for a disruption of the order was to be found in the – mostly unilateral – ascertainment of a failure to repeat mutual basic tenets of order: The inter-episcopal contentions in the invocation of mutual norms and names had grown to such an extent that some of the bearers of church order deemed to no longer detect any common basis. As the threshold for this conclusion could occasionally be quite high, at least the date for a disruption of the order was accidental.[57] Additionally, it was mostly not even comprehensible for one of the two sides, as all of the protagonists usually reckoned to be acting within the frame of their personal systems of reference.

Such an evolutionary process of alienation, communicated in a personal form, reverting quasi incidentally into a disruption of the order, lies at the heart of the Acacian Schism. In Egypt, both Salophakiolos and Mongus were characterized by rather more moderate positions: While

56 Due to covering minor differences, dissent in the sources mostly only becomes tangible in the failure of order. Only when an action is not perceived as an expected repetition, do differing positions have the possibility of articulating themselves. The antecedent creeping differentiation is hardly visible. Thus, it is the seeming stability of the order of the church that makes its fracture seem to come as a surprise. The astonishment of contemporaries and historians in regard to this disruptions indicates how stable the previous order was regarded to be.

57 After having said this, the question of being able to claim the same for the fracture of the order itself remains to be seen. In the long run, in Late Antiquity at least, a disruption of the order of the church seems more probable than its perpetuation.

the Chalcedonian was prepared to include Dioscorus in the diptychs, the anti-Chalcedonian refrained from explicitly condemning Chalcedon after 482.[58] It is obvious that the rift within Egypt was hardly as unsurpassable as the bishops in Rome tried to make believe: There was no room for any grey areas in the Roman view of a duality between pro- and anti-Leonic stances.[59] Therefore, the settlement between the Chalcedonian Acacius and the anti-Chalcedonian Mongus was bound to both surprise and overtax Rome. The Roman perspective had provided no other criteria of assessment for Chalcedon than either the unrestricted acceptance or the rejection of the tomus Leonis. That such other criteria very well existed had now become plain; still, as long as the East had invoked Chalcedon and, in consequence, Leo, Rome had seen no need to look into the matter any further. Now, however, the unity between Mongus and Acacius was seen as a rejection of Chalcedon, of Leo, of St. Peter and finally of Rome itself. In the East, on the other hand, this consequence came as a surprise, with the point made repeatedly that the synod of 451 had in fact never been condemned there.[60]

---

58 The Henotikon (Cod.Vatic.gr. 1431), the basis for Mongus' establishment of a *communio* with Acacius, explicitly refrains from condemning the Synod of Chalcedon. Ps.Zach.h.e.4,10 describes the inclusion of Dioscorus into the diptychs of the Church of Alexandria through Salophakiolos, leading to censure by Leo in Rome, cf. also Grillmeier 1990: 36-38. The lack of differentiation in the mental concepts of both sides' rigorist representatives found its continuation in a simplified description of dogma by the sources. The explicit antithesis of Chalcedonians-anti-Chalcedonians may accurately describe the situation regarding the reception of Chalcedon in Rome; the same can hardly be said for e.g. Alexandria.

59 The scope of Rome's unwillingness to compromise becomes apparent in the severity with which the compromising Timothy Salophakiolos was brought back in line (Coll.Avell.63). The distrust of Rome he had engendered by his willingness for reconciliation in Egypt does not seem to have been fundamentally dispelled, cf. also note 45.

60 The fact that the Emperor as well as the Bishop of Constantinople insisted on never having rejected Chalcedon was registered in Rome with some irritation: »nos ista de catholico imperatore non credimus utpote

These differences in perception were not exclusively based on the abridged personalization of doctrine, but also on a fundamental lack of information. The knowledge of actual local dogmatic developments should not be overestimated: The exchange of positions between bishops could generally only occur within the frame of mutual correspondence. In cases of ambiguity, this did not permit any direct clarification of the situation and mainly served to establish and assert the church's unity.[61] Furthermore, to come back to the phenomenon of personalization, the correspondence often merely used the code of particular individuals as templates to express dogmatic positions and to ascertain unity. However, this formulaic invocation of common authorities catering to patterns of expectation obscured the differences regarding the understanding of a seemingly common *orthodoxy*. With the outbreak of the Acacian Schism, this was further aggravated by the fact that, due to Acacius' failure to report, Rome was additionally cut off from the flow of information from the East.[62]

Thus, Rome was not capable to see that the moderate representatives of both dogmatic groups in the East were not inevitably as irreconcilably pitted against each other as allowed for by Rome's dualistic perspective with its reduction of the Chalcedonian synod to Leo. The East was positioned in a different system of traditions and exigencies. As a result, the interpretation and reception of Chalcedon had taken a different route

---

cuius sacra retinemus, in quibus catholicam fidem et Chalcedonensis synodi definitionem se tenere testatur« (Coll.Veron.11 [36,25-26]).

61 In general, correspondence with this functionality may be supposed to have been limited to the situation of ordination of new bishops.

62 The fundamentality of this lack of information becomes apparent in 482, when Rome only found out about the incidents in Alexandria when the Emperor gave notice to Pope Simplicius on him recognizing Mongus. Acacius had obviously not volunteered any information about the controversial election. Thus, Rome had seen no reason not to recognize John Talaia, who in turn had notified Rome of his ordination as a rightful bishop. The Pope was only in the last minute able to withhold a corresponding acknowledgement, when Zeno informed him about the deposition of Talaia, cf. Coll.Avell.68,2-3.

there, with other priorities having been set within the church.[63] Rome saw its expectations towards the order of repetition ruptured, was not capable of integrating the Eastern incidents into its view of the order. Without this having actually been intended in the East, the events were seen by Rome as an apostasy of the Eastern bishops from the common doctrinal basis invoked so far.[64]

The stabilizing effects of personalization for the order of the church were faced with the destabilizing potential of the same phenomenon. This potential was often founded in the same elements as the stabilizing ones. Personalization had a potentially disruptive effect. This was due to the order's dependency upon the brittle consensus of the church's protagonists and the mutually hardly impartable differentiation of positions within identical frames of reference. Personalization in this case did not only have a destabilizing effect on the order but, moreover, actually prevented a simple rapprochement of the different groups after a schism had taken place: Now the effects of personalization no longer stabilized the order but rather the alienation within the church.

Synthesis: functions of personalization

The personalization of the church order in Late Antiquity is manifest in any scrutiny of the sources. The quote at the beginning of this article is only one example of many, although a rather concise one, as it demonstrates the two temporal levels of personalization: On the one hand, as exemplified in the rejection of the Alexandrian Peter, the current func-

63 Particularly the question of ecclesiastical unity was more exigent in the East in comparison to the dogmatically already more or less homogeneous West. Additionally, there were the interests of the Emperor, for whom a common theological foundation in the East had become more important than an ecclesiastical union with Rome, especially as the latter had already ceased to be part of the Empire.

64 His former anathematizing of Peter Mongus in 477 and Rome's subsequent notification thereof would yet prove to become a problem for Acacius (Coll.Veron.4 [5,2-7]). It provided Rome with a proof of Acacius' alleged apostasy.

tional order of the church was personalized, supported by a small clear-cut group of individuals, established by bishops and dependent upon them. On the other hand, the personalization of the order developed a historical depth of dimension, evinced by the invocation of the Apostle Peter. The positions of past normative authorities continued within the church, creating a system of reference for any current positioning.

In the personalized order of repetition, this system of reference was effective on two levels: Within his own diocese, each bishop was, more or less inevitably, called to invoke his predecessors within his own episcopal line of succession. This promoted the establishment of local traditions, and both governed and limited the choice of ecclesiastic positions taken by the bishops, making them more predictable. Through the simultaneous personalization of hierarchical-dogmatic opinions, effects similar to those within the internal context of a parish can also be found outside, on the inter-episcopal level.

In all this, the personalization of church order had both a stabilizing and a destabilizing effect. First of all, the frame of reference of episcopal predecessors and personalized positions was a prerequisite for the establishment of any communication within the church. For only the possible invocation of conjoint normative references provided a controllable frame for the communication between bishops. Within the small group of key supporters of the order of the church, the personalization of doctrine generated the prerequisite for expecting a particular positioning from other protagonists and for the expression of certain positions towards them. As a result, the personalized system of reference not only stabilized the order, but also served as its foundation.

However, the same phenomena also had an opposite effect. They were capable of destabilizing the order of the church. In this respect, personalization was ambivalent, as by its mechanisms a breach of order could also be expressed and perpetuated. This ambivalence is due to the genesis of a repetitive order, which was based on the interaction of the historically personalized frame of reference with the currently personalized functional system of a continuous ascertainment of a common church order. The frame of reference in the repetitive order provided the

bishops with the possibility of deceiving both each other and themselves in regard to any mutual dissent.

Thus, agreements had to remain personally transmitted illusions. That is why the protagonists were consistently astounded by disruptions of their seemingly stable order. If one, however, realizes that the frame of reference of church positioning concealed the creeping differentiation of specific bearers of the order – making any order actually possible in the first place – this astonishment is somewhat put into perspective. The disruption merely establishes the point at which the mutual repetition of order was no longer mutually experienced as such. At this point, the previously existing, creeping, personalized and personally obscured differentiation of positions collapsed into the disruptive event. This situation was all the more probable as the church rested on the shoulders of only a few central supporters.

Thus, the stabilizing and destabilizing effects of personalization cannot be separated, as they have their basis in the same phenomena. Or, to put it differently: Within the development of a normative order there also implicitly lay the possibility of its criticism. Personalization, therefore, was not only a prerequisite and a functional mechanism for the order, but also a structural flaw and a perpetual source of dissent within the church.

In all this, the impression should not be conveyed that the ecclesiastical order of repetition was solely based upon personal factors. Thus, the frame of reference of church positions was not at all limited to persons. Places or, to be more precise, synods could acquire similar structural functions. In this respect, invoking Pope Leo was equivalent to an invocation of the Synod of Chalcedon – and vice versa. At the same time, a continuous reference to the Council of Nicaea can be noted for all groups within the church. Also synods could stand in as symbols for complex theological issues. However, in this context it must remain open if the invocation of particular synods was used synonymously to respective personal systems of references or, alternatively, to mitigate a controversial personalization. Possibly an inherent personalization formed the basis of such synodal invocations, as the synods were composed

of bishops, i.e. former ecclesiastical authorities, now collectively denoted by the site of their convention.[65] Maybe, the individual should also quite deliberately recede behind a collective forming a consensus, to seemingly dissolve within the consensus, to strengthen the normative binding force of a position. In this context it is conspicious that in the era after Chalcedon both variants for an appointment to the same position were used: an individual invocation of Leo and a collective one of Chalcedon.

However, even if personalization was not the only basis for order and disorder of the church, it was a particularly central form of structuring the church in Late Antiquity. Sources imply as much. An analysis of the often controversial history of the church in Late Antiquity is bound to be continuously aware of these phenomena of personalization, as in them lies one of the keys to the understanding of this age.

65 Cf. the so-called *Encyclical* of Basiliscus, referring to the »150 Holy Fathers« of the Synod of Constantinople in 381 and the »Symbol of the 318 Holy Fathers« of Nicaea in 325: EVAGR.h.e.3,4.

References

Sources

Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum I,2:

Schwartz, Eduard 1925-1926: *Concilium Universale Ephesenum (AD 431)*. Vol. 2: *Collectio Veronensis (ACO I,2)*. Berlin

Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum II,1:

Schwartz, Eduard 1933-1935: *Concilium Universale Chalcedonense (AD 451)*. Vol. 1: *Acta Graeca* (ACO II,1). Berlin

Collectio Avellana:

Günther, Otto 1895: *Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur Collectio* (CSEL 35). 2 vols. Leipzig

Collectio Berolinensis:

Schwartz, Eduard 1934: *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* (ABAW N.F. 10). Munich: 59-117

Collectio Sabbaitica contra Acephalos et Origenistas destinata:

Schwartz, Eduard 1940: *Collectio Sabbaitica contra Acephalos et Origenistas destinata* (AD 536) (ACO III). Berlin

Collectio Veronensis:

Schwartz, Eduard 1934: *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* (ABAW N.F. 10). Munich: 1-58

Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431:

Schwartz, Eduard 1927: *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431, eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaisers Zenon* (ABAW.PH 32,6). Munich

Evagrius Scholasticus:

Hübner, Adelheid 2007: *Historia ecclesiastica/Kirchengeschichte* (FCh 57,2). Turnhout

Hilary of Poitiers:

Feder, Alfred 1916: *Hilarius von Poitiers, Opera* (CSEL 65,4). Leipzig

Pseudo-Zacharias Rhetor:

Ahrens, Karl and Gustav Krüger 1899: *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor*. Leipzig

Theodorus Lector:

Hansen, Günther Chr. 1971: *Theodoros Anagnostes. Kirchengeschichte* (GCF N.F. 3). Berlin

Literature

Bienert, Wolfgang A. 1997: *Dogmengeschichte*. Berlin

Blaudeau, Philippe 2006: Rome contre Alexandrie? L'interprétation pontificale de l'enjeu monophysite (de l'émergence de la controverse Eutychienne au schisme Acacien 448-484). *Adamantius* (12): 140-216

Caspar, Erich 1933: *Geschichte des Papsttums. Von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*. Vol. 2: *Das Papsttum unter byzantinischer Herrschaft*. Tübingen

Coleman, James S. 1994: *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge

Grillmeier, Alois 1990: *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*. Vol. 2/4: *Die Kirche von Alexandrien mit Nubien und Äthiopien nach 451*. Freiburg [engl. 1996: *Christ in Christian tradition*. Vol. 2/4: *The Church of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451*. London]

Grillmeier, Alois 1991: *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*. Vol. 2/1: *Das Konzil von Chalcedon (451). Rezeption und Widerspruch (451-518)*. 2nd ed. Freiburg [engl. 1987: *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Vol. 2/1: *Reception and contradiction. The development of the discussion about Chalcedon from 451 to the beginning of the reign of Justinian*. London]

Grillmeier, Alois 2002: *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*. Vol. 2/3: *Die Kirchen von Jerusalem und Antiochien nach 451 bis 600*. Freiburg

Luhmann, Niklas 1984: *Soziale Systeme. Grundriß einer allgemeinen Theorie*. Frankfurt/Main

Martin, Thomas O. 1979: The twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon. A background note. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Vol. 2: *Entscheidung um Chalkedon*. 5th ed. Würzburg, edited by Heinrich Bacht and Alois Grillmeier: 433-458

Pietri, Charles 1987: D'Alexandrie à Rome. Jean Talaia, émule d'Athanase au Ve siècle. *Alexandrina. Hellénisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie*. Paris, edited by P. Claude Mondésert: 277-295

Rapp, Claudia 2005: *Holy bishops in Late Antiquity. The nature of Christian leadership in an age of transition*. Berkeley

Wirth, Gerhard 1990: Anastasius, Christen und Perser. Zu den Problemen des Verhältnisses zwischen Staat und Kirche um die Wende zum 6. Jahrhundert. *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* (33): 81-139

A cultural history of elections in the USA and Germany

Meanings and functions of elections in the 19th century

Hedwig Richter

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, elections in the German states did not play a significant role either in the business of government or in the lives of the population as a whole. The representative bodies of government, which normally consisted solely of the privileged classes (the clergy, the nobility and the city fathers), were often no longer convened or had been dissolved completely. The representative bodies, structured according to class, were seldomly created through elections and much more through birth or appointment (cf. Sternberger & Vogel 1969: 189 f.). Even the new state constitutions after 1815 perpetuated many class privileges. Where there were elected assemblies, suffrage was linked primarily to the level of tax paid or the amount of property owned (Weber & Wehling 2007: 59 f.; Brandt 1998). Also in the USA, a republic where each state independently determined its own suffrage, still at the beginning of the century there were many governmental positions which were by appointment only. Moreover, despite the 1787 constitution enshrining equality, the overwhelming majority of people were excluded from suffrage, since they did not meet property or tax requirements (Keyssar 2009: 854). Thus at the beginning of the nineteenth century, in Germany as well as the USA, elections belonged to the privileges of a minority. However, a century later, after the First World War, elections stood at the centre of political life, and in both countries the overwhelming majority of the population could vote. Both Germany (1919) and the USA (1920) introduced women's suffrage, and both ensured

DOI:10.2390/indi-v2-i1-28 ISSN 2191-6721

universal suffrage through the various components of the Australian ballot (uniform ballot papers, ballot boxes, polling booths, etc.).

Why, then, did elections become so important, not only in terms of determining who would enter office, but also in terms of their inclusion of more and more people, and therefore their increasing significance for people's lives? What functions did governments ascribe to elections, and what motives did those in power have when they introduced elections? What importance did people attribute to the vote? Since elections are a complicated interplay of legal, social and economic factors, of mentalities and philosophies, and are therefore also bound up with political decisions after all, I will develop in my project a cultural history of elections, one that combines practice with materiality and performance, without ignoring structural conditions (Petersen's contribution in this issue; Welskopp 1997: 44; Mergel 2005: 360-361). I will ask questions such as who observed or surveilled the voters. Were there ballot boxes, voting booths, uniform ballot papers, writing implements? Who was responsible for producing and distributing the ballot papers? What effect did the day of the week have on voting? Who had the householder's right at the polling station? In adopting a cultural-anthropological approach, I intend to interpret elections as a ritual which requires explanation. In doing so, I can focus upon the functions of, and the functions ascribed to, elections, functions which deviate from our normative, Western concept of democracy and which show »what electoral politics meant to many contemporaries« (O'Gorman 1992: 136; Nohlen 2009: 27-36; Jessen & Richter 2011). Although a cultural-historical approach to elections has already been called for a number of times (Neugebauer-Wölk 1984; O'Gorman 1989; Kühne 1993; Mergel 2005a and 2005b), such an approach remains in its early stages, particularly in German-speaking research (exceptions are Kühne 1994; Arsenschek 2003).

A cultural-historical view of the functions of elections reveals the ambivalence of the institution of voting (Bertrand et al. 2006). It is difficult to tell the history of the vote in terms of goals successfully achieved; rather, it is a history strewn with errors and reversals. As a consequence, I see the development of elections from within the framework of three

dichotomies. On the one hand, elections lead to more freedom, and on the other to more disciplining. On the one hand, to individualization; on the other, to de-individualization. On the one hand, to integration; on the other, to new modes of exclusion. The extension of the franchise, I argue, can only be explained when elections are seen not only as an instrument of power for the masses but also as an instrument of discipline wielded by those in power. Elections as a performative act can be read, that is, not only as a demonstration of power by the people, but also as a subjugation of the people to authority, a subjugation which was regarded as ›modern‹ and appropriate to the time. For such an approach it is necessary to use a horizontal concept of power. With Max Weber I will view power as the »chance to obey a particular order«,[66] an obedience which enables those being ruled to believe in the legitimacy of those who rule (*Legitimationsglauben*).

In view of the *Sonderweg* theory, which again and again has been pronounced dead but shows strong signs of life in regard to elections, it is helpful to compare Germany with another country, and for that the USA is appropriate. Actually, a huge amount of literature on elections still puts forward for both Germany and the USA a kind of double *Sonderweg* thesis: the USA as the ›Land of Democracy‹, where equal voting rights had been implemented in the first half of the nineteenth century after pressure from below; and Germany, in contrast, as the land in which electoral participation had been prescribed from above (Rogers 1990: 3; Bensel 2004: 287, 295).[67] The research project will examine these assumptions in regard to the following regions: for Germany, the dominant Prussia and the liberal Württemberg with its agrarian-egalitarian society. For one, this will allow us to consider the ambivalent modernity of Prussia which, through the 1808 city orders, gave suffrage to a significant number of men, while at the same time only installing (from above) a constitution in 1849 and keeping the three-class system

66 »Chance, Gehorsam für einen bestimmten Befehl zu finden«.

67 Already the historian James Bryce explained in 1921 that the progressive suffrage in imperial Germany was irrelevant, see Bryce 1921: 23-26.

of suffrage until the First World War. Württemberg, in contrast, witnessed a smoother development with its quite progressive constitution of 1819 and its accompanying suffrage which was relatively egalitarian. In terms of the USA, my focus will be on the heated electoral culture of New York City which, due to its high number of immigrants, was constantly confronted to questions of integration and exclusion; and upon South Carolina, the American state with the highest black population, brutal racism, its particularly restrictive suffrage, and its dominance of the legislature (Bernheim 1889: 152; Ryan 1999: 573 f.; Hayduk 2006; Edgar 1998: 338 f.).

I start my investigation with the beginning of the expansion of the franchise. For Germany, that means the years following the wars of liberation of 1813; and for the USA, the 1820s during the Jacksonian Democracy, when politics turned into a mass phenomenon.[68] In Germany, the revolution of 1848/1849 meant a radical break in the practice of elections and, despite all reactionary attempts, suffrage in Germany widened through the new, partly imposed constitutions after 1848/1849. The introduction of universal and equal male suffrage, which was progressive by European standards, in the North German *Bund* (1867) and the German Empire (1871) developed its own momentum, which led to an increasing number of people voting. In the USA, the decisive break came in the middle of the century with the Civil War (1861-1865), which not only made possible the expansion of suffrage but also strengthened the tendencies to exclude. The decades preceding the turn of the century are characterized in the USA by a massive restriction of the franchise and a dramatic reduction in electoral participation (Burnham & Weinberg 1980: 51-58). My investigation will end with the introduction of women's suffrage in Germany (1919) and the USA (1920).

68 »König Friedrich an seine lieben getreuen Diener, Vasallen und Unterthanen«, 15.3.1815, Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart (State Archive Wuerttemberg, hencefort HStASt) A 22, Bü 8; »Wahlordnung für die Wahlen der Abgeordneten«, 1819-1869, Report to the King, 5.3.1823, HStASt E 14 Bü 537; for the USA Silbey 1978; Keyssar 2009: 40; Seymour & Frary 1918: 290-291.

My most important sources are the complaints to the governing or parliamentary bodies that were made by the populace regarding voting procedures, and also government documents on how elections were organized, how complaints were dealt with, and how changes to voting procedures were discussed. Here can be found examples of ballot papers and suggestions on what ballot boxes should look like. These files, like the complaints concerning how elections were conducted, enable us to gain a microhistorical insight into the actual practice of elections. In the case of controversial elections or far-reaching changes to suffrage, such as the introduction of polling booths in 1903 in the German Empire, I will also refer to parliamentary debates and the press.

So as to be in a position to analyze the ambivalence of elections and of the functions ascribed to them, I will investigate the three dichotomies already mentioned (individualization/de-individualization, integration/ exclusion, freedom/disciplining). These dichotomies can enlighten the investigation of the double *Sonderweg* thesis. Was it a case of freedom, individualization and integration in the USA, and disciplining, de-individualization and exclusion in Germany? If this is the case, we should be able to see that elections had different functions in the two countries. To what extent, for example, was universal and equal suffrage something that was imposed from above in Germany as a tool of disciplining, while in the USA it was demanded by the people from below as a basic human freedom?

Integration and exclusion

According to conventional research on democratic and competitive elections, the function of integration plays a central role, and the focus of such research is on the integration of the diverse interests of different groups (Sternberger & Vogel 1969: 15; Almond & Verba 1966). For this project it seems to be more interesting to focus on the social-integrative function of elections in regard to emerging states and nations. It is precisely here that an investigation into the performative aspect of elections can be fruitful, since performative acts such as rituals »create differences and therefore identity«, and they »make clear who belongs and who does

not« (Mergel 2002: 21). New states, such as Württemberg with its kingdom (›by Napoleon's mercy‹) lacking tradition and the emerging US states, saw as early as the first half of the nineteenth century how important to their own legitimacy it was to secure an acceptance of the masses that was ostentatious, as wide as possible and, as it was seen at the time, progressive (Keyssar 2009: 855; Brandt 1998: 87). On the other hand, the newly constituted populace united itself through the performative act of voting. The demand for elections therefore also regularly surfaced at crucial moments of nation-building, such as the Wars of Liberation against Napoleon in Germany and the 1848 revolution and the Civil War (Delbrück 1914: 45-46 and 57).[69] Many members of the Frankfurt parliament hoped that equal and universal suffrage would bring with it positive emotions towards the new *Reich* (Frensdorff 1892: 149). Indeed, one of the main reasons why universal and equal suffrage was introduced in the legitimately precarious North German Federation (*Norddeutscher Bund)* (1867) and in the German Empire (*Reich*) (1871) was the hope that it would have a positive effect on integration (Biefang 2009: 45-47).[70] Also, one of the most common reasons for extending suffrage in both the USA and Germany was to reward soldiers for their service or to recruit new soldiers. Wars, that is, prove to be a decisive factor in the widening of the franchise, and contemporaries explicitly connected the performance of soldiers or working women with their right to participate in elections.[71]

69 See »Amtliche Königliche Ansprache«, *Staats-Anzeiger für Württemberg*, No. 160, 6.7.1850, HStASt E 7 Bü 97.

70 »Fürst Bismarck und das Wahlrecht«, 14.9.1894, Bundesarchiv Berlin (German Federal Archive, henceforth BA) R 8034 II, 5073.

71 »An den König. Anbringen des Gesammtministeriums betreffendes Ergebniß der Landtagswahlen«, 14.7.1868, HStASt E 14 Bü 537; Minutes of the Reichstag, 6.7.1917, HStASt E 40/16 Bü 53; treatise »Arbeiterschaft und Kriegsentscheidung« (*christlicher Gewerkschaftsverlag*, Cologne), 30.10.1917, Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin-Dahlem (Prussian Secret Archive, henceforth GStA PK) I. HA Rep. 169 C 80, Nr. 27; *Weser Zeitung* 17.10.1897; see for the USA Keyssar 2000: 59 and 81 f.

Nonetheless, the expansion of suffrage mostly led to new exclusions. In general, next to women and non-citizens the charitable poor, convicted felons, and those in debt were excluded from suffrage, and in the USA voters also had to be ›white‹. Suffrage always meant a definition and standardization of the voter. In the legal statutes, much space was given to defining those who belonged to the electorate and those who did not.[72] Suffrage required a definition of nationality, with all the exclusions that entailed (cf. Keyssar 2000: 90; Gosewinkel 2001). The mechanism of inclusion and exclusion was particularly clear in the southern states of America. The Confederates justified their ›*herrenvolk*‹ democracy‹ by referring vehemently to the constitution's principle of equality which, of course, was granted only to a white elite (Edgar 1998: 338 f.; Keyssar 2009: 855 f.; Hochgeschwender 2010: 19-20, 52)[73] and went hand in hand with a violent exclusion of Afro-Americans. In the whole of America, the extension of suffrage in the first half of the nineteenth century was probably only possible because the lower classes remained in any case excluded on the basis of race or, as in the North and the West, they only played a marginal role during that period.

Analyzing the mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion reveals striking parallels between the two countries, and these parallels become even more evident if we continue our investigations on a regional level. While in Württemberg after 1819 there was, despite the mixed democratic and social composition of the second chamber, a relatively egalitarian male suffrage (Scherer 1848: 819), in South Carolina blacks, who made up more than half the population, were excluded from all forms of participation. Similarly to Württemberg, though, there was a broad agrarian middle class in the north and west states of America, and, in both cases,

72 »Königliches Recript in Betreff der Wahl der Vertretung des deutschen Volks«, 11.4.1848, HStASt E 30, Bü 49; election law for the parliament (*Reichstag*) of the North German Federation, 13.5.1868, BA R 101, Nr. 3342; for the USA Bensel 2004: 26; Keyssar 2009: 855; also Heinsohn 2010; Geulen 2004.

73 South Carolina Department of Archives and History (henceforth SCDAH), S165013, box 100; and S165024, boxes 1-3.

society approximated to the liberal ideal of a largely homogeneous civil society, an ideal which German liberals in the first half of the century regarded as a prerequisite for suffrage. In the southern states of America, in contrast, suffrage for slaves was as unimaginable as suffrage for unpropertied farm labourers in Prussia's *Ostelbien*. Despite the American rhetoric of equality, both Prussia and South Carolina were dominated by a small minority of estate owners and accordingly planters (Edgar 1998: 339). It seems that America's extension of suffrage followed the same logic as it did in German states: suffrage only for a financially and socially independent class. In those areas of Prussia where society was relatively egalitarian, a liberal suffrage could be introduced: with the city suffrage of 1808 Prussia proved to be especially progressive. Prussia's population was simply too heterogeneous for those in power to want to introduce a uniformly equal franchise. And the same was true of the USA. In contrast to Prussia, though, the federal US government did not have to stipulate voting rights centrally, since this task was left to the individual states. Comparing the situation with other countries also reveals how strongly the inclusion/exclusion mechanisms were in operation everywhere: while in Württemberg around 14 percent of the total population could vote, the Chamber of Deputies in France and the House of Commons in England were elected by only three percent of the population (Brandt 1998: 84; Schäfer 2009: 55).[74] The central government in these neighbouring countries did not consider it appropriate to extend the franchise to include the masses of the unpropertied and the impoverished. And, while voting rights in many Western European countries were extended relatively continuously in the second half of the century, the governments of the US states limited them in response to the increasing heterogeneity of the population and the growing presence of an unpropertied working class, brought to America by the processes of industrialization and mass immigration (Keyssar 2009).

74 Cf. »Wahlordnung für die Wahlen der Abgeordneten in die II. Kammer der Ständeversammlung«, 1819-1869, Report to the King, 5.3.1823, HStASt, E 14 Bü 537.

The exclusion of Afro-Americans from suffrage, which continued up until the second half of the twentieth century, is, however, hardly comparable to the exclusion of lower social classes. Rather, it appears in some respects to be just as puzzling a phenomenon as the long-lasting discrimination against women, and is possibly connected to the belief that women and blacks were different by ›nature‹. To contemporaries, the difference appeared to be not a construct, not a product of current traditions or of a backward belief which even conservatives at some point would no longer accept, but as something obvious, as natural or even as God-given. Bruno Latour's linkage of culture and nature and his call for ›nature‹ to be judged according to its own law are relevant here (1995; cf. DuBois 1999; Sneider 2008). Despite the somewhat shared situation of women and blacks, Southern suffragists (a late and rare emergence) feared that their call for suffrage might be intermingled with the African-Americans' request for the right to vote; they asked for the right to vote as whites, not as human beings, and were anxious not to challenge the »white supremacy« (Johnson 1972: 369-370 et passim).

Individualization and de-individualization

The modern act of voting represents on its own the tense relationship between individualization and de-individualization: the more suffrage became extended, the clearer became the problem posed by the sheer mass of voters. Amongst millions of votes, the single vote counted for nothing, even though the whole procedure was constituted of individual votes. The materiality of the secret ballot was designed to ground electoral legitimacy upon the rationality of the individual person. This notion was based on enlightenment ideas, at the centre of which (in particular in the work of Hobbes and Rousseau) was the concept of the natural equality and freedom of the human being. The polling booth can therefore be seen as the epitome of the individualized citizen, as the »place of the modern« (Mergel 2005b: 343-344), since it was there that the citizen could present her- or himself as a rational, individualized subject and no longer as an object belonging to and determined by the collective mass. What counted now was the rationality of the individual person, and not tradition, external influence, cultural ideas and feelings, or community.

Paradoxically, though, it was only with the advent of mass participation with its belief in the rationality of equal individuals that demagogy and vote-rigging in all its lurid forms occurred, from alcohol to wild promises and threats, all the way to bribes. The extension of the franchise was, then, always accompanied by the (understandable) fear of demagogy (cf. O'Gorman 1992). In many parts of the USA elections became the business of high crime in the second half of the century. The famous, or infamous, ›election machines‹ ensured the desired electoral outcomes. Regarding the growing corruption, a New York politician stated in 1889 that »the popular will is still being defeated at elections« (Bernheim 1889: 134).

However, vote-rigging should be defined not only in negative terms. Instead, if we take a cultural-historical approach we can see it as raising a number of important questions. Was it not that initially corruption and manipulation ensured the continuing functioning of the old elites in the regulation of power when, for example, gang bosses in New York controlled elections, when leaders in the mid-West produced ethnically homogeneous electoral results, when factory owners and religious ministers gave instructions on whom to vote for or even made threats (cf. Welskopp 2010: 479)? If the mass of voters were so pliable, did this mean that they were simply not ready for their role as modern voters? How should farm labourers, who previously had no rights and no time for politics, overnight become individuals with the right to vote? Recent quantitative studies of village elections in China have shown that people are much more interested in elections for their concrete advantages (such as bribes) than for their democratic standards (for example, as open competitions, Lu & Shi 2009). Corruption, then, served as an important tool, one that made voting attractive for a wide mass of people. And that perhaps explains why in the USA the culture of voting was so unusually vibrant during the period of greatest corruption, while in Württemberg, with its functioning rules and regulations, it remained less so (Bensel 2004).

Freedom and discipline

If we take a critical perspective on the process of modernization, we can see individualization as also playing a central role in the modern project of disciplining. What counts is no longer the local or religious communities or the prevalent traditions but the state alone, to which each individual belongs directly (Bertrand et al. 2006: 4). What this perspective places at the centre, however, is not the exercising of power by the ›little man‹, whose vote in any case disappears into the sea of votes (Falter & Schoen 2005: 26), but the subjugation of the voter to the norm. Indeed, elections during the whole of the nineteenth century were linked to the education of the individual, especially by the liberals (Nipperdey 1983: 739). The early German liberals resisted a general and equal franchise as long as the masses remained uneducated. For the liberals, then, education was the key to developing a modern society. It was logical, therefore, that they should have wanted to link suffrage with ownership or tax, since only those who had money could afford to be educated.

Occasionally, progressives at the time – in Germany as well as in the USA – also hoped that the act of voting would itself have an educative function. In the 1860s, the New York politician Henry Ward Beecher said that »to have an ignorant class voting is dangerous«, but »to have an ignorant class and not have them voting is a great deal more dangerous«, and that »nothing so much prepares men for intelligent suffrage as the exercise of the right of suffrage«.[75] According to a liberal German newspaper in 1897, the de-individualization through elections and election campaigns recalls »the modern anonymity of the army« (*Weser Zeitung* 17.10.1897). However, in the same way the army »was encouraged to focus on educating for the independence of individual soldiers, so it can also perhaps be hoped that the electorates and the individual voters can

75 Cited in Keyssar 2000: 89; for the educational role of elections see Below 1909: 50-51, 75-78; »An den König. Anbringen des Gesammtministeriums betreffend es Ergebniß der Landtagswahlen«, 14.7.1868, HStASt E 14 Bü 537; note to the Ministry of Interior, Stuttgart, 26.1.1850, HStASt E 7 Bü 97, Ständeversammlung; »Angriffe gegen das Dreiklassenwahlrecht«, *Die Post* 6.10.1897, BA, Reichslandbund R8034, II, 5075, 10.

become used to behaving as independent beings«. In 1868, government officials in Württemberg reassured the King after the (for them) disappointing state election (*Landtagswahlen)* results that extending the right to vote had been worthwhile. According to the officials, the people first had to learn, as they had learnt in previous extensions of the franchise, how to deal appropriately with their new right: »Only gradually have these elections delivered satisfactory results, and we should not give up the hope, particularly not now, that in the future election results will be more satisfying, especially when the conservative party, like the democratic party, recognizes the need for sound organization.«[76] Elections and their results were understood by the ruling class as belonging to the business of government, and manipulation from above was part of the culture of elections into the twentieth century.[77]

Therefore, manipulation was recognized as being part of the educational programme of elections. In the 1850s, Prussian members of parliament rejected a formal complaint concerning electoral manipulation by officials on the basis that it was »precisely a duty of government to protect public opinion in its natural and pure state from being misled by the machinations of the political parties«.[78] Again, it was not too different in South Carolina. There, after Reconstruction Era, the racist Democratic Party started to organize the elections and managed to keep blacks away from the ballot.[79] On the other hand, during reconstruction, the Radical

76 »An den König. Anbringen des Gesammtministeriums betreffendes Ergebniß der Landtagswahlen«, 14.7.1868, HStASt E 14 Bü 537.

77 »An den König. Anbringen des Gesammtministeriums betreffendes Ergebniß der Landtagswahlen«, 14.7.1868, HStASt E 14 Bü 537; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, 1826, SCDAH S 165005, Item 00094; US District Attorney's Office, Newark, to A. J. A Kerman, Attorney General in Washington, 11.11.1870, National Archives and Records Administration (henceforth NARA) RG 60, Entry A1 9, Cont. 112 and other letters in this box; Edgar 1998: 352.

78 »Bericht der Kommission zur Berathung des Antrages des Abgeordneten Grafen v. Schwerin«, 28.7.1856, GStA PK I HA Rep. 169 C 80, Nr. 7.

79 E.g. SCDAH L04036 or L04017; Voters registration (Act of 1896), SCDAH S 213104.

Republicans used their authority to manipulate elections and used laws to eliminate hostile voters from the registration books.[80]

Through the act of voting, each citizen expressed acceptance of the rulers, and each citizen contributed publicly and actively to their legitimacy. The Social Democrats' frequent boycott of elections (cf. Welskopp 2000: 462-508) undoubtedly also had something to do with their desire to escape from the process of legitimation. The disciplining effects show themselves not only in Germany but also in the USA where, in the 1860s, a conservative politician could claim that »it is safer, easier, and more practicable to govern ignorant people as fellow-citizens than as subjects« (cited by Keyssar 2000: 113). In America, too, then, the right to vote was determined from above. Alexander Keysaar emphasize how in the USA workers and blacks demanded the right to vote, but also how their demands were met only when the elites saw an extension of the franchise as being opportune and compatible with their own interests. Indeed, when the lower classes fought violently for suffrage in Rhode Island in the 1840s, they lost this battle ignominiously to those in power (Keyssar 2000: 71-76).

As the instrument of standardization and disciplining, elections correlated with the formation of modern states and also with the replacement of unequal and hierarchical societies based on personal dependencies by the impersonal administrative state based on »bureaucracy's standardizing omnipotence« (Geisthövel 2008: 25, 57-58; Raphael 2000). The sources that I have seen up to now show how electoral technology and the modern bureaucratic state developed together. In order to establish electoral registers, each election became also a census. Everyone entitled to vote normally had to have lived in one place for one or more years. However, controlling the place of residence of subjects is the bureaucratic state's central instrument of power. The pre-1848 Württemberg bureaucracy established the electoral registers for the privileged, too: to have the right to vote, even members of the nobility had to demonstrate

80 Voter registration reported to the military government, 1867-8, SCDAH S213102; Abstract of voter registrations, 1867, SCDAH S 213103.

that they were respectable citizens who were prepared to submit themselves to the drastically complicated regulations.[81] Elections were a strict state ceremony to which the participants had to submit themselves. When the Social Democrats did participate in elections, they informed their voters in great detail about what they had to do in the election and what they should refrain from doing – thereby demonstrating their own domestication. With the advent of prohibition, elections became part of the fight against alcohol; the candidates' and election managers' oaths required to abstain from alcohol; »all barrooms and drinking saloons shall be closed on the day of election«, as Governor of South Carolina, Robert K. Scott, declared in 1870.[82] A German newspaper described elections as »anonymous«, as »a great machinery« with »complicated technology«; elections had, and here there was even an undertone of criticism, lost their former »liveliness and directness« (*Weser Zeitung* 17.10.1897).

For the USA, it can indeed be ascertained that the overexuberant and ›undisciplined‹ feelings gradually disappeared from the polling station and its surroundings. Wild expressions of annoyance, impulsiveness, violence, and spontaneous protests came increasingly to be seen as illegitimate and illegal (Bensel 2004). The establishment of elections always also implied steering protest along the correct participatory tracks and thereby making a taboo of protests by the lower classes. In terms of such disciplining, Germany appeared to be decades ahead of the USA. The sources indicate that in Württemberg modern electoral regulations such as the secret ballot had already shaped electoral practice in the pre-

81 Cf. »Königliches Oberamt Leonberg, Präsidium des königlichen Regierung des Neckar-Kreises«, 16.4.1839 and other records in HStASt E 146 Bü 7604; lists in HStASt E 7 Bü 97; »Königliches Recript in Betreff der Wahl der Vertretung des deutschen Volks zum Zweck der neuen Begründung der Verfassung Deutschlands«, 11.4.1848, HStASt E 30, Bü 49.

82 Candidates' pledge and expense reports, 1906-1908, SCDAH L 02014; Proclamation by His Excellency Robert K. Scott, Governor of the State of South Carolina, 19.8.1870, SCDAH S 155013-1.

1848 period.[83] Elections as a public festival, as carnival, as drinking time – apparently that was never the case in Germany, in contrast to both the USA and England (Dinkin 1977; O'Gorman 1989). Germans during the Empire considered their electoral practices to be especially well-ordered and free of corruption and were dismissive of the apparently manipulative and chaotic way that elections were run in other countries such as England and the USA (Delbrück 1914: 10-13, 73-74). Nonetheless, electoral standards established themselves in the West in the course of the century, and the material conditions of elections were brought into line everywhere. It is little wonder that electoral practice in the form of the secret ballot should have spread with the idea of the nation state and of bureaucracy, and become part of global uniformity (Christopher Bayly).

83 Cf. about the secret ballot »Ansprache an das Volk auf dem Lande«, undated, 1850, HStASt E 7, Bü 97 and further documents in this file.

References

Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba 1966: *The civic culture. Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. 3rd ed. Princeton

Anderson, Margaret L. 2000: *Practicing democracy. Elections and political culture in Imperial Germany*. Princeton

Arsenschek, Robert 2003: *Der Kampf um die Wahlfreiheit im Kaiserreich. Zur parlamentarischen Wahlprüfung und politischen Realität der Reichstagswahlen 1871-1914*. Düsseldorf

Below, G. von 1909: *Das Parlamentarische Wahlrecht in Deutschland*. Berlin

Bensel, Richard Franklin 2004: *The American ballot box in the mid-nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.

Bernheim, Abram C. 1889: The ballot in New York. *Political Science Quarterly* (1889) Issue 4/1: 130-152

Bertrand, Romain et al. (eds.) 2006: *The hidden history of the secret ballot*. Bloomington

Biefang, Andreas 2009: *Die andere Seite der Macht. Reichstag und Öffentlichkeit im »System Bismarck« 1871-1890* (Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien 156). Düsseldorf

Brandt, Hartwig 1998: *Der lange Weg in die demokratische Moderne. Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte von 1800 bis 1945*. Darmstadt

Bryce, James 1929: *Modern democracies*. 2 vols. 4th. ed. (1st ed. 1921). London

Burnham, Walter D. 2007: Triumphs and travails in the study of American voting participation rates, 1788-2006. *The Journal of the Historical Society* (7): 505-519

Burnham, Walter D. and Martha Wagner Weinberg 1980: *American politics and public policy*. Cambridge, Mass.

Crook, Malcolm and Tom 2011 (forthcoming): Reforming voting practices in a global age: the making and remaking of the modern secret ballot in Britain, France and the United States, c. 1600-c. 1950. *Past & Present*

Delbrück, Hans 1914: *Regierung und Volkswille. Eine akademische Vorlesung*. Berlin

Dinkin, Robert J. 1977: *Voting in provincial America: A study of elections in the thirteen colonies, 1689-1776*. Westport, Conn.

DuBois, Ellen 1999: *Feminism and suffrage: The emergence of an independent Women's Movement in America, 1848-1869*. Ithaca, NY

Edgar, Walter 1998: *South Carolina. A History*. Columbia

Falter, Jürgen W. and Harald Schoen (eds.) 2005: *Handbuch Wahlforschung*. Wiesbaden

Frensdorff, Ferdinand 1892: Die Aufnahme des allgemeinen Wahlrechts in das öffentliche Recht Deutschlands. *Festschrift der Göttinger Juristenfakultät für R. v. Ihering zum fünfzigjährigen Doktorjubiläum am 6. August 1892*. Leipzig: 135-200

Geisthövel, Alexa 2008: *Restauration und Vormärz 1815-1847*. Paderborn

Geulen, Christian 2004: *Wahlverwandte. Rassendiskurs und Nationalismus im späten 19. Jahrhundert*. Hamburg

Gosewinkel, Dieter 2001: *Einbürgern und Ausschließen. Die Nationalisierung der Staatsangehörigkeit vom Deutschen Bund bis zur Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Göttingen

Hayduk, Ron 2006: *Democracy for all: Restoring immigrant voting rights in the United States*. New York

Heinsohn, Kirsten 2010: *Konservative Parteien in Deutschland 1912 bis 1933. Demokratisierung und Partizipation in geschlechterhistorischer Perspektive*. Düsseldorf

Hochgeschwender, Michael 2010: *Der amerikanische Bürgerkrieg*. Munich

Jessen, Ralph and Hedwig Richter (eds.) (forthcoming): *Elections under 20th-century dictatorships*. Frankfurt/Main

Johnson, Kenneth R. 1972: Kate Gordon and the woman-suffrage movement in the south. *Journal of Southern History* (3): 365-391

Keyssar, Alexander 2000: *The right to vote. The contested history of democracy in the United States*. New York

Keyssar, Alexander 2009: Voting. *Princeton Encyclopedia of American Political History*. Princeton: 854-863

Kocka, Jürgen 2001: Das lange 19. Jahrhundert. Stuttgart

Kousser, J. Morgan 1974: *The shaping of southern politics. Suffrage restriction and the establishment of the one-party South, 1880-1910*. New Haven, CT.

Kühne, Thomas 1993: Wahlrecht – Wahlverhalten – Wahlkultur. Tradition und Innovation in der historischen Wahlforschung. *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* (22): 481-547

Kühne, Thomas 1994: *Dreiklassenwahlrecht und Wahlkultur in Preußen: 1867-1914. Landtagswahlen zwischen korporativer Tradition und politischem Massenmarkt*. Düsseldorf

Latour, Bruno 1995: *Wir sind nie modern gewesen. Versuch einer symmetrischen Anthropologie*. Berlin

Lu, Jie and Tianjian Shi (2009): »Political Experience« – a missing variable in the study of political transformation. *Comparative Politics (*42): 103-120

Mergel, Thomas 1997: Geht es weiterhin voran? Die Modernisierungstheorie auf dem Weg zu einer Theorie der Moderne. *Geschichte zwischen Kultur und Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Theoriedebatte*. Munich, edited by idem and Thomas Welskopp: 203-232

Mergel, Thomas 2002: *Parlamentarische Kultur in der Weimarer Republik. Politische Kommunikation, symbolische Politik und Öffentlichkeit im Reichstag*. Düsseldorf

Mergel, Thomas 2005: Wahlkampfgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte. Konzeptionelle Überlegungen und empirische Beispiele. *Was heißt Kulturgeschichte des Politischen?* (ZHF-Beiheft 35). Berlin, edited by Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger: 355-376

Mergel, Thomas 2005b: Die Wahlkabine. *Orte der Moderne. Erfahrungswelten des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt/Main, edited by Alexa Geisthövel and Habbo Knoch: 335-344

Neugebauer-Wölk, Monika 1984: Wahlbewußtsein und Wahlerfahrungen zwischen Tradition und Moderne. *Historische Zeitschrift* (238): 311-352

Nipperdey, Thomas 1983: *Deutsche Geschichte 1800-1866. Bürgerwelt und starker Staat*. Munich

Nohlen, Dieter 2009: *Wahlrecht und Parteiensystem. Zur Theorie und Empirie der Wahlsysteme*. 6th ed. Opladen

O'Gorman, Frank 1989: *Voters, patrons, and parties. The unreformed electoral system of Hanoverian England 1734-1832*. Oxford

O'Gorman, Frank 1992: Campaign rituals and ceremonies: The social meaning of elections in England, 1780-1860. *Past and Present* (135): 79-115

Osterhammel, Jürgen 2009: *Die Verwandlung der Welt. Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. 3rd ed. Munich

Peukert, Detlev J. K. 1989: *Max Webers Diagnose der Moderne*. Göttingen

Raphael, Lutz (2000): *Recht und Ordnung. Herrschaft durch Verwaltung im 19. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt/Main

Richter, Hedwig 2011: Obedience of the masses. Meanings and functions in state socialist elections. *Elections under 20th-century dictatorships*. Frankfurt/ Main, edited by Ralph Jessen and Hedwig Richter

Rogers, Donald W. 1990: Introduction – the right to vote in American history. *Voting and the spirit of American democracy: essays on the history of voting and voting rights in America*. Urbana, Ill., edited by idem et al.: 3-18

Rokkan, Stein 1970: *Citizens, elections, parties*. Oslo

Rustow, Dankwart 1970: Transitions to democracy. Toward a dynamic model. *Comparative Politics* (3): 337-363

Ryan, Mary 1999: Civil society as democratic practice: North American cities during the 19th-century. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* (29): 559-584

Schäfer, Michael 2009: *Geschichte des Bürgertums*. Stuttgart

Scherer, Hermann 1848: Württemberg. *Staats-Lexikon. Encyklopädie der sämmtlichen Staatswissenschaften für alle Stände*. Vol. 12. Altona, edited by Carl von Rotteck and Carl Welcker: 812-827

Seymour, Charles and Donald Paige Frary 1918: *How the world votes. The story of democratic development in elections*. 2 Vols. Springfield, Mass.

Silbey, John H. et al. (eds.) 1978: *The history of American electoral behavior*. Princeton, N.J.

Sneider, Allison 2008: *Suffragists in an Imperial Age. U.S. expansion and the Woman Question, 1870-1929*. New York

Sternberger, Dolf and Bernhard Vogel (eds.) 1969: *Die Wahl der Parlamente und anderer Staatsorgane. Ein Handbuch*. Vol. 1: *Europa*. Berlin

Weber, Reinhold and Hans-Georg Wehling 2007: *Geschichte Baden-Württembergs*. Munich

Welskopp, Thomas 1997: Der Mensch und die Verhältnisse. »Handeln« und »Struktur« bei Max Weber und Anthony Giddens. *Geschichte zwischen Kultur und Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Theoriedebatte*. Munich, edited by Thomas Mergel and Thomas Welskopp: 39-70

Welskopp, Thomas 2000: *Das Banner der Brüderlichkeit. Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie vom Vormärz bis zum Sozialistengesetz*. Bonn

Welskopp, Thomas 2010: *Amerikas große Ernüchterung. Eine Kulturgeschichte der Prohibition*. Paderborn

On the margins of urban society?

Inequalities and the differentiation of social space in a metropolis of the modern age – St. Petersburg 1850-1914

Hans-Christian Petersen

The social question has returned. And in its wake the interdisciplinary dialogue between the social and historical sciences has intensified, after it had been comparatively subdued in the last few years because of the prevailing historiographical trends to apply cultural-historical aspects. These conclusions could be drawn under the impression of the reactions to the *47th German Historians' Congress* seen in the comments and features of the press. This convention took place in Dresden in 2008. In fact, by choosing »Inequalities« as the overall topic, a motto had been chosen that like nothing else was qualified to build a bridge to sociology and its related disciplines. At the same time, this motto referred to presently ongoing processes of increasing social polarizations. Everywhere catchwords like precarization, gentrification or the crisis on the financial markets and their social consequences were connected with a rediscovery of the social question by the guild of historians – hence »Hard facts for harsh times« (Bollmann 6.10.2008), as it was put to the point by the German newspaper *taz*? And consequently a change from cultural-historical approaches to a return of social history, as could be read frequently?

A look at the program of the Dresden convention makes it clear quickly that such a turnaround is out of the question, as the vast majority of sections have continued to put the focus on cultural-historical aspects, the analysis of symbols, habitats and discourses. In addition, the question should be raised whether such a rigid confrontation of social history on the one hand and cultural history on the other hand is truly the right way

DOI:10.2390/indi-v2-i1-29 ISSN 2191-6721

to advance understanding. Or would it be more fruitful to look upon the respective advantages and shortcomings and thus come to a modification and improvement of existing approaches: to link »hard facts« (to use the same term as above) with the lately widely accepted progressing knowledge of looking upon processes of historical ways of perception and creation of meaning? In this context, Christoph Cornelißen has spoken of a »return of social history«, which will surely be no longer the old history of the labour movement and organization. We will rather see a »new social history« which will take into account the numerous turns of recent years, among others the »latest steps towards a history of space« (Cornelißen 2008).

Doubtlessly, it is nothing new to demand a combination of cultural- and socio-historical approaches. Looking at the international discourse, it quickly becomes clear that critical voices become louder, turning against too extensive a claim of interpretation of the Cultural Turn and demanding concepts for a cultural-historically expanded »New Social History«. This has especially been happening in the English-speaking part of historical science since the mid 1990s.[84] Here, the focus has been and still is on the perpetuation of the socio-critical impetus, which formed the basis of social history, and on the apprehension that the broad and explanatory perspectives of historical science could be lost in the course of cultural-historical microstudies: »History's priorities became refocused by centering the discipline's established subject matters; by claiming the neglected contexts of the personal, the local, and the everyday; and by allowing historians to better face questions of political subjectivity. But why should the earlier concerns of social historians be forgotten, as opposed to fruitfully reengaged? Why should embracing the possibilities of microhistory require leaving macrohistory entirely behind?« (Eley 2005: 199).

84 As representatives there are to be named: Corfield 1996; Halpern 1997; Bonnell & Hunt 1999; Eley 2005, as well as the correspondent discussion of his theses in the forum of the *American Historical Review* 2008; Pooley 2005.

In comparison to this, the German discourse is still at the very beginning of its possibilities. After a time of convergence between historical and social sciences in the 1960s and 1970s and the subsequent dominance of cultural-historical approaches, only recently there have been voices demanding the return of the social under an expanded perspective.[85] My project is connected to these considerations, as its focus is more strongly directed on the social question through a concurrent examination of structures, action and social space, without abandoning any cultural-historical cognitive progress.

The history of industrialization and urbanization can certainly be called a classical field of »old« social history (according to the differentiation used by Cornelißen). Legions of studies on the growth of towns, the development of their populations and the relevant social questions have been carried out on the assumption that social processes can be seen first and more pronounced – like under a magnifying glass – in the towns. For a long time the geographic focus was on Western Europe, mainly Great Britain, whereas the urban history of Eastern Europe experienced a more wide-spread interest among western researchers as late as in the 1970s and 1980s (Bater 1976; Bradley 1985; Hamm 1986; Hildermeier 1986; Brower 1990). At the same time we see a voluminous Soviet historiography dealing intensively with social differences at the end of the Tsarist Empire, from which valuable information can still be gained even today. It is, however, generally influenced by collectivistic and teleological interpretaments of Marxist-Leninist ideology.[86]

Since 1991, the research of urban history in the Russian Empire has experienced a marked upswing which here shall be represented by the key word »local society«. Guido Hausmann (Hausmann 1998; 2002), Lutz

85 As a combative representative there is to be named: Maderthaner & Musner 2007; additionally there is to be mentioned the Annual Seminar of the *Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology* 2009 that was followed by the foundation of this journal: Introduction 2010.

86 Cf. with regard to St. Petersburg, among others Kruze 1958; 1961; Semanov 1966.

Häfner (2004) and others have shown developments of structures of civil society in the form of liberal local public and municipal self-government. Through this they have confronted Dietrich Geyer's dictum of the 18th century Russian society being a »governmental affair« (Geyer 1966) with the image of a society as a local affair.

As important and welcome as this discussion may undoubtedly be, it is also clear that it covers only a small part of the urban population of the empire. Only a small percentage of the inhabitants of the towns have taken part in the formation of a local society, comprising city dumas, the press and public representation. When applying such a perspective, a large proportion of the inhabitants is not taken into consideration or is, if at all, seen as the object and recipient of public welfare. An indication of this is the reappearing statement in scientific literature that the towns of the Russian Empire were split up into a rich, modern »bright« centre on the one hand and poor »dark« fringes governed by rural traditions on the other hand.

In the meantime, this impression has been enlightened in some instances (among others Zelnik 1971; Bonnell 1983a and 1983b; Bradley 1984; Steinberg 1992; Neuberger 1993; Frank & Steinberg 1994; Engel 1994; Goehrke 2003; Rustemeyer 1996; Rustemeyer & Siebert 1997). On the whole, only a few studies can be found where members of the lower classes, the inhabitants of the poor quarters of the towns are regarded as active participants. This is where my project sets in, by attempting to shed light on the ›dark‹ peripheries of the towns. In other words, I want to look at the social question in municipal areas of the Russian Empire. Structural factors shall be combined with individual actions and the formation of social space.

The concept of »social space«

The category of »space« is undoubtedly one of the winners of the last few years among the fields of research in the historical and social sciences. The »spatial turn« has often been dealt with and has made us more aware of numerous social spaces beyond a traditional understanding of space. I am under the impression that this term has sometimes

simultaneously been made into a kind of label in the debates among historians, by remaining at the undoubtedly important understanding that spaces are not just there but are continually created by people – without considering further reflections and differentiations. Compared with this, I think that the aspects recently developed by spatial sociology seem to be more promising. Particularly the *Centre of Research Excellence URBAN RESEARCH* at the *Technische Universität Darmstadt* has made highly interesting theoretical reflections aiming at a new spatial sociology to begin with, but which can also be put to good use in historical science.

The joint starting point of the different projects was and is the aim to overcome the dualism between natural space and social space which has dominated research debates on spatial theories for a long time. To bring it to an ideal-typical point, we find two opposite opinions as to the formation of space. On the one hand, we have the followers of an absolutistic concept of space, among others strongly influenced by the geographer Friedrich Ratzel. It is based on the image of space as a container that has an effect on the objects in it but which cannot be influenced by the objects. At the other end of the scale we have a line of research, created by Émile Durkheim and Georg Simmel, of a relativistic concept of space emphasizing the primate of social order, understand ing physical space as a consequence and not as a prerequisite of social organization and power structures (Dünne & Günzel 2006: 289-303, 371-376).

In contrast to this, starting out from the conceptions of Anthony Giddens and Pierre Bourdieu, Martina Löw has developed a concept of space founded on action theory which she called »relational« (Löw 2001). It is based on the assumption that spaces are developed, perceived and continually constituted anew or altered. On this understanding, spaces are »relational arrangements [(An)Ordnungen] of living beings and social goods« (Löw 2001: 271) at certain locations. The dualism between natural space and social space is abolished, in favour of a single »social space of interactions« (Dünne & Günzel 2006: 302).

Consequently, this means that there can be several spaces at one location depending on the perspective of the acting participants who use this

respective space and that this is not only true for concrete physical spaces but also for nonphysical spaces like associations or cognitive maps. Löw takes up the differentiation earlier made by Michel de Certeau. He defined a »location« as a »momentary constellation of fixed points«, in contrast to »space« which he described as a »network of mobile elements« (Certeau 1988, cited in Dünne & Günzel 2006: 345). »As a whole«, as Certeau put it »*space is a location with which you do something*« (Certeau 1988, cited in Dünne & Günzel 2006: 345, italics in the original).

Moreover, Martina Löw has introduced two notions describing the constitution of social spaces, thus making an analysis possible: spacing and synthesis. By »spacing« she understands that social goods and/or people are placed or place themselves in space. This leads to the above-mentioned »relational arrangements«. These arrangements alone do not create social space – it needs people to make these arrangements become space through processes of perception, imagination and memory. This is what she calls synthesis (Löw 2001: 158).

At the same time, it is important that more attention than seen in some recent cultural-historical studies has to be paid to the fact that the continuous constitution of social spaces does not take place in a vacuum. The structure of spaces depends to a decisive extent on the prevailing specific social conditions, and not each individual has equal opportunities of taking part in their formation by means of spacing and synthesizing.[87] By introducing the term »habitus« and different types of capital that are available to the acting parties involved to a varying extent, Pierre Bourdieu developed suitable analytical tools for grasping these inequalities (Bourdieu 1998, in Dünne & Günzel 2006: 354-368). With regard to the specific area of the ›town‹, it is necessary to ask which other prerequisites are required – besides plain physical presence – in order to participate in the constitution of urban spaces. »You can show physical presence in a residential area without actually living there in the strict

87 Cf. on the criticism of such a blind »culturalism« towards the social question Maderthaner & Musner 2007.

sense of the word; namely, you lack the means tacitly taken for granted, e.g. you lack a certain habitus« (Bourdieu 1991: 31).

Moreover, as was pointed out conclusively by Markus Schroer, turning away from spatial determinism should not be followed by spatial voluntarism (Schroer 2006: 175). Even if space is understood to be constantly negotiated, developing spatial areas do not lose their influence on the persons acting in them. Spatial areas come into being through actions and their relevant conditions, the meaning and value people place on them (Schroer 2006: 176; Gunn 2001). This statement is taken up within the scope of my study in so far as I will not only deal with the constitution of spatial areas in the sense of the concept of relational space as defined by Martina Löw, but I will also pursue the question to which extent certain spatial areas exert an influence. Hence I agree with Schroer who has said that it cannot be our aim to arrive at the one and only concept of space, but to let this depend on each particular problem in question. Most studies – this is also true for an investigation of social space in St. Petersburg – have to deal with a variety of different spaces. Thus it follows that we need different concepts of space for an analysis.

Moreover, it does not suffice to mark every neglected space with a minus sign without examining its interior structures. Such a perspective, as correctly critizised by Loïc J. Wacquant as an »exotization of the ghetto« (Wacquant 1998: 203), excludes that we see power structures, self-organization and disputed areas also at and within the peripheries. To avoid this, the supposedly clear divisions between in- and outside, between centre and periphery, between ghetto and gated community are not to be taken for granted, but should be made subject to analysis. »The homogeneity of quarters is due to a view from the outside which does not account for the differentiations inside. […] The assertion of homogeneity ignores individual fates and differences that are hidden behind the general pictures of homogenous quarters. When undertaking the effort to look more closely, we realize how little the pictures we have of underprivileged districts, ghettos, favelas and banlieus have to do with the real lives of their inhabitants« (Schroer 2006: 249).

This is not meant to belittle existing differences and inequalities and to make them disappear in the most colourful panorama. In accordance with Loïc J. Wacquants, it will rather be my aim to show how the people ›from below‹ deal with these inequalities by way of social and cultural practices; this way I intend to shed light on the heterogeneity and individuality behind the facades: »The inhabitants of ghettos must therefore be seen as active participants. They have to be described more closely so that their habits and ways of living do not only appear as derivates of forces which can ›automatically‹ be ›measured‹ by structural conditions, but will also be seen as a result of their active confrontation with outer and inner social powers which cross and mould their world« (Wacquant 1998: 203; cf. on this in detail also Wacquant 2008: 128-144).

Poverty and social spaces in the metropolis: St. Petersburg and the international context

Now, what meaning do the above outlines have for my project? To demonstrate this, I have chosen a very preliminary division into three great headings. This way it is possible to present surveys of central problems. Rather than keeping the contents of each section apart, they are based on each other and are closely connected in the sense of an understanding of social spaces as caused by actions and their conditions. Above all, but not exclusively, my study will deal with St. Petersburg in the years from 1850 to 1914.

The fortress founded by Peter I. in 1703 under the name of Sankt-Piter-Burch in the northwest of the Russian Empire quickly became the second metropolis of the empire besides Moscow. Like other Russian towns this settlement, which was soon called St. Petersburg, experienced a tremendous increase in population as a result of the abolition of serfdom in 1861 and the rapid growth of industrialization at the end of the 19th century. The number of its inhabitants quadrupled between 1850 and 1914 and amounted to more than 2.2 million at the beginning of the First World War.[88] This town, located on the river Neva, differed from

88 The literature on the history of St. Petersburg is clearly much too voluminous to be adequately dealt with here. For this reason I would like to

other urban centres of the Tsarist Empire in respect of its role in domestic and foreign affairs. Being the capital and residence, it was the administrative centre of the Empire and at the same time since its foundation »a laboratory of modern age« (Schlögel 2002) where new ideas and social utopian visions were to be realized. Accordingly, changes in Russia in modern age could first and most markedly be noticed in St. Petersburg. Of course, this is also true for the increasing aggravation of the social question from the middle of the 19th century onwards.

The time covered by my project ranges from 1850 to 1914. This period of time makes it possible to cover several central political events in a phase of rapid urbanization. It is intended to compare the conditions seen before and after the abolition of serfdom in 1861 as well as before the municipal reform of Alexander II in 1870 and the following developments. Under the municipal statute of 1870, care for the poor as part of urban welfare became the responsibility of the local government (Bautz 2007). This leads us to the question of in how far we see consequences under the aspect of social space. Further important landmarks which shall be examined as to their effects are the municipal reform of Alexander III in 1892 as well as the first Russian revolution in 1905 (with a focus on St. Petersburg: Surh 1989). Scientific studies often see the latter as a phase of acceleration followed by an aggravation of social differences. This statement shall be examined as to its importance for questions of social space. In how far can we notice a stronger division between rich and poor areas e.g. in the years before the First World War? And what are the effects the events of the revolution have on the

refer to the bibliography of the National Library of Russia: Rossiyskaya Natsional'naya Biblioteka 1989ff.: Literatura o Leningrade – Sankt-Peterburge. Bibliograficheskiy ukazatel' knig, zhurnal'nych i gazetnych statey na russkom yazyke, Sankt-Petersburg, as well as to the continuously updated online data bank: Ėlektronnye katalogi Rossiskoy Natsional'noy Biblioteki. Literatura o Sankt-Peterburge: http://www.nlr.ru/poisk/. A recently published introduction to the history of Petersburg is to be found in Kusber 2009.

actions of the ordinary people of the town, on their perception and adoption of social space?

1914 was chosen as the final year of my investigations as I have realized that a further extension up to the years of Soviet rule would simply exceed the scope of my study, as highly interesting as this time may be (cf. for the [post-]Soviet time amongst others Staub 2005). The outbreak of the First World War 1914 as well as the revolution of February 1917 and the days of ›Red October‹ led to fundamental changes of municipal structures, so that the period of time examined was restricted to the beginning of these upheavals.

Structure and space. A social topography of St. Petersburg

An investigation of the differentiation of social space has to include a survey about the relation between the development of urban spatial areas (spaces) and the social question if the aspects of inequality are to be considered. Accordingly, the first part of my study will deal with the social topography of St. Petersburg and its development from 1850 to 1914. The development and changes of internal differentiations in urban space in the course of the years will be examined, based on parameters such as accommodation, the development of rentals and infrastructure (public transportation, sewage systems etc.).

On the one hand, such an analysis can make use of already existing research results. Here James H. Bater has provided an important pioneering work with his study *St. Petersburg. Industrialization and Change.*[89] Moreover, there is a wide range of contemporary publications discussing extensively and in great detail the development of urban space in the Russian Empire from the 1860s onwards. This is true for the liberal periodical *Gorodskoe delo* as well as for periodicals dealing with the problem of welfare, including the *Vestnik blagotvoritel'nosti* and medical journals writing about sanitary standards, hygiene and the causes of existing problems such as the *Archiv sudebnoy mediciny i obshchestvennoy gigieny* in the years

89 Bater 1976; also Steffens 1985; about the challenges of a social topography of St. Petersburg: Limonov 1989.

of 1865 to 1917 (published under varying names). Moreover, an evaluation of the local press will be carried out. Newspapers such as *Peterburgskiy listok* offer a good insight into details of urban life in St. Petersburg and are an interesting source owing to their more widespread distribution.

Reports and records of central governmental and local authorities are just as important. In addition to the *National Library of Russia*, there are above all the *Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg* (*Tsentral'nyy gosudarstvennyy istoricheskiy archiv Sankt-Peterburga*) and the *Russian State Historical Archive* (*Rossiyskiy gosudarstvennyy istoricheskiy archiv*). The records available at these archives provide useful information of the processes of decision-making and measures taken by a great number of organizations from central governmental institutions like the *Ministry of the Interior* to bodies of local municipal self-administration and committees dealing with specific problems concerning the development of urban space, such as the sanitary committee and local police.

Furthermore, maps, drafts of town planning and contemporary photographs can be put to good use. Mainly the cartographic department of the *National Library* offers manifold and informative material showing the general expansion of the town as well as specific aspects like the extent of public transportation or the state of the sewage system over all of the years in question. Above all, the *Central State Archive of Cinema, Photographic and Phonographic Documents* in St. Petersburg (*Tsentral'nyy gosudarstvennyy archiv kinofotofonodokumentov Sankt-Peterburga*) is an important address to turn to for relevant photographic documentation. The collections of this archive do not only give an impression of the structures of certain parts of St. Petersburg at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century but show in an exemplary way the usage of locations such as market places and courtyards by the people living there.

Based on such a social topography of the town, the next step will be a closer look at certain aspects. Among others, it will be examined in how far we find indications for a segregation of urban space in St. Peters-

burg.[90] How close or far apart were the poor and the rich, which role did further differentiation categories like gender or ethnicity play and how strict or flexible were those boundaries? The respective starting point of St. Petersburg was different from comparable metropolitan centres of Central and Western Europe. Owing to the geographic location of the town and insufficiently developed public transportation, large-scale sub-urbanization, so typical for London in the 19th century for instance, did not take place in the Russian capital. Mainly in the centre of the city no strict dividing lines can be drawn between poorer and richer areas. Social differences can often be found in one street or even in one house. Bater therefore spoke of a »three-dimensional segregation« (Bater 1976: 379) as a typical feature of St. Petersburg: besides a given limited spatial differentiation it was not the least a question of height: A great number of the poor inhabitants of the town were either found in the basements or the attics of the houses, whereas it was seen as a sign of prosperity when people lived on the so-called beletage which was generally found on the first floor.

At the same time, however, a diachronic perspective illuminates processes reminding us of corresponding contemporary developments in big western cities, which can also be observed today in many places. From the turn of the century onwards, for instance, there is an increase in the number of articles on the so-called ›housing problem (question)‹ (*kvartirnyy vopros*/*zhilishchnyy vopros*) (cf. Pazhitnov 1910a and 1910b; Gorodskoe delo 1912a; Polupanov 1913 among others). We read about the general conditions of most of the flats and the insufficient number available, but mention is also made of a process known today under the notion of gentrification:[91] an upgrading of housing and increased rentals in the city centres, leading to altered structures of the population living

90 On the term of segregation cf. Häußermann & Siebel 2002; von Saldern 2006: 4.

91 Cf. on the term of gentrification among others Friedrichs 1996; Holm 2010.

there. New prosperous people moved in, while the former inhabitants, who could no longer afford the rents, were pushed out.

In view of the above-mentioned relatively small area of St. Petersburg, the question arises how this development took place. Subject to the still ongoing thorough evaluation of my sources I can give two preliminary answers: On the one hand, a displacement process occurred within the town boundaries, i.e. a certain percentage of the inhabitants moved from the city centres to the fringes of the inner city (Pazhitnov 1911). On the other hand, the people making use of the night asylums (*nochlezhnye doma*) and other shelters for the homeless changed. In addition to the very poor, who had already frequented these places for a long time, low-paid hired labourers, craftsmen and similar workmen were more and more unable to use any other kind of accommodation (Karaffa-Korbut 1912).

Furthermore – in the sense of space as being in a constant bargaining process as outlined above – it shall be examined which private and governmental organizations as well as institutions were involved in this process and how this had a part in the physical shape of space. In how far were certain spatial formations the result of certain norms or targets that were to be enforced?

The discussion about the conversion of the Petersburg Haymarket can serve as an example. The Haymarket (actually literally translated Hay Square, *Sennaja ploshchad'*) was situated in the centre of the capital and originally served as a trading place for hay and firewood. In the course of the 19th century it became one of the biggest markets for foodstuffs in the city (Jahn 1996). At the same time it was a place of poverty, around which many of the urban slums were found, thereby presenting a sanitary problem for the whole town. Against this background, a discussion started in the 1860s about in how far it would be useful to re-organize this ›wild‹, primarily undeveloped square by building four big metal market halls. For twenty years this discussion went on between numerous local and governmental institutions such as the duma of St. Petersburg, the administrative authorities of the town and the *guberniya*, the *Ministry of the Interior* and even the Emperor himself. The various points of view recorded in detail in the respective files range from a support of the

intended re-construction to a total rejection. Quite different reasons were given for the latter attitude. In addition to opinions demanding a complete clearance of the area and promoting the idea of moving the market to another place, we find urgent appeals that any interference with the structures of the Haymarket would entail an interference with the habitats of its population and would endanger the social function the market had all the same.

In the end the market halls were built and inaugurated in 1886. For my project this debate provides an interesting example. It shows the participants in the constitution of public space and their individual intentions and that the relevance of places such as the Haymarket as social spaces was already a topic at that time. Moreover, by evaluating autobiographical texts the impression of these changes on the people living there who did not take part in the discussions at that time shall be brought to light.

Acting and space. Social spaces ›from below‹

So far, the focus has been on the structure of space. Based on this, we will now move on to the question of how spaces are created by the acting of the people living in them. How did the poor people of the town cope with the conditions of their environment? How did they solve their existential daily problems? How much did the structure of space restrict their actions and in what way did each of them take possession of urban space and create social spaces? In how far did they transgress boundaries, either on purpose or unintentionally by cultural and social practices and therefore challenged, in terms of Schroer, supposedly clear dichotomies by everyday actions? And how far can the sources at hand provide information about ›voluntary segregation‹ as it is controversially discussed in recent publications of municipal sociology (Heitmeyer 1998; Häußermann & Siebel 2002; von Saldern 2006: 4): the creation of urban boundaries by the poor themselves, for instance with the intention of staying ›among themselves‹ in certain areas?

These questions will be viewed from two sides: individual and joint actions. For an analysis of individual actions, autobiographical texts will be used which have partly been published or are additionally available in the

collections of handwritings at the libraries. They were mainly written by rural migrants commuting between the surrounding countryside and St. Petersburg or settling in the city for good.

As an example of a retrospective view of the city, here we see the reminiscences of Spiridon Drozhzhin (1848-1930), later known as a ›peasant‹ (*poet-krest'yanin*), who was born in a village of the *guberniya* Tver' as the son of a serf and his wife. He came to St. Petersburg at the age of twelve (Poet-Krest'yanin 1884) and stayed mainly in the third ward of the Spasskaya borough for more than a decade, hence in an area of the city which included the Haymarket. He led a life of poverty, frequently changed the rooms he stayed in or, being homeless at times, even slept in the streets. He eked out a living by taking over frequently changing jobs at numerous pubs.

At the time of his arrival in St. Petersburg Drozhzhin was able to read, owing to the teachings of his grandmother as well as lessons at a village school. However, his knowledge of writing was only rudimentary. From his reminiscences we can learn how he started making use of the corners of the city in which he was living in the true sense of the word.[92] He gained further knowledge by teaching himself. In 1865 he registered at the *Publichnaya Biblioteka* (today's National Library) and started writing poems. For a long time, however, his life was dominated by material misery. From the turn of the century onwards his popularity increased and he could free himself from his former way of life (Zhizn' poeta-krest'yanina 1915).

Drozhzhin's reminiscences can be taken as an example of the creation of social spaces by the poor, of how they were perceived by them and of how in the long run it was possible for them to profit from the »dynamics of social identities in the Late Russian Empire« (Kaplunovskiy 2006). A comparison with other autobiographical texts ›from below‹ will show in how far it was possible to rise in society as well as the limitations in

92 Living in the corner (*ugol*) of a room was a wide-spread phenomenon among the very poor inhabitants of St. Petersburg and a significant indication of the existing housing shortage, cf. Goehrke 2003/2005.

this respect. This raises not least the question about the impact of further differentiating categories on socio-spatial patterns. For instance, the places frequented by persons like Drozhzhin showed a strong patriarchal structure. For this reason it will be important to set the reminiscences of male authors against the perspectives of female writers (cf. also Breckner & Sturm 2002). The same is true for an adequate account of ethnicity. In a multiethnic country like the Russian Empire and in a city like Petersburg this is of central importance.

At the same time, the notes of Drozhzhin provide an account of his perception of a number of spaces ranging from his everyday surroundings to his nightly walks on the grand boulevard of Petersburg, the Nevskiy Prospect. On the one hand, these descriptions provide an individual insight into urban space and its totally contrasting aspects. On the other hand, a comparison with further corresponding texts can also provide an answer to the question of in how far certain effects of space are evident. Above all, the Nevskiy Prospect should provide an interesting example of this, as a place leaving hardly anybody without his own individual associations on his first visit. Accordingly, it will be examined in how far parallel views can be found in the perception of the boulevard. This would confirm the thesis established by Schroer that there are certain »spatial arrangements« with »inherent images and assessments« attached to them by the people (Schroer 2006: 177).

A further important role in shaping the images adhering to certain places is played by contemporary journalism. The development of mass press following the reforms of Alexander II and of literature dealing with the »plebs« of Petersburg since the middle of the 19th century contributed to an »imaginary geography of the ›other‹ Petersburg« (Jahn 2010: 122), having repercussions on the actions of the people. Above all, the study by Helmut Jahn, dealing extensively with this process of social imagination of poverty, provides many interesting observations in this respect which will be considered in my work. This includes, for instance, the wide-spread image of Petersburg as a town of social dichotomy, one pole being the Haymarket while on the opposite side we find the Nevskiy

Prospect. Against this background, texts like those written by Drozhzhin provide interesting insights, as he was a traveller between both »worlds«.

In addition to looking at individual actions, further investigations shall be carried out as to the patterns of social spaces constituted by collective efforts. The above-mentioned process of gentrification may provide insights into the question whether – besides being subject to displacement – the people who could no longer afford to live in the centre of the city also took actions against it. An answer is provided by the relevant contemporary periodicals reporting not only about increasing rentals but also about the growing number of housing associations (Pazhitnov, K. 1910a; Gorodskoe delo 1912a and 1912b). Tenants cooperated in order to acquire flats in a joint effort in order to manage them by themselves on decidedly improved terms. The foundation of such housing associations was not only limited to St. Petersburg from the turn of the century onwards, but was also seen in quite a few Russian cities from the 1850s onwards (Pazhitnov 1912). This shows how people responded actively to social polarization by taking possession of social space through collective actions.

The foundation of housing associations was however largely restricted to the middle classes. This was already a topic at that time. Only those people who had already lived in a rented flat and owned a certain amount of capital were able to take advantage of this. As a rule, those who lived in the corners, in the basements or in the streets could not take part. Hence it follows that it has to be elucidated in how far joint actions by the very poor took place or whether their traces remain isolated and are lost in the daily struggle for survival.

An example of such a collective adoption of space »from below« are graffiti as found in »Vasya's Village«. »Vasya's Village«, being a slum on the Vasil'evskiy Island in Petersburg, was one of those places which came into being by the displacement of poor people to the outskirts of the city. The *Malen'kaya gazeta* took this occasion to publish a series of reports on life in »Vasya's Village«. Among others, reference was also made to numerous texts and illustrations on the walls of the buildings (Yashkov 1915), showing either the poor people themselves or also the

owner of these establishments who was depicted as a greedy person forcing them to pay their rents.

The graffiti at »Vasya's Village« are evidence of the above-mentioned conflict between forced and voluntary segregation. Undoubtedly, a slum is above all the result of economic necessities and displacements, a place where nobody lives of his own volition. At the same time, the graffiti are also proof of an ongoing process of identification with that area which is regarded as one's own possession threatened by the owner. They are evidence of a process of adopting the respective space and correspond to Richard Sennett's definition of graffiti being »a writing of the underclass« – an openly shown sign of their presence: »We exist, and we are everywhere. Moreover, you others are nothing; we write all over you« (Sennett 1990: 207).

Social spaces in an international context

So far the focus has been on St. Petersburg. The purpose of a third phase is furthermore to evaluate the position of this town in an international context. Vienna and London seem to be suitable objects for comparison. Both of them were seats of royal power and possessed a centralising quality for their countries comparable to that of St. Petersburg for the Russian Empire. Moreover, there are both a series of published sources and recent studies on Vienna and also on London at hand on similar issues as outlined above, thus offering a promising basis for a comparative analysis (cf. for instance White 1986; Maderthaner & Musner 1999; White 2001; Bled 2002; Brodie 2004; Mattl et al. 2004; Fishman 2005; Schwarz et al. 2007; White 2007; Musner 2009).

No doubt, such a comparison, which shall be systematically carried out in all parts of the project and not be reduced to an outlook attached to the main text, is a demanding task and not easy to accomplish. Nevertheless, it will be undertaken for two reasons. On the one hand, such a comparison was an issue in all of the contemporary discussions about the causes of poverty and urban development of inequalities. A perusal of periodicals such as the *Archiv sudebnoy mediciny i obshchestvennoy gigieny* quickly shows that corresponding developments and possible strategies

for solving these problems in Central and Western European countries were considered in great detail and that the authors felt that they belonged to this international community of experts. This point of view has to be taken seriously. It should not be hastily assumed that Russia is a singular case which cannot be compared. On the other hand, recent case studies have repeatedly asked for such a contextualization, but so far mostly in vain.[93] In the absence of comparative investigations of housing problems in the cities, Andreas R. Hofmann has rightly pointed out that it would be »of little use« to proceed per se from the »widespread theorem of a ›delayed development‹ as a putative inherent feature of Eastern and East Central Europe – a theorem that does not lead to relevant findings. This is also, above all, true for an empirical survey of dwelling and living conditions of the urban proletariat. On closer examination, differences between East and West were rather of a gradual than of a qualitative kind« (Hofmann 2006: 226). It remains to be assessed in what way this assumption applies to the processes of differentiation of social spaces. However, there is no way around a comparative analysis unless it is intended to adhere to blurry dichotonomies burdened with manifold metaphors such as those of a »European city« and an »Asian« or »Islamic« city (Schubert 2001).

Conclusion

The images we have of the socially deprived quarters of the world are usually very similar. They are the result of a perspective from a safe distance. What we see are largely dull and frequently grey or black tableaus. This process of »perpetuating the same images« (Schroer 2006: 250) can also be applied to Russia – according to the common belief that the world of the very poor of Russian society consisted (and consists) of

93 One of the few exceptions being the current research project of Jan C. Behrends; cf. his discussion paper: Behrends 2007; also conceived with a comparative approach were the two conferences of the *German Historical Institute Warsaw* and the *Social Science Research Center Berlin* »Nation and Modernity. The East European Metropolis (1890-1940); cf. the conference reports: Bianchi & Scholz 2009; Westrup 2009.

people resorting to alcohol, violence and excessive religiousness. That is the end to any further questions.

As much as these circumstances can undoubtedly be found in the relevant sources and have determined everyday life in many slums, it does not suffice to stick to this coarse interpretation of the margins of urban society. What is left aside when looking for a confirmation of the well-known impressions is the perception of the inhabitants as individuals, as actively engaged people: »The inhabitants of socially deprived areas are subjected to the traps of the economy in an especially drastic way. Nevertheless they do not stop shaping the social conditions of their lives by a process of a meaningful acquisition« (Neckel 1997: 79).

The aim of my work is to ask – taking St. Petersburg as a model – in how far the socially underprivileged have not merely been the victims of unequal social circumstances but in what way have they also struggled individually and jointly against their situation on the margins of society by interpreting and adopting social space. Consequently, my key approach will be to assess structures and actions at the same time by combining social-historical approaches with recent cultural-historical aspects and in this way to contribute to an actual return of the social question to the academic discourse of historians.

References

American Historical Review Forum 2008: Geoff Eleys' »A crooked line«. *American Historical Review* (113): 391-437

Bater, James H. 1976: *St. Petersburg. Industrialization and change*. London

Bautz, Annegret 2007: *Sozialpolitik statt Wohltätigkeit? Der Konzeptionswandel städtischer Fürsorge in Sankt Petersburg von 1892-1914*. Wiesbaden

Behrends, Jan C. 2007: Moskau und Chicago als Metropolen der Moderne. Sozialer Konflikt und gesellschaftliche Integration 1870-1914. *Discussion Paper SP IV 2007-402. Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB*): http://bibliothek.wzb.eu/pdf/2007/iv07-402.pdf

Bianchi, Sarah and Dominik Scholz 2009: Nation and Modernity. The east European metropolis (1890-1940). *H-Soz-u-Kult* 23.1.2009, http://hsoz-kult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=2503

Bled, Jean-Paul 2002: *Wien. Residenz – Metropole – Hauptstadt*. Wien

Bollmann, Ralf 2008: Harte Fakten für harte Zeiten. *Die tageszeitung* 6.10.2008

Bonnell, Victoria E. 1983a: *Roots of rebellion. Worker's politics and organizations in St. Petersburg and Moscow, 1900-1914*. Berkeley

Bonnell, Victoria E. (ed.) 1983b: *The Russian worker. Life and labor under the Tsarist regime*. Los Angeles

Bonnell, Victoria E. and Lynn Hunt (eds.) 1999: *Beyond the Cultural Turn. New directions in the studies of society and culture*. California

Bourdieu, Pierre 1991: Physischer, sozialer und angeeigneter physischer Raum. *Stadt-Räume*. Frankfurt/Main edited by Martin Wentz: 25-34

Bourdieu, Pierre 1998 [2006]: Sozialer Raum, symbolischer Raum. *Raumtheorie. Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften*. Frankfurt/Main, edited by Jörg Dünne and Stephan Günzel: 354-368

Bradley, Joseph R. 1984: »Once you've eaten Khitrov Soup Yu'll never leave!« Slum renovation in Late Imperial Russia. *Russian History/Histoire Russe* (11): 1-28

Bradley, Jospeh R. 1985: *Muzhik and Muscovite. Urbanization in Late Imperial Russia*. Berkeley

Breckner, Ingrid 2010: Gentrifizierung im 21. Jahrhundert. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* (17): 27-32 (http://www.bpb.de/files/U8HQVX.pdf)

Breckner, Ingrid and Gabriele Sturm 2002: Kleiderwechsel – Sackgassen und Perspektiven in patriarchalischen Öffentlichkeiten. *Differenzierungen des Städtischen*. Opladen, edited by Martina Löw: 157-187

Brodie, Marc 2004: *The politics of the poor. The East End of London, 1855-1914*. Oxford

Brower, Daniel R. 1990: *The Russian city between tradition and modernity*. Berkeley

Certeau, Michel de 1988 [2006]: Praktiken im Raum. *Raumtheorie. Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften*. Frankfurt/Main, edited by Jörg Dünne and Stephan Günzel: 343-353

Corfield, Penelope J. 1996: New approaches for old towns? *Journal of Urban History* (23): 94-107

Cornelißen, Christoph 2008: Die Sozialgeschichte kehrt zurück. *Der Tagesspiegel* (30.9.2008)

Dünne, Jörg and Stephan Günzel (eds.) 2006: *Raumtheorie. Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften*. Frankfurt/Main

Eley, Geoff 2005: *A crooked line. From cultural history to the history of society*. Ann Arbor

Engel, Barbara Alpern 1994: *Between the fields and the city. Women, work, and family in Russia, 1861-1914*. Cambridge

Fishman, William J. 2005: *East End 1888. A year in a London borough among the labouring poor*. Nottingham

Frank, Stephen P. and Mark D. Steinberg (eds.) 1994: *Cultures in flux. Lower class values, practices and resistance in Late Imperial Russia*. Princeton

Friedrichs, Jürgen 1996: Gentrification. Forschungsstand und methodologische Probleme. *Gentrification. Theorie und Forschungsergebnisse*. Opladen, edited by Jürgen Friedrichs and Robert Kecskes: 13-41

Geyer, Dietrich 1966: »Gesellschaft« als staatliche Veranstaltung. Bemerkungen zur Sozialgeschichte der russischen Staatsverwaltung im 18. Jahrhundert. *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (14): 21-50

Goehrke, Carsten 2003/2005: *Russischer Alltag. Eine Geschichte in neun Zeitbildern, vom Frühmittelalter bis zur Gegenwart.* 3 vols. Zürich

Gorodskoe delo 1912a: Zhilishchnyj vopros 3 (1.2.1912): 210-211

Gorodskoe delo 1912b: Soobshchenija s mest Odessa 4 (15.2.1912): 246-248

Gunn, Simon 2001: The spatial turn: Changing histories of space and place. *Identities in space. Contested terrains in the Western city since 1850.* Aldershot, edited by Simon Gunn and Robert J. Morris: 1-15

Hamm, Michael 1986: *The city in Late Imperial Russia.* Bloomington

Häfner, Lutz 2004: *Gesellschaft als lokale Veranstaltung. Die Wolgastädte Kazan' und Saratov 1870-1914.* Köln

Halpern, Rick 1997: Respatializing Marxism and remapping urban space. *Journal of Urban History* (23): 221-230

Hausmann, Guido 1998: *Universität und städtische Gesellschaft in Odessa, 1856-1917. Soziale und nationale Selbstorganisation an der Peripherie des Zarenreiches.* Stuttgart

Hausmann, Guido (ed.) 2002: *Gesellschaft als lokale Veranstaltung. Selbstverwaltung, Assoziierung und Geselligkeit in den Städten des ausgehenden Zarenreiches.* Göttingen

Häußermann, Hartmut and Walter Siebel 2002: Die Mühen der Differenzierung. *Differenzierungen des Städtischen.* Opladen, edited by Martina Löw: 29-69

Heitmeyer, Wilhelm 1998: Versagt die »Integrationsmaschine« Stadt? Zum Problem der ethnisch-kulturellen Segregation und ihrer Konfliktfolgen. *Die Krise der Städte. Analysen zu den Folgen desintegrativer Stadtentwicklung für das ethnisch-kulturelle Zusammenleben.* Frankfurt/Main, edited by Wilhelm Heitmeyer et al.: 443-469

Hildermeier, Manfred 1986: *Bürgertum und Stadt in Russland 1760-1870. Rechtliche Lage und soziale Struktur.* Köln

Hofmann, Andreas R. 2006: Von der Spekulation zur Intervention. Formen des Arbeiterwohnungsbaus in Lodz und Brünn vor und nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg. *Wohnen in der Großstadt 1900-1939. Wohnsituation und Moderni-*

sierung im europäischen Vergleich. Stuttgart, edited by Alena Janatková and Hanna Kosińska-Witt: 225-249

Holm, Andrej 2010: *Wir bleiben Alle! Gentrifizierung – Städtische Konflikte um Aufwertung und Verdrängung*. Münster

InterDisciplines 2010: Introduction. *InterDisicplines* (1) Issue 1: 4-8

Jahn, Hubertus F. 1996: Der St. Petersburger Heumarkt im 19. Jahrhundert. Metamorphosen eines Stadtviertels. *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (44): 162-177

Jahn, Hubertus F. 2010: *Armes Russland. Bettler und Notleidende in der russischen Geschichte vom Mittelalter bis in die Gegenwart*. Paderborn

Jaškov, V. 1915: Vasina derevnya (ocherk). *Malen'kaya gazeta* (3.1.-8.1.1915) No. 2-7: 3

Kaplunovskiy, Alexander 2006: »Kupecheskie prikazchiki« und »torgovo-promyshlennye sluzhashchie«: Die Dynamik sozialer Identitäten im ausgehenden Russländischen Reich im Fokus der Begriffsgeschichte. *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (54): 375-409

Karaffa-Korbut, K. V. 1912: Nochlezhnye doma v bol'shich russkich gorodach. *Gorodskoe delo* (15.5.1912) No. 10: 627-643; (1.-15.6.1912) No. 11/12: 691-713; (1.-15.7.1912) No. 13/14: 803-824

Kruze, Ė. Ė. 1958: *Rabochee dvizhenie v Petrograde v 1912-1917 gg. Dokumenty i materialy*. Leningrad

Kruze, Ė. Ė. 1961: *Peterburgskie rabochie 1912-1914 gg*. Moskva

Kusber, Jan 2009: *Kleine Geschichte St. Petersburgs*. Regensburg

Limonov, L. Ė. 1989: Problemy interpretacii karty social'no-bytovych i funkcional'nych zon Peterburga konca XIX-nachala XX vv. *Anciferovskie chtenija. Materialy i tezisy konferencii* (20-22 dekabrja 1989 g.). Leningrad, edited by T. B. Pritykina: 176-179

Löw, Martina 2001: *Raumsoziologie*. Frankfurt/Main

Maderthaner, Wolfgang and Lutz Musner 1999: *Die Anarchie der Vorstadt. Das andere Wien um 1900*. 2nd ed. Frankfurt/Main

Maderthaner, Wolfgang and Lutz Musner 2007: *Die Selbstabschaffung der Vernunft. Die Kulturwissenschaften und die Krise des Sozialen*. Wien

Mattl, Siegfried et al. (eds.). 2004: *Felix Salten »Wurstelprater«. Ein Schlüsseltext zur Wiener Moderne*. Wien

Musner, Lutz 2009: *Der Geschmack von Wien. Kultur und Habitus einer Stadt*. Frankfurt/Main

Neckel, Sighard 1997: Zwischen Robert E. Park und Pierre Bourdieu: Eine dritte »Chicago Schook«? *Soziale Welt* (47) Issue 1: 71-85

Neuberger, Joan 1993: *Hooliganism. Crime, culture, and power in St. Petersburg, 1900-1914*. Berkeley

Pažitnov, K. 1910a: Kvartinyy vopros v Moskve i v Peterburge. *Gorodskoe delo* (1.9.1910) No. 17: 1162-1165

Pažitnov, K. 1910b: Kvartinyy vopros v Peterburge: *Gorodskoe delo* (15.10.1910) No. 20: 1373-1383

Pažitnov, K. 1911: Naselenie Peterburga po perepisi 15 dekabrya 1910 g. *Gorodskoe delo* (15.2.1911) No. 4: 338-340

Pažitnov, K. 1912: Stroitel'nyya tovarishchestva v borbe z zhilishchnoj nuzhdoy. *Gorodskoe delo* (1.3.1912) No. 5: 291-299

Poėt-krest'yanin Spiridon Drozhzhin v ego vospominanijach 1848-1884. *Ottiski iz istoricheskogo zhurnala »Russkaya starina« izdan. 1884 g.* Sankt-Peterburg 1884

Polupanov, D. 1913: Zhilishchnyy vopros, stroitel'nye ustav i pravila. *Gorodskoe delo* (1.-15.8.1913) No. 15/16: 1004-1011

Pooley, Colin 2005: Space, society, and history. *Journal of Urban History* (31): 753-761

Rossijskaya Natsional'naya Biblioteka 1989 ff.: *Literatura o Leningrade – Sankt-Peterburge. Bibliograficheskij ukazatel' knig, zhurnal'nych i gazetnych statey na russkom yazyke*. St. Petersburg

Rustemeyer, Angela 1996: *Dienstboten in Petersburg und Moskau 1861-1917. Hintergrund, Alltag, soziale Kontrolle*. Stuttgart

Rustemeyer, Angela and Diana Siebert 1997: *Alltagsgeschichte der unteren Schichten im Russischen Reich (1861-1914). Kommentierte Bibliographie zeitgenössischer Titel und Bericht über die Forschung*. Stuttgart

Saldern, Adelheid von 2006: Integration und Fragmentierung in europäischen Städten. Zur Geschichte eines aktuellen Themas. *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*: 3-60

Schlögel, Karl 2002: *Petersburg. Das Laboratorium der Moderne*. Munich

Schroer, Markus 2006: *Räume, Orte, Grenzen. Auf dem Weg zu einer Soziologie des Raums*. Frankfurt/Main

Schubert, Dirk 2001: Mythos »europäische Stadt«. Zur notwendigen Kontextualisierung eines umstrittenen Begriffs. *Die alte Stadt* (28) Issue 4: 271-290

Schwarz, Werner Michael et al. (eds.) 2007: *Ganz unten. Die Entdeckung des Elends. Wien, Berlin, London, Paris, New York*. Wien

Semanov, S. N. 1966: *Peterburgskie rabochie nakanune pervoy russkoy revolyucii*. Moskva

Sennett, Richard 1990: *The Conscience of the eye. The design and social life of cities*. New York

Staub, Alexandra 2005: St. Petersburg's double life. The planners' versus the people's city. *Journal of Urban History* (31): 334-354

Steffens, Thomas 1985: *Die Arbeiter von Petersburg 1900 bis 1917. Soziale Lage, Organisation und spontaner Protest zwischen zwei Revolutionen*. Freiburg

Steinberg, Mark D. 1992: *Moral communities. The culture of class relations in the Russian printing industry 1876-1907*. Berkeley

Surh, Gerald D. 1989: *1905 in St. Petersburg. Labor, society, and revolution*. Stanford

Welskopp, Thomas 2010: Irritating flirtations. Reflections on the relationship between history and sociology since the 1970s. *InterDisicplines* (1) Issue 1: 9-42

White, Jerry 1986: *The worst street in North London. Campbell Bunk, Islington, between the wars*. London

White, Jerry 2001: *London in the twentieth century. A city and its people*. London

White, Jerry 2007: *London in the nineteenth century. »A human awful wonder of God«*. London

Wacquant, Loïc J. 1998: Drei irreführende Prämissen bei der Untersuchung der amerikanischen Ghettos. *Die Krise der Städte. Analysen zu den Folgen desin-*

tegrativer Stadtentwicklung für das ethnisch-kulturelle Zusammenleben. Frankfurt/ Main, edited by Wilhelm Heitmeyer et al.: 194-211

Wacquant, Loïc J. 2006: *Das Janusgesicht des Ghettos und andere Essays*. Basel

Westrup, Felix 2009: Nation and modernity. The East European metropolis (1890-1940) (Conference Report). *H-Soz-u-Kult* 3.7.2009 http://hsozkult. geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=2672

Zelnik, Reginald 1971: *Labor and society in Tsarist Russia. The factory workers of St. Petersburg, 1855-1870*. Stanford

Zhizn' poėta-krest'yanina S. D. Drozhzhin (1848-1915 gg.): *Opisannaya im samym, i izbrannyja stichotvorenija. Tret'e, znachitel'no ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe avtorom izdanie redakcii zhurnala »Junaya Rossiya«.* Moskva

Institutionalization of dissatisfaction

Towards the dichotomy of »order and disorder«

Olga Galanova

Introduction

The notion of ›order‹ has always been identified as the main object of the social sciences. In the course of its history this notion has taken on a variety of semantic meanings and has thereby allowed for controversial ideological statements about social reality. A primary example of such controversies in the definition of order is the generally used dichotomy of order and disorder,[94] which has embraced the concept of order in itself and which introduces something structural and systematic in contrast to something chaotic and changeable.

This study suggests another view on the relationship between categories of ›order‹ and ›disorder‹. The main concern of the paper is to demonstrate that disorder cannot be seen beyond order in the study of the object within a sociological analysis. They both are in a continuous flow and present themselves rather as two sides of a common whole. Various order problems like, for example, unemployment or criminal activities always originate as complementary parts of order and possible ways of its development (Lipp 1994). This view of order problems allows to

94 The relation between the concepts of »order« and »disorder« has influenced the sociological manner of questions and is worthwhile to study already for the purpose of a closer determination, as this relation refers to the problematic status of sociology in the society (Galanova 2011). On the one hand, the sociologist searches for possibilities to a solution of the problem which endangers the social structures and brings chaos to social life. Hence, she or he positions her- or himself as someone who searches for disorder to settle an order instead. On the other hand, her or his results may cause disorder for the normality scale.

overcome the normative weighings of (dis-)order and to consider the concepts of order/disorder in a fluid continuity. Such a free-of-value concept of order allows to develop more possible ›forms of order‹ and replaces the mentioned dichotomy of ›order/disorder‹ by the question: How does social reality originate from different possibilities and how is it determined by the concrete actions of social actors (Rehberg 2001)?

The goal of this paper is to concretize this ›dichotomy concept‹ of social order and to show that social reality cannot be seen as a static phenomenon which is constantly off balance and must be moved back to its original state. We propose to overcome this theoretical problem by applying an empirical analysis of those forms of actions which social actors routinely use when dealing with some kind of problems or disturbances of the social order.

Dissatisfaction as an indicator of the fragility of social structures

Instead of the working with some pre-given theoretically developed categories, we concentrate on settings which for the actors appear as actual inconsistencies. Within this perspective, the borders of ›order‹ and ›disorder‹ can be recognized at the empirical and phenomenological level as not meeting the expectations of social actors. What can we find out about the social reality if one starts out not from the unquestioned fact of the social order but questions it together with the actors? (Bergmann 1988). How do actors process the breeching of order in such a way that it turns into something unproblematic, integrates itself into the order and obtains, in addition, a new, order-supporting function (Garfinkel 1996)? By laying emphasis on the perspective of social actors it becomes possible to guarantee the closeness to the empirical reality.

The diversity of order disturbances social actors deal with can be reflected through the semantic field of the dissatisfaction communication. In the following we will demonstrate how dissatisfaction makes settings in which actors deal with different problems of order, visible and observable. Dissatisfaction will be understood as a »symbolic practice« (Castoriadis 1984) which points out to something undesirable (Grimm 1936: 2315, keyword »unzufrieden«) or to something which does not

correspond to our every-day expectations. Dissatisfaction will be conceptualized in this paper as a convenient object to observe the processes of how the social basic structures can be put into question by the disturbances of everyday life. For our analysis, expression of dissatisfaction is taken as a piece of litmus paper which makes unquestionably accepted events noticeable.

Institutionalization of dissatisfaction in different fields of social order

Dissatisfaction shows several figures and ways. Ways of its expression vary from simple and spontaneous (as for example a baby crying) to institutionalized and well-organized actions (such as public actions of a political opposition). Also the object of dissatisfaction seems inexhaustible. One can express discontent with her- or himself, with neighbors, with politics and politicians as well as with the whole world. The conditions under which dissatisfaction penetrates our life seem contradictory at first sight and not unambiguously determinable.

Expressions of dissatisfaction appear in society in spite of all religious and moral sanctions. Accordingly, in the early modern times it was a religious taboo to express dissatisfaction with one's situation in life because the existing social order was considered God given. At the same time, the principle of dissatisfaction turns out to be the driving force of the Reformation. The discontent with the Catholic Church and its institutions, in particular with the selling of indulgences, had to be legitimated (as, for example, a struggle against corruption).

At the legal level, the institutionalization of dissatisfaction legitimizes its identity by the right to criticism. However, these rights are also equipped with the certain containments which refer to the personality of the complainant. If this person falls under the category of »trouble-maker« which *constantly* searches to frown on something, his or her discontents are defined as a result of psychic illness and the contents of his complaint are not treated under the right to criticism any more.

Also the ambivalent assessment of dissatisfaction in moral instructions is a cause for the fact that the process of its institutionalization cannot be defined unambiguously. On the one hand, expressing dissatisfaction can be easily disapproved as moaning. Already in the year 319 B.C., Theophrast in his *Characters* described moaning as an immoral behavior. At the same time, with this partial tabooing of expressions of dissatisfaction, morality, just as religion, turns out to be the instance which serves for the legitimacy of concern of the discontented person. Dissatisfied persons appeal not least to moral authorities to justify their emotionality and to make it comprehensible. By refering to basic moral principles they often legitimize their own dissatisfaction with dominating negative states.

The ambiguity in the moral assessment of dissatisfaction is also reflected by popular sayings. Some examples: »The discontented finds no comfortable chair«, »moaning fills no chambers«, »complaint does not fill the stomach«, »February is the month in which the farmer has the fewest to grumble, at most only 28 days«. In Russian popular sayings, dissatisfaction has found a specific medium in spite of moral and religious bans. It legitimizes its expression so so-called anecdote stories (Lewis 2008) and joking songs (*chastuschki)* (Adonjeva 2006). Dissatisfaction is not simply expressed in them but is turned and legitimized in a humorous tone. Here the ›discontented‹ compete with each other to show the situations of everyday life more sharply and wittily. In a society in which criticism of official politics could not be freely and openly picked out as a central theme, such communication forms served above all as channels of political dissatisfaction. Openly expressed dissatisfaction, possibly in the form of protest and uprisings, was always nipped in the bud by the government or was knocked down bloodily. Hence, dissatisfaction could be expressed only in private or made in an unfamiliar humorous or ironic form. The Soviet song-writer Vyacheslav Butusov formulated this situation very appropriately by the remark: »The people blow the trumpet tacitly.«

Similar to the relationship of dissatisfaction and morality, one also finds ambivalences in the relation of dissatisfaction and political power. There

are numerous examples in which the ways, of how to express dissatisfaction have also been arranged by the dictatorial political forces. This holds e.g., for the *Lettres de cachet* in France of the 18th century, which are analyzed by Michel Foucault (1989). From them it is evident that these complaints, extremely dangerous for the citizens, were written in full trust in the power and goodness of the feudal king.

Another example is the complaint culture of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), which was also interpreted by the state as trust of the citizen in his state. As Ina Merkel describes, the German government had never before received as much post as did the leadership of the GDR. Petitioning had become a widespread complaint practice there and showed a direct form of communication between the citizens and the state. Petitions were used not only as a remedy to achieve some personal goals and private interests, but also to draw attention to the serious social defects with proposals for a change in politics. For instance, free elections or the demolition of the wall were demanded by anonymous complaints. The rising dissatisfaction at the end of the 1980s can apparently be read from the often threatening style of the letters, where GDR politicians were also accused. The complaints compensated the plebiscitary function due to the lack of public and the weakness of the informational policy and even caused one law or another to be changed (Merkel 1998: 11-19).

Also these days the politics create many rooms and media channels which serve as platforms to reveal expression of dissatisfaction about political events, to bundle up and to channel dissatisfaction of the citizens. Thus, political forums are organized also on the Internet where the citizen can articulate his or her discomfort with politics.

This overview of examples of different mechanisms of the institutionalisation of dissatisfaction brings to light how dissatisfaction embodies a conflict between different forms and possibilities of order. On the other hand, dissatisfaction has to be seen as a mechanism which regulates relationships between different contradicting and co-existing processes of social order.

Formal variety of expressions of dissatisfaction

As we have already pointed out, dissatisfaction can appear in different communicative forms and in varied frames of social relations. Expressions of dissatisfaction by a single actor, for example, should be distinguished from that what appears in communications of two, three, or four interacting actors. However, the statement »two-, three-or four-interaction« does not mean the exact number of persons taking part in the conversation. Instead, the number refers to the communicative status. By help of this variety of interactive and communicative forms of dissatisfaction in different constellations we can show the variety of actions allowing social actors to deal with unexpected and unwanted situations and sometimes making it even possible to correct inconsistencies of order.

To develop the classification of ways of expressing dissatisfaction we refer to empirical data which have been already been analyzed and classified in different studies (Goffman 1978; Günthner 2000; Galanova 2009, 2011). The detailed analysis of concrete conversations show different ways of expressing dissatisfaction and can be found there. For this reason we will only concentrate on the system of different forms of dissatisfaction with reference to the previous results. We will pay, however, extra attention to the questions of how participants recognize some problems and disturbances of order, of how they make these problems recognizable for others and of how the situation can change after dissatisfaction has been expressed.

We begin with the dissatisfaction of a single actor. Erving Goffman calls such format of dissatisfaction »spill cries«. These are exclamatory utterances (exclamatory statements) which are »emitted to accompany our having, for a moment, lost guiding control of some feature of the world around us, including ourselves. Thus a woman, rapidly walking to a museum exit, passes the door, catches her mistake, utters Oops!, and backtracks to the right place« (Goffman 1978: 801). The sound can provide a warning to others present that a piece of the world has gotten loose, and that they might best be advised to take care.

Spill cries allow social actors not just to point the disappointment of some expectations and routine circumstances but also to let others know that something goes wrong and some help is needed. For example, if a person falls down in the middle of the street and utters Ooh!, other people know that something unexpected and unwanted has happened. In such a situation it is common practice to help the person to stand up.

Dissatisfaction in a two-interaction is expressed by a reproach which usually serves one actor for informing another about a violation of rules (Günthner 2000). In the case of a disregard of control these communicative formats allow to point out to a mistake and to force the violator to correct his or her behavior.[95] In such situations, the actor may express his or her dissatisfaction to force the opponent to correct his or her behavior.

However, people can express dissatisfaction in form of reproach not only to point out to a disturbance of order and to enforce the correction of the problem. Reproach makes it also possible to take the communicative position of supervising the implementation of control and active correction of a »broken order«. Advantages of this role should be considered as an additional profit from expressing dissatisfaction in the reproach (Galanova 2011).

Another communicative format of dissatisfaction is the complaint. A three-interaction is typical for the development of this communicative genre: First, a person who complains; second, the object of complaints, and third, the witness to whom dissatisfaction is addressed. This constellation usually appears when in order to demonstrate and to stand his or her own point of view on the situation a complainant shows his or her dissatisfaction with the behaviour of a conflict originator towards a third party (Günther 2000). Thereby he or she tries to restore his or her social competence if this was questioned in the past by the object of the complaint. To persuade the complaint recipient, one usually reconstructs

95 It is to be supposed here that in households whose members carry out a firmly defined allocation of duties the reproaches are to be heard more often than in others.

the actions of the opponent as unacceptable and unfair. Hence, often the negative moral assessment of the mistake of the person serves as a main strategy of the complaint talk.

By a constellation of four-interaction there are four different speech statuses: a dissatisfaction producer; an object of dissatisfaction; an immediate recipient; and an observer whose presence is known to all participants. Such a form of relationship can be observed in situations when somebody indirectly tries to include an observer into a group. In such settings dissatisfaction can take on, for example, the form of open provocations which are used to invite the observer to demonstrate his or her response reaction and thereby to become involved in the conversation. Provocation, alienation and surprise effects are commonly known as universal strategies by which the actor calls on an observer for active attention.

At the same time, to create a more pleasant climate for the recipient, the actor can easily turn these contents into something amusing and cheerful. As a result, dissatisfaction can be easily changed into a joke, which often appears as a community-endowing mechanism to bind actors with different perceptions. In such format, dissatisfaction can be converted into something amusing and playful. Here, the ironic and funny presentation of disturbances of order should be called the parodying of the expression of dissatisfaction because such dissatisfaction is dissociated from its original goal of providing dismay. Instead, dissatisfaction becomes a caricature and a laughing ritual, which brings original values in rotation (Bachtin 1969: 32).

Expression of dissatisfaction as an order-supporting action

Through the description of the commonly known and recognizable forms of expressions of dissatisfaction we have shown that social actors actively use a well-organized system of ritualized actions to indicate different problems of order, to make them recognizable for other participants and sometimes to restore the disturbed order. What does it mean for the mentioned discrepancy of the order/disorder?

By the notion of *Entselbstverständlichung,* Arnold Gehlen defined situations when self-evident structures do not meet expectations and become problematic for social actors. From the moment these self-evident structures are interrupted they become an object of permanent reflection, understood as a critical attitude towards routine structures, the problemless nature of the institutionalized structures of the order not being guaranteed any more. Helmut Schelsky (1980) complements Gehlen's thoughts with the concept of an institutionalization of permanent critical reflection (*Dauerreflexion*). Institutions become functional via the institutionalization of critical reflection because this reflection challenges institutions to the fast and effective development of their functions according to new requirements. From this perspective the disturbance, the object of critical reflection and of the communication of dissatisfaction is not destruction but a mechanism in support of the order.

In addition, Schelsky introduces the definition of »adaptation«. In contrast to Gehlen, he understands adaptation as an ability to develop counter-models of behavior which enable a critical position in relation to the structures of social order. The possibilities of active adaptation – as a condition for the change and individual emancipation from the compelling behavioral legality – may by no means be excluded from the description of society. According to Schelsky, social order cannot be imagined without any deliberate doubt about the given structures and traditions.

Schelsky's idea of the institutionalization of »permanent critical reflection« is pivotal for the definition of (dis-)order, because it gives a fruitful concept of how actors deal with inconsistencies of order. They overcome and restructure order disturbances by the way they translate them into secure and familiarized behavioral strategies of dissatisfaction representation and thereby bring into effect the institution-stabilizing role of »permanent critical reflection«. Ritualized communicative formats of dissatisfaction can be defined as institutionalized and communication-

stabilizing forms which help to translate different problems of everyday life into the known and normal.[96]

Conclusion

In this study we developed the thesis that dissatisfaction is a medium which enables to register and to observe actions dealing with different problems and irritations of social order. The conceptualization of dissatisfaction by various communicative formats has enabled us to elucidate the relevant and understandable system of actions and has made it possible to investigate the question: How can actors articulate and indicate different problems, disturbances, and tensions by means of dissatisfaction?

We have described dissatisfaction in terms of an organized set of different communicative forms actors employ to reach a normalization of the situation in case of a problem and/or when certain expectations are disappointed. As a result, we have succeeded to retain the expression of dissatisfaction in its polyfunctionality and to formulate the general function of the expression of dissatisfaction. It consists of articulating a demand for establishing the order and in making this demand, as an improvement impulse, effective.

By the determining this function, it was then possible to return to the main thesis and to demonstrate that ›order‹ and ›disorder‹ are not finite given facts which should be imagined as a disjunctive polarity relation; rather it means those stabilized tensions whose balancing contains certain potentials related to social development dynamics. Dissatisfaction is a demand for order. According to Schelsky, this certain necessity for order should be imagined not as supporting a conservative adaptation to structures but as supporting an impulse for development and change.

96 Dominik Schrage (2003) formulated this idea as a question: »Which type of disorder does ›ritualized action‹ address?«

References

Adonjeva, Svetlana 2006: *Derevenskaja chastushka XX veka*. St. Petersburg

Bachtin, Michail 1969: *Literatur und Karneval. Zur Romantheorie und Lachkultur*. Munich

Bergmann, Jörg 1988: *Ethnomethodologie und Konversationsanalyse* (Studienbrief mit 3 Kurseinheiten). Hagen

Castoriadis, Cornelius 1984: *Gesellschaft als imaginäre Institution. Entwurf einer politischen Philosophie*. Frankfurt/Main

Foucault, Michel 1989: *Familiäre Konflikte. Die »Lettres de cachet«*. Frankfurt/Main, edited by Arlette Farge

Galanova, Olga 2009: Kommunikativer Vorgang der Unzufriedenheit: Von der alltäglichen Gattung zur Rhetorik. *Dialogue Analysis* XI. Münster, edited by Edda Weigand: 483-492

Galanova, Olga 2011: *Unzufriedenheitskommunikation. Zur Ordnung sozialer Un-Ordnung*. Wiesbaden

Garfinkel, Harold 1996: *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Cambridge

Gehlen, Arnold 2004: *Urmensch und Spätkultur. Philosophische Ergebnisse und Aussagen*. Frankfurt/Main

Goffman, Erving 1978: Response Cries. *Language* (54): 787-815

Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm 1936: *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Leipzig

Günthner, Susanne 2000: *Vorwurfsaktivitäten in der Alltagsinteraktion. Grammatische, prosodische, rhetorisch-stilistische und interaktive Verfahren bei der Konstitution kommunikativer Muster*. Tübingen

Lewis, Ben 2008: *Hammer & Tickle. A history of communism told through communist jokes*. London

Lipp, Wolfgang 1994: *Drama Kultur*. Berlin

Merkel, Ina 1998: *Wir sind doch nicht die Mecker-Ecke der Nation. Briefe an das DDR-Fernsehen*. Cologne

Puzicha, Michaela 2002: *Regula Benedicti Propria voluntas. Der Eigenwille und der eigene Wille. Selbstverwirklichung und Selbstbestimmung in der Benediktusregel.*

Salzburger Äbtekonferenz. http://www.kloster-alexanderdorf.de/MI/Texte/rb/08/08_2.htm

Rehberg, Karl-Siegbert 1973: *Ansätze zu einer perspektivischen Soziologie der Institutionen*. PhD Thesis, University of Aachen

Rehberg, Karl-Siegbert 2001: Weltrepräsentanz und Verkörperung. Institutionelle Analyse und Symboltheorien. Eine Einführung in systematischer Absicht. *Institutionalität und Symbolisierung*. Cologne, edited by Gert Melville: 3-49

Schelsky, Helmut 1980: Zur soziologischen Theorie der Institutionen. *Die Soziologen und das Recht. Abhandlungen und Vorträge zur Soziologie von Recht, Institution und Planung*. Opladen, edited by idem: 215-247

Schrage, Dominik 2003: Das Ritual als Verfahren. Zur performativen Herstellung intangibler Ordnung. *Kunst, Macht und Institution. Studien zur Philosophischen Anthropologie, Soziologischen Theorie und Kultursoziologie der Moderne*. Frankfurt/Main, edited by Joachim Fischer and Hans Joas: 198-208

Schütz, Alfred 2004: *Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt: eine Einleitung in die verstehende Soziologie*. Konstanz