



SOCIOLOGY OF THE ARTS

# The Sociology of Arts and Markets New Developments and Persistent Patterns

*Edited by*  
Andrea Glauser · Patricia Holder  
Thomas Mazzurana · Olivier Moeschler  
Valérie Rolle · Franz Schultheis

palgrave  
macmillan

# Sociology of the Arts

## **Series Editors**

Katherine Appleford  
Kingston University  
London, UK

Anna Goulding  
University of Newcastle  
Newcastle, UK

Dave O'Brien  
University of Edinburgh  
Edinburgh, UK

Mark Taylor  
University of Sheffield  
Sheffield, UK

This series brings together academic work which considers the production and consumption of the arts, the social value of the arts, and analyses and critiques the impact and role of cultural policy and arts management. By exploring the ways in which the arts are produced and consumed, the series offers further understandings of social inequalities, power relationships and opportunities for social resistance and agency. It highlights the important relationship between individual, social and political attitudes, and offers significant insights into the ways in which the arts are developing and changing. Moreover, in a globalised society, the nature of arts production, consumption and policy making is increasingly cosmopolitan, and arts are an important means for building social networks, challenging political regimes, and reaffirming and subverting social values across the globe.

More information about this series at  
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/15469>

Andrea Glauser  
Patricia Holder  
Thomas Mazzurana  
Olivier Moeschler • Valérie Rolle  
Franz Schultheis  
Editors

# The Sociology of Arts and Markets

New Developments and Persistent  
Patterns

palgrave  
macmillan

*Editors*

Andrea Glauser  
University of Music and Performing Arts  
Vienna, Austria

Patricia Holder  
University of St. Gallen  
St. Gallen, Switzerland

Thomas Mazzurana  
University of St. Gallen  
St. Gallen, Switzerland

Olivier Moeschler  
University of Lausanne  
Lausanne, Switzerland

Valérie Rolle  
University of Nantes  
Nantes, France

Franz Schultheis  
Zeppelin University  
Friedrichshafen, Germany

ISSN 2569-1414

ISSN 2569-1406 (electronic)

Sociology of the Arts

ISBN 978-3-030-39012-9

ISBN 978-3-030-39013-6 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39013-6>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover image © Anna Goulding

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG. The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

# Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>1 Introduction</b>  | 1  |
| <i>Andrea Glauser, Patricia Holder, Thomas Mazzurana,<br/>Olivier Moeschler, Valérie Rolle, and Franz Schultheis</i> |    |
| <b>Part I Creators in the Market: Artists Between Aesthetics,<br/>Critique, and Trade</b>                            | 17 |
| <b>2 Patrick Modiano, Between the Fields of Limited<br/>Production and Large-Scale Production</b>                    | 19 |
| <i>Clara Lévy</i>  |    |
| <b>3 A Star Down-to-Earth: On Social Critique in Popular<br/>Culture</b>   | 47 |
| <i>Désirée Waibel and Robert Schäfer</i>   |    |

|                 |   |     |
|-----------------|---|-----|
| <b>Part II</b>  | <b>Artistic Career Paths: Trajectories and Inequalities in the Market</b>   | 73  |
| <b>4</b>        | <b>Art Workers, Inequality, and the Labour Market: Values, Norms, and Alienation Across Three Generations of Artists</b>      | 75  |
|                 | <i>Orian Brook, Dave O'Brien, and Mark Taylor</i>   |     |
| <b>5</b>        | <b>Visual Artists' Professional Situations and Trajectories Between Institutions and the Market</b>                           | 97  |
|                 | <i>Pierre Bataille, Johannes M. Hedinger, and Olivier Moeschler</i>   |     |
| <b>6</b>        | <b>The Art Market: Art's Incomplete Mirror—Artistic Action's Guiding Principles and Their Consequences for the Art Market</b> | 129 |
|                 | <i>Linda Dürkop-Henseling</i>   |     |
| <b>Part III</b> | <b>The Economy of Idiosyncrasy: Art Dealers and the Commodification of Individuality</b>                                      | 157 |
| <b>7</b>        | <b>When Market Promotes Individuality: Arts in Early Modern Japan from the Macrosociological Perspective</b>                  | 159 |
|                 | <i>Takemitsu Morikawa</i>   |     |
| <b>8</b>        | <b>The Art Market Facing New Connoisseurship: The Reception of Pieter Brueghel the Younger at Auction</b>                     | 183 |
|                 | <i>Anne-Sophie Radermecker</i>  |     |
| <b>9</b>        | <b>Collective-Artists: Actors on the Margins of the Global Field of Contemporary Art</b>                                      | 213 |
|                 | <i>Séverine Marguin</i>   |     |

|                |  |     |
|----------------|--|-----|
| <b>Part IV</b> | <b>Marketable Art: Galleries and Gallery Owners as Central Intermediaries</b>  | 237 |
| <b>10</b>      | <b>Hierarchies and Divisions in the Subfield of Gallery Owners: A Research on Art Galleries in Milan</b><br><i>Anna Uboldi</i> | 239 |
| <b>11</b>      | <b>Mapping the Professional Self-Concepts of Gallery Owners: A Typology</b><br><i>Michael Gautier</i>                          | 263 |
| <b>12</b>      | <b>The Diffusion of Galleries in China (1991–2016)</b><br><i>Linzhi Zhang</i>  | 287 |
| <b>Part V</b>  | <b>Market Assessments: The Increasing Role of Art Rankings</b>   | 317 |
| <b>13</b>      | <b>Magic Index on the Wall: Who Is the Most Valuable Artist of Them All?</b><br><i>Nathalie Moureau</i>                        | 319 |
| <b>14</b>      | <b>Can Contemporary Art Galleries Be Ranked? A Sociological Attempt from the Paris Case</b><br><i>Alain Quemin</i>             | 339 |
| <b>Part VI</b> | <b>Features of the Art Market in Advanced Capitalism: From Established to New Patterns?</b>                                    | 363 |
| <b>15</b>      | <b>The Art Fair Boom and Its Contradictions</b><br><i>Erwin Single</i>   | 365 |



viii      **Contents**

|           |   |     |
|-----------|---|-----|
| <b>16</b> | <b>Art Meets Capitalism: In Praise of Promising Potentialities?</b> | 387 |
|           | <i>Denis Hänzli</i>   |     |
| <b>17</b> | <b>The Art, the Market, and Sociology: Concluding Remarks</b>       | 411 |
|           | <i>Franz Schultheis</i>   |     |
|           | <b>Index</b>  | 421 |

## Notes on Contributors

**Pierre Bataille** is a lecturer at the Université Grenoble Alpes. His research interests include the sociology of education, sociology of elites, sociology of work, cultural sociology, gender perspective, and longitudinal approaches in mixed methods research design. His main works have been published in *European Educational Research Journal*, *European Sociological Review*, *Formation-Emploi*, *Sociétés Contemporaines*, and *Sociologie*.

**Orian Brook** is AHRC Creative and Digital Economy Innovation Leadership Fellow at the University of Edinburgh, researching social and spatial inequalities in the creative economy, including precarity in creative employment, and spatial differences in the social stratification of cultural participation. Prior to academia she worked in cultural organisations for many years, specialising in audience research.

**Linda Dürkop-Henseling** is a lecturer at the Christian-Albrechts University of Kiel; she also holds a PhD from that university. Her research interests are sociology of culture and sociology of organisations. Her published works are as follows: *Typisch Künstler? Zum Selbstverständnis in der bildenden Kunst* (Weinheim: Beltz Juventa, 2017) and *Arbeiten in der Kulturbranche: Take the Money and Run?* In *Typisch Soziologie!?* (edited by Obermeier, Claudia and Linda Dürkop-Henseling, 34–48; Wiesbaden: Beltz Juventa, 2018).

**Michael Gautier** is an editor at the Swiss Parliament. His research interests include the sociology of culture and the arts. His latest publication is *Passion und Kalkül. Zur beruflichen Bewährung in der Galerie (Passion and Strategy. On the Prerequisites for Coping with the Gallerist's Professional Challenges)* (Frankfurt/New York 2019).

**Andrea Glauser** is Professor of Cultural Studies at the University of Music and Performing Arts, Vienna. Her research interests cover the sociology of arts, cultural sociology, urban studies, sociological theory, and qualitative research methods.

**Denis Hänzi** is a lecturer at the Bern University of Teacher Education. His research interests include theatre, social order, and collective imaginaries. He is working on a book on potentialism as the upcoming societal regime in contemporary capitalist countries.

**Johannes M. Hedinger** is a curator, researcher, educator, artist, and author working in the field of contemporary art. He is the director of the Institute for Land and Environmental Art and a lecturer at the Zurich University of the Arts and at the University of Cologne. His focus and research topics include art strategies, art world studies, art market studies, sociology of art, socially engaged art, participatory art, art in public sphere, land and environmental art, urban art, transdisciplinarity, inter-media, cultural hacking, and artistic research.

**Patricia Holder** holds an MA in cultural studies from Goldsmiths College, the University of London. As a researcher, she has mainly been interested in the fields of artistic and creative labour in the last years.

**Clara Lévy** is a professor at the University of Paris 8 (Institut d'études européennes). Her research interests include sociology of art, sociology of literature, and sociology of identities.

**Séverine Marguin** is a postdoctoral researcher at the Collaborative Research Center 1265 "Refiguration of spaces". Her research interests are design research, experiment, knowledge, sciences studies, and architecture.

**Thomas Mazzurana** studied sociology and business informatics in Vienna and St. Gallen, where he received his PhD in 2017. His research interests cover the sociology of art and the sociology of the family.

**Olivier Moeschler** is an associate researcher at the University of Lausanne, Head of Cultural Statistics at Federal Statistical Office (FSO), and teaches at Haute École de Gestion (HEG) in Geneva. He is interested in the various aspects raised by the sociological analysis of cinema, culture, cultural policies, media, and the arts. He is the president of the Research committee Sociology of Arts and Culture (RC-SAC) of the Swiss Sociological Association (SSA).

**Takemitsu Morikawa** is Professor of Sociology at the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Faculty of Letters at Keio University, Tokyo, Japan. His focus is on sociological theory, history of sociology, sociology of culture, and sociology of knowledge.

**Nathalie Moureau** is Professor of Economics at the University of Montpellier 3. Her research interest is cultural economics and more especially the art market, and many books and papers of hers on this topic have been published.

**Dave O'Brien** is Chancellor's Fellow in Cultural and Creative Industries at the University of Edinburgh. Several of his works on the sociology of culture, culture-led urban regeneration, and inequalities in cultural labour markets have been published.

**Alain Quemin** is Exceptional Class Professor of Sociology of Art at Université Paris 8 / Institut d'études européennes and an honorary member of Institut Universitaire de France. He specialises in the sociology of art markets and institutions. He also studies visitors' surveys, the internationalisation of the visual arts, and the social construction of artistic reputations and consecration for visual artists.

**Anne-Sophie Radermecker** is a BAEF Fellow at Duke Art Law and Markets Initiative (Durham, NC). Her main research interests deal with art market studies, the economics of the artist's name, and anonymity in art.

**Valérie Rolle** holds a chair for Sociology of Art and Culture at the University of Nantes. She has conducted extensive research on creative work such as tattoo, theatre, and graphic design. She is working on the field of contemporary art in Nantes.

**Robert Schäfer** is a researcher and a lecturer at the University of Fribourg and a lecturer at the Distance University of Switzerland. His areas of expertise are qualitative methods, cultural sociology, sociology of religion, and social theory.

**Franz Schultheis** is Professor of Sociology at Zeppelin University, Friedrichshafen, Germany, and President of Bourdieu Foundation. His research fields are sociology of arts, creative economy, work worlds, and social exclusion.

**Erwin Single** is a research associate at the Institute of Sociology at the University of St. Gallen. He is co-writer of the research publications *When Art Meets Money* and *Art Unlimited*.

**Mark Taylor** is Senior Lecturer in Quantitative Methods (Sociology) at the Sheffield Methods Institute, University of Sheffield, and is AHRC Leadership Fellow (Creative Economy) until 2021. His research interests are in the sociology of culture: in consumption, production, and education, and its relationship with inequality.

**Anna Uboldi** is a PhD scholar in applied sociology and methodology of social research at the University of Milano-Bicocca. Her main research interests focus on sociology of art, education, inequalities and youth condition, Bourdieu's theory, and qualitative methods.

**Désirée Waibel** is a PhD candidate and a lecturer at SOCIUM—Research Center on Inequality and Social Policy at the University of Bremen and a lecturer at the Distance University, Switzerland. Her research areas are sociological theory, the sociology of expertise, and the sociology of valuation.

**Linzhi Zhang** is a postdoctoral research fellow at the Centre for Chinese Visual Arts at Birmingham City University and an affiliated researcher in the Department of Sociology at the University of Cambridge, where she received her PhD. Her research concerns the production of fine arts in post-socialist China.

# List of Figures

|          |  |     |
|----------|--|-----|
| Fig. 5.1 | ACM dimensions inertia   | 108 |
| Fig. 5.2 | Space of professional positions (Dim1 and Dim2)  | 109 |
| Fig. 5.3 | Clouds of individuals, cluster membership, and sex   | 112 |
| Fig. 5.4 | Clouds of individuals, diploma, age, and partner situation   | 115 |
| Fig. 5.5 | Self-presentation on official documents  | 118 |
| Fig. 5.6 | Motivations to become an artist  | 119 |
| Fig. 6.1 | The differentiated art system  | 138 |
| Fig. 6.2 | Leading concepts of artistic actions in the art system   | 143 |
| Fig. 7.1 | Hishikawa, Moronobu. “After a Tune” (「低唱の後」), ca. 1673–81, in the collection of Keio University Libraries  | 173 |
| Fig. 7.2 | Suzuki, Harunobu. “Tea-stall of O-Sen” (「おせん茶屋」), ca. 1764–1772, in the collection of Tobacco and Salt Museum in Tokyo   | 174 |
| Fig. 7.3 | Kitagawa, Utamaro. “Eight Views of Famous Teahouse Beauties: The Beauty Okita Looking into a Mirror” (「名所腰掛八景 鏡」), ca. 1800–1806, in the collection of Keio University Libraries | 175 |
| Fig. 7.4 | Tōshū-sai Sharaku. “The Actor Ôtani Oniji as Edobei” (「三代目大谷鬼次の江戸兵衛」), 1794, in the collection of Tokyo National Museum  | 176 |
| Fig. 8.1 | Distribution by attribution qualifier ( $n = 733$ )  | 195 |
| Fig. 8.2 | Average length of notes (or total number of words) by attribution qualifier  | 195 |

**xiv**      **List of Figures**

|          |  |     |
|----------|--|-----|
| Fig. 8.3 | Price index by attribution qualifier (By = 100)                                      | 203 |
| Fig. 9.1 | Example of an artist file in the archives of <i>Documenta</i> from Kassel            | 223 |
| Fig. 9.2 | Examples of collective-artist's file in the archives of <i>Documenta</i> from Kassel | 224 |

# List of Tables

|            |  |     |
|------------|--|-----|
| Table 2.1  | The most frequently invited writers on <i>Apostrophes</i> between 1975 and 1989  | 32  |
| Table 2.2  | Sales figures in France of Modiano's works before and after the Nobel Prize  | 38  |
| Table 2.3  | Works in translation available in a selection of foreign countries before and after the Nobel Prize                                    | 41  |
| Table 3.1  | Overview of <i>Formation's</i> critiques, justifications, and pre-emptions of counter-critique   | 68  |
| Table 5.1  | Comparison of the socio-demographic profile of visual artists (respondents sample), Swiss visual artists, and Swiss working population | 102 |
| Table 5.2  | Active modalities  | 106 |
| Table 5.3  | Sample composition   | 112 |
| Table 5.4  | Illustrative modalities  | 123 |
| Table 8.1  | Descriptive statistics—Average and Median Prices by Attribution Qualifier  | 202 |
| Table 8.2  | Results of the Hedonic Regression by Attribution Qualifier   | 203 |
| Table 9.1  | Collective membership in the various editions of <i>Documenta</i> from Kassel (1955–2012)  | 225 |
| Table 13.1 | Ranking of artist by country on the art scene, 2017  | 325 |
| Table 13.2 | Marking artistic quality according to Roger de Piles   | 328 |
| Table 13.3 | Institutions' rating   | 329 |
| Table 13.4 | Artists' ranking   | 330 |



**xvi**      **List of Tables**

|            |  |     |
|------------|--|-----|
| Table 13.5 | Top 10 young contemporary artists (under 30)—<br>breakdown by turnover   | 332 |
| Table 14.1 | Star galleries and other important ones in France in terms<br>of integration to the contemporary art world   | 354 |
| Table 14.2 | Ranking in terms of medium range of the top ten artists in<br>the rosters  | 356 |
| Table 14.3 | Overall rank: Comparison of the two rankings in terms of<br>recognition of the gallery and access to the market and in<br>terms of “quality” of its roster | 358 |



# 1

## Introduction

**Andrea Glauser, Patricia Holder, Thomas Mazzurana,  
Olivier Moeschler, Valérie Rolle, and Franz Schultheis**

This book draws on the papers presented at a congress at the University of St. Gallen in 2016 under the title “Art and Market: Alienation or Emancipation?” Organised by the Swiss Sociological Association (SSA)’s Sociology of Arts and Culture Research committee (RC-SAC) in collaboration with the St. Gallen Institute of Sociology and supported by the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences (SAHS), this event

---

We warmly thank Joanne Walker for the quality of the proofreading of this introduction in English, and the Centre nantais de sociologie (CENS—UMR 6025) of the University of Nantes for sponsoring it.

---

A. Glauser

University of Music and Performing Arts, Vienna, Austria

e-mail: [glouser@mdw.ac.at](mailto:glouser@mdw.ac.at)

P. Holder • T. Mazzurana

University of St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland

e-mail: [patricia.holder@unisg.ch](mailto:patricia.holder@unisg.ch); [thomas.mazzurana@unisg.ch](mailto:thomas.mazzurana@unisg.ch)

O. Moeschler (✉)

University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

e-mail: [olivier.moeschler@unil.ch](mailto:olivier.moeschler@unil.ch)

© The Author(s) 2020

A. Glauser et al. (eds.), *The Sociology of Arts and Markets*, Sociology of the Arts,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39013-6\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39013-6_1)

sought to discuss the complex and changing relationship between the arts and the market.<sup>1</sup>

In analysis of art as well as in common representations of artistic creation, the market has often been ascribed an ambivalent role. Some authors have suggested the market brings about the commodification or even the bondage of art. According to the Frankfurt School, the “cultural industry”, as an integrated economic and technological system, produces and disseminates standardised cultural products aimed at fulfilling needs that it itself creates from scratch and at encouraging consumers to conform to dominant norms (Adorno and Horkheimer 1947). In turn, the figure of the “accursed artist” or “*artiste maudit*” who continues to create pieces of art even when she or he cannot sell them, is often presented as the epitome of “authentic” creation. From this point of view, genuine art only becomes possible by *escaping* the market, thanks to non-market support, for instance, in the form of private grants or state subsidies.

In his seminal analysis of “the rules of art”, which focused specifically on literature but has a wider scope of application, Pierre Bourdieu (1993) showed that over time, modern artistic creation has formed relatively autonomous production fields, establishing a “reversed economy”. In the latter, art is believed to be valued according to its aesthetic rather than its

---

<sup>1</sup>The scientific committee was, at the time, composed of Andrea Glauser (University of Lucerne), Jens Kastner (Akademie der bildenden Künste, Vienna), Olivier Moeschler (University of Lausanne), Alain Quemin (University Paris VIII), Valérie Rolle (London School of Economics), Ulf Wuggenig (Leuphana University, Lüneburg), and Franz Schultheis, Patricia Holder, and Thomas Mazzurana (all University of St. Gallen).

---

V. Rolle

University of Nantes, Nantes, France

e-mail: [valerie.rolle@univ-nantes.fr](mailto:valerie.rolle@univ-nantes.fr)

F. Schultheis

Zeppelin University, Friedrichshafen, Germany

e-mail: [franz.schultheis@zu.de](mailto:franz.schultheis@zu.de)

economic properties—although, in reality, it never truly escapes economic considerations. In the first stage of their structuration, the fields of cultural production therefore defined their own rules against the expectations of “*bourgeois*” and “social art”. They were then more generally structured according to a constitutive distinction between *two subfields*, the subfield of restricted, “pure” production organised around aesthetic norms and the judgement of peers, and the subfield of a heteronomous and broader production responding to market-based considerations. Bourdieu showed that this duality structures the contemporary “market of symbolic goods” with an ideal-typical opposition between the consumption of the “aesthete” and the quest for entertainment.

Other sociological studies have stressed the central role of the market in the process of the autonomisation of the arts. Historically, the market has contributed to the casting off of subordination to religion, the court and the nobility, an excessively demanding cultural patronage or, sometimes, the state. This was emblematically the case for Mozart. In his “Sociology of a Genius”, Norbert Elias (1993) showed how the use of subscriptions and concerts allowed the young composer and musician to move beyond the dictates of noble patrons. But while Beethoven (Bourdieu 2001; DeNora 1995), later on, succeeded in becoming an “entrepreneurial artist”, the musical market was, in Mozart’s time, in its early stages, which, paradoxically, both drove Mozart’s prodigious productivity and probably explains his premature death. Svetlana Alpers (1991) also highlighted the constitutive role market mechanisms can play for artistic creation, by showing how the division of labour in Rembrandt’s studio simultaneously reflected and shaped the creation of the market while sustaining the production of art and the reputation of the master. As a sort of response to Theodor Adorno, Edgar Morin (1961) described how, in the “cultural industries” (specifically in cinema), standardised cultural goods are produced by various categories of actors who thereby contribute to the creation of a new worldwide public.

The dissemination of artworks requires, as Antoine Hennion (1993) has argued, numerous “mediators”, including technological and commercial actors: for example, it is not despite but thanks to the modern phonographic industry that a stance of “pure” listening, centred on the appreciation of music for itself, was made possible by the opportunity

given to individuals to buy, listen to and compare several versions of the same piece of music at home (Hennion et al. 2000).<sup>2</sup> From a sociological perspective, the market cannot be conceived solely as a set of economic exchanges responding to the interplay of offer and demand. Indeed, the market constitutes a broader social structure, a vast network of human and non-human actors mobilising numerous material devices and collectively elaborated representations and practices (Callon 2017). Art markets are no exception, and often express more vividly the characteristics and contradictions of the market logic.

For some decades now, certain sociological analyses have brought to light the consequences of that *porosity* between art and markets for artists' career paths. In its way, the "art world" model of Howard Becker (1982) is an affirmation that art, just like every other occupational sector, is formed by collaborative chains of various actors interacting together with shared conventions of production that do not exclude the "social drama of work", for example, a disagreement about how things should be done according to one's position in the chain of production and consumption (Hughes 1996). Following Howard Becker's premise, authors like Pierre-Michel Menger (2002) have stressed that the artist is a "worker" like any other professional, who has to organise herself or himself as an entrepreneur, for example, by selling his or her artwork and/or holding multiple jobs within or outside the field of art. From a broader perspective, Boltanski and Chiapello (2007) have shown how the mainstream capitalist economy has integrated the "artist critique" to managerial injunctions requiring professionals to be "creative" but also flexible risk-takers in the face of the precariousness of the labour market. In the last twenty years or so, the arts have increasingly been discussed as being part of the "cultural industries" or, more largely, the "creative economy" and thus an important area for economic and cultural development.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>The scales of appreciation and their translation into market value nevertheless remain what defines the work of cultural intermediaries, the analysis of which has considerably developed in recent years (Lizé et al. 2011; Jeanpierre and Roueff 2014).

<sup>3</sup>From 2008 on, the United Nations Conference on Trade and development (UNCTAD) has regularly published its "Creative Economy Reports" (see [https://unctad.org/en/pages/publications/Creative-Economy-Report-\(Series\).aspx](https://unctad.org/en/pages/publications/Creative-Economy-Report-(Series).aspx)). The "cultural and creative industries" are seen by UNESCO, who published a *Creative Economy Report* in 2013, as a "new agenda for development" that can be used for "widening local development pathways" (UNESCO 2013) see <https://en.unesco.org/creativity/events/cultural-creative-industries-new-agenda-development>).

Historical and contemporary relations between the arts and markets are highly complex and diverse. In which conditions and configurations do various types of markets play a role in the constitution of art and what different kinds of role do they play? How does “originality”, “nonconformity”, “authenticity” or “criticism” relate to market settings? What are the situations and trajectories that characterise the different categories of professionals contributing to the creation and dissemination of art? What role do intermediaries such as galleries or art experts, and platforms such as art fairs play? What about the more and more important place accorded to art rankings? What specificities can we observe depending on different artistic forms (visual art, music, theatre, literature), national contexts, political contexts, real conditions of production and larger historical patterns?

The present book explores a much-studied topic in the sociology of the arts from the standpoint of new empirical case studies in different artistic, historical and spatial settings. It illuminates the changes that have occurred lately in various art markets as well as in their sociological analyses.

Opening Part I, Clara Lévy’s chapter sheds light on the artificial character of the opposition made in the field of art between artistic recognition within the subfield of restricted production, and economic success within the subfield of large-scale production. This is especially the case for a minor faction of artists (in this chapter the French writer Patrick Modiano) whose highest awards, such as the Nobel Prize for Literature, have enabled them, having already attained a certain level of consecration, to progress to the stage of canonisation. Through analysis of a documentary corpus of Modiano’s promotional materials and reviews, the paper shows with particular acuity the strategies put in place by “cultural intermediaries” (Lizé et al. 2011), such as publishers, to ensure the conversion of the symbolic value attached to the author, already validated by national and international appraisals, into a surplus of economic value. Such a position finally appears to express a proximity neither to the literary avant-garde nor to the principle of mass consumption. Rather, it seems to occupy a specific place between recognition (among connoisseurs) and canonisation (for posterity, in the public sphere) within the recognition space of the literary field (Denis 2010).

The contribution of Désirée Waibel and Robert Schäfer also deals with issues of recognition, but this time in the cultural industries market.

Based on analysis of the music video and the lyrics of Beyoncé's song *Formation* (first performed during the Super Bowl in 2016), the paper shows how the pop artist builds her renown by combining a critical posture, on an exclusively visual level (referring to historical events revealing racial inequalities such as slavery or hurricane Katrina), with the aesthetic conventions of pop music through self-reflection of her star status, on a lyrical level. These results echo Frith's analysis (2008) highlighting that pop music production seeks to create "a simulacrum of emotional connection" between the artist and his or her audience, focusing attention on the singer (or musicians), beyond the formal aspects of the song.

As noted by Orian Brook, Dave O'Brien, and Mark Taylor, the flip side of recognition is exclusion. Part II points out the discriminating power of the market. Through the portrayal of three generations of female artists selected from a data set of 237 interviews following a large-scale Internet survey, the three authors highlight the impact of class and gender inequalities, as well as unequal integration into professional networks in a given area, on cultural workers' career paths (job opportunities, pay levels, access to funding, etc.). Peripheralised artists therefore justify remaining by a (common sense) vocational commitment to their art, conceived as a passion or "a natural exorcism" (as one interviewee put it) that needs to be pursued despite economic precariousness. In order to be successful on the market—be it commercial or cultural—and to acquire international renown or to exhibit in prominent cultural institutions, rather than continuing with local networks and exhibitions of artistic collectives, a good "sense of placement" is needed.

In a similar vein, Pierre Bataille, Johannes Hedinger and Olivier Moeschler highlight the differences in living conditions, integration into the art market and self-representation for Swiss visual artists. Based on a national survey, their study confirms the need to hold multiple jobs to make ends meet for more than two-thirds of the 457 respondents. More interestingly, it shows the disproportionate number of mostly self-financed artists compared to a minority being sponsored by the state and, above all, by galleries. The latter appear to be more often men than women, working in a professional field structured around three poles: market success, institutional support, and lack of professional integration. Even though they are supported by cultural institutions, women

under thirty and over sixty years old have more difficulties in finding success and struggle to be represented in the market.

Linda Dürkop-Henseling emphasises the incompleteness of the market as a mirror of the whole range of artistic production. Indeed, many of the 24 visual artists she met during exploratory research produce artwork in a professional way without making a living from its sale. By analysing what she calls the “guiding principles of artistic action”, the author distinguishes four types of creators and, therefore, of integration into or proximity/distance to the art market: the “pragmatic artist” who is just exploiting a gift, the “pragmatic-professional artist” looking for recognition as a “real” artist, the “critical-professional artist” who offers criticism within the profession, and the “critical artist” who ambitions to criticise society with art.

In this regard, the inscription of social trajectories in a situated state of the market determines the “field of possibilities” within which the artists project themselves. This space of positions and of “*prises de position*” depends, of course, on a broader historical context, as illustrated in Part III. In Western as in Eastern countries, the market has offered a major emancipatory light on artists’ horizons as regards the religious or aristocratic powers in place. Takemitsu Morikawa exemplifies this in his study of the sociocultural changes that occurred in *ukiyo-e* art (printed paintings) in an emergent publishing market. The Japanese case appears strikingly similar to the “revolutions” induced by the invention of the printing press as regards the processes of secularisation and individualisation in modern societies (Goody 1977; Eisenstein 1991). Copying workshops run by the clergy gave way to the mechanised reproduction of (illustrated) books, at first confined to scholars or members of the aristocracy, until aesthetic changes (notably in the customisation of contents and the diversification of genres) encouraged their democratisation. At the same time, the signature of the painter grew in importance.

Anne-Sophie Radermecker places the question of authentication (e.g. the attribution of an artwork to a single name) at the heart of a paper looking into the sales of Brueghel the Younger’s paintings in auction houses. Her study is based on a qualitative discourse analysis of 235 lot notes produced by the two leading market competitors, Christie’s and Sotheby’s. Assuming that searching for the artist’s hand is anachronistic



for Renaissance paintings, Radermecker assesses the effects of academic advances on the selling strategies of salesrooms. However, this “new connoisseurship” arising from the use of scientific tools (such as X-ray, infrared photography or pigment analysis) has only had a slight impact on the way the “market of classified art” (Moulin 1992) works. Although today based on sophisticated levels of identification, it is the belief in the authenticity of signed work that continues to set the price level established by auction houses and agreed upon by collectors.

In her chapter, Séverine Marguin uses the phenomenon of “collective-artists” to show the permanency of the contemporary art market economy’s idiosyncrasies. Associations of two or more artists who produce works of art together and sign them collectively have increased since the 1960s, typically in critical opposition to prevailing notions of authorship and the idea of the artist as a creative individual genius. Marguin’s central thesis is that collective authorship—despite different diagnoses and the recognition of some groups of artists such as Fischli / Weiss and Gilbert & George—is strongly marginalised in the global field of contemporary art in general, and in the art market in particular. She supports her thesis empirically by analysing art market reports and artist rankings such as Artprice, Kunstkompass and ArtFacts and by investigating the representation of artist collectives at Art Basel and Documenta in Kassel (two major institutions in the international art field). The marginalisation of “collective-artists” is attributed to the fact that individuality still represents the predominant pattern of creative subjectivity in the field of contemporary art—unlike, for example, in the field of music—and that in the context of the art market, the individual artist functions as a “lever for economic speculation”.

The world of art galleries and the profession of the gallery owner, crucial to the understanding of the art field, are the subject of three chapters in Part IV. While all three contributions propose a typology of gallery owners or galleries, their socio-spatial or world-regional focus and their research questions differ.

In her contribution, Anna Uboldi analyses galleries in Milan. Based on interviews and participatory observation and on a theoretical perspective that combines elements of the “field” concept of Pierre Bourdieu and the concept of “art worlds” of Howard Becker, she explores the professional

activities and practical knowledge of gallery owners; furthermore, she is particularly interested in the self-definitions of the central actors and the positions and oppositions in the Milanese gallery scene. She identifies the “integrated gallery owner”, who forms the elite of Milanese art galleries both symbolically and economically, as having a dominant position in the field and distinguishes this type from the profile of the “historical” and the “radical gallery owners”, both of whom occupy a position that Uboldi characterises as corresponding to a “marginalization in the center”. In contrast, “quasi gallery owners” and “aspiring gallery owners”, who largely lack symbolic recognition in the field, occupy dominated positions.

Michael Gautier’s chapter studies the professional self-conception of gallery owners and the question of how affinity to art on the one hand and business acumen on the other are intertwined. The sample consists of galleries in Europe and the USA that have been able to establish themselves on the international art market over a long period of time and occupy a dominant position both symbolically and economically. They function, in the words of Bourdieu (1993, 121), as the main “instances of consecration”. On the basis of qualitative research (interviews, biographical analyses), Gautier has reconstructed four different types of gallerists, the “operator”, the “companion”, the “curator-gallerist” and the “adviser”, and sheds light not only on their self-conceptions, but also on the social background and educational biographies that are characteristic of each type.

Linzhi Zhang’s chapter, in turn, draws attention to the emergence of a gallery scene in China between 1991 and 2016, in an important contribution to research into the globalisation of the art market (Velthuis and Curioni 2015; Moulin 2003). Zhang argues that the emergence of galleries in China is the result of a process of diffusion in which Western practices were received and reconfigured by Chinese gallerists. The author understands diffusion as not simply implying the formation of homogeneous patterns, but also encompassing processes of adaptation, modification and rejection, in addition to the dimension of adoption. It is precisely the reconstruction of such processes that the author is interested in, bringing to light the differences between two predominant types of galleries: on the one hand, a variation that she refers to as the

“price-centered model”, which flourished above all in the years of the market boom but became much less present after 2010; and on the other hand, the model of “for-profit exhibition spaces”, which since 2010 has become the formative paradigm. The reconstruction of the genesis and transformation of these types is based on fieldwork by the author.

Rankings have met with great interest in sociology in recent years. They now exist in practically all domains of society—in science, regarding cities, in art—and raise questions not only as to their effects, but also about what is documented within them, especially in connection with the field of art: what ideas of artistic work and art do they emanate from, how are these elements operationalised, and how do they then find their way into rankings (Buckermann 2020)? An important thesis here is that rankings generate what they claim to represent and measure in the first place—namely, competition, be it between universities or cities (Brankovic et al. 2018; Kornberger and Carter 2010)—and that they represent powerful ordering procedures (Espeland and Sauder 2016, 2007; Heintz 2019).

The two chapters dedicated to this subject in Part V adopt very different approaches to the phenomenon. The chapter by Natalie Moureau critically analyses the phenomenon of rankings in the field of art, focusing on current rankings or indexes such as ArtFacts, Artprice, ARTnews, ArtReview or *Kunstkompass*, which are published on the Internet or in the media. She examines the question of how the proliferation of such indexes is to be understood in the field of art (as well as in many other fields of practice). Furthermore, she draws attention, on the one hand, to the production mechanisms of such rankings, which, as she argues, are based on simplifications and typically do not make the methodological approach on which they are based transparent. On the other hand, she is interested in the effects these rankings produce; she speaks of “perverse effects”, which she associates, among other things, with the fact that the evaluated and ranked actors adopt strategies to perform better in the ranking—strategies “which may be inefficient from a welfare point of view within the art world”. In addition, she points out that rankings (can) have problematic consequences insofar as they tend to have “self-fulfilling effects”, like those Robert K. Merton described in his well-known analysis, “The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy” (1948), in which he examined the social

mechanisms that lead to lies becoming true or an originally inadequate description of a situation becoming reality.

At the centre of Alain Quemin's chapter is the question of how a ranking can be elaborated consistently on the basis of sociological instruments and what can be learnt from this in regard to the contours of the art market—in other words, what possible gains in knowledge for sociological studies result from the construction of a ranking. He examines this through the example of a ranking of galleries in the field of contemporary art in France, based on the observation that there have been numerous rankings of artists since the 1970s, but hardly any of galleries. A central thesis is that the phenomenon of rankings, which is often associated with journalism and non-scientific procedures, can function as a fruitful instrument of knowledge in the context of sociological research under certain conditions.

In Part VI, the last chapters of the volume explore the prevailing mechanisms and discourses in the field of art in advanced capitalism on the basis of empirical examples and thus also describe the constraints and limits of the art market, which sometimes appear, at first glance, to be spaces of possibility.

Using a collective research carried out on the Basel art fair, Erwin Single discusses recent changes in the contemporary art market, where art fairs play a role similar to auction houses in the market of classified art: they set the value of artists and of their production.<sup>4</sup> Salesrooms have competed with the gallery system of fairs (particularly on the primary market) since they added contemporary art to their catalogue from the 1980s onwards. However, Single notes that the multiplication of art fairs (from 3 in 1970 to some 300 at an international level in 2018) contributes to the weakening of the market, since the success of these events depends on participation as well as the commercial health of the galleries. Consequently, art dealers have reoriented their commercial strategies, reinforcing the globalisation of a henceforward internationalised trade. While some (the average galleries struggling for recognition) are driven to

---

<sup>4</sup>As shown in the book, cultural intermediaries usually contribute, alongside merchants, to setting the value of art. Their collaborative relationship nonetheless does not exclude competition favouring the market, observable in the decline of art criticism as well as in the gradual substitution of salaried museum curators with freelance contractors (Poulard 2007).

close their showrooms if they cannot tie into local networks, others (the prominent galleries defining the rules of the game) tend to multiply their group's subsidiaries abroad (Velthuis 2013).

But such growth in the number of art fairs could not have been achieved without the arrival all over the world of billionaires whose purchasing behaviour encouraged the financialisation of contemporary art. These results confirm the observation made elsewhere of the emergence of a “transnational elite” with a “cosmopolitan cultural capital” (Prieur and Savage 2013)—that is to say a fraction of wealthy and well-educated social actors inclined to move out of a national cultural reference framework and contributing, in this way, to a “globalisation of high culture”.<sup>5</sup> Even if they are key players in a supply market that cannot exist if it does not meet their demand, collectors are not addressed in this book. While they are usually analysed as one of the actors in a wider chain of economic cooperation (Moulin 1989; Schultheis et al. 2015), recent studies have focused on the variety of collectors' profiles, showing they cannot be reduced to the figure of the “mega-collector” (Moureau et al. 2016).

In his contribution, Denis Hänzi shines the spotlight on the maxim, prevalent in both artistic and economic worlds, that individuals should “realize their potential”. Based on examples from the field of theatre, the educational system and the labour market in general, he discusses the central role played today by the principle of potential actualisation. He emphasises that the idea of “promising potentiality” is a new valuation criterion in late capitalist society and that the figure of the artist is represented in current discourses as an almost ideal-typical embodiment of potential to be realised. The central thesis of this contribution is that the predominance of this maxim sheds light on a paradoxical situation: while at first glance the maxim stands for the possibility of authentic self-realisation, on closer examination it turns out to be a “tricky vehicle for capitalist commodification”, which actually limits the individual and the social horizon of possibilities.

In his concluding remarks, Franz Schultheis reflects on the paradoxes of a market of symbolic goods reaching astronomical figures but refusing

---

<sup>5</sup>This internationalisation is not new, as shown by the historian Christophe Charle (2015); however, it differs from nineteenth-century trends by its financialisation (Thompson 2008).

to be considered as another market as a result of an *illusio* of disinterestedness. However, the exchanges in the field of art are characterised by financial dealings based on legitimacy echoing, for Schultheis, Max Weber's idea of "status groups" which, distinct from but in articulation with his definition of social classes, underlines how possessing property or wealth interacts with ideas of social honour to foster patterns of social stratification. This leads the author to see the art field as a "social enclave" growing as fast as financialisation and as the number of millionaires—a trend which makes Schultheis fear that art, with this very special position in society, may become just another luxury good.

## References

- Adorno, Theodor W., and Max Horkheimer. 1947. *Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente*. Amsterdam: Querido Verlag.
- Alpers, Svetlana. 1991. *L'atelier de Rembrandt. La liberté, la peinture et l'argent*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Becker, Howard S. 1982. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley/London: University of California Press.
- Boltanski, Luc, and Eve Chiapello. 2007. *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London/New York: Verso.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature*, edited and introduced by Randal Johnson. New York City: Columbia University Press.
- . 2001. Bref impromptu sur Beethoven, artiste entrepreneur. *Sociétés & Représentations* 11 (1): 13–18.
- Brankovic, Jelana, Leopold Ringel, and Tobias Werron. 2018. How Rankings Produce Competition. The Case of Global University Rankings. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 47 (4): 270–288.
- Buckermann, Paul. 2020. *Die Vermessung der Kunstwelt: Quantifizierende Beobachtungen und plurale Ordnungen der Kunst*. Weilerswist: Velbrück.
- Callon, Michel. 2017. *L'Emprise des marchés. Comprendre leur fonctionnement pour pouvoir les changer*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Charle, Christophe. 2015. *La dérégulation culturelle: essai d'histoire des cultures en Europe au XIXe siècle*. Paris: PUF.