

Pierre Bourdieu in Germany: reception and critique

Hans-Peter Müller¹ 

Introduction

Today, Pierre Bourdieu counts as one of the most important theorists of the 20th century in Germany. His status equals other great figures in social theory like Jürgen Habermas, Niklas Luhmann or Ulrich Beck. It seems as if Bourdieu is a Max Weber *redivivus*. According to the German understanding, a *classic* has to meet three criteria:

- He or she has to be dead;
- There has to be a comprehensive and substantive oeuvre;
- The classic exhibits what is called “Anschlussfähigkeit” in German or “connectivity”.

Problems, concepts and arguments of the classic need to have the capability to relate to questions of today in a productive manner. Death, oeuvre and connectivity, then, taken together “make” a classic.

Undoubtedly, Bourdieu fulfills these three criteria. The empirical sign for his classic status is the fact that person and oeuvre are portrayed in a handbook (Fröhlich; Rehbein, 2009). Furthermore, the entire oeuvre is continuously published by a prestigious publishing house. In Germany, the premi-

ent home of the classics is Suhrkamp. This is why Bourdieu is unmistakably a contemporary classic.

But how did he make his way into the Olympus of classics in Germany? Why is he seen as a Weber *redivivus*? What were the channels and multifold ways in which he gained entrance into the social-scientific discourse of Germany? Answering these three questions will give a better understanding of the reception of Bourdieu in Germany¹. According to my view, we can discover three waves of reception paving the way to eternal fame. These three waves overlap and come in tight intervals. In the first wave, Bourdieu entered education with his studies on educational inequality; in a second wave, he conquered sociology with his new class approach and his studies on the style of life; in the third wave he expanded his standing into different disciplines by his concept of field and field analysis in the arts and social sciences. In a brief sketch to follow, I am going to reconstruct these three waves and their discourses respectively. It would need a monograph to document the widespread reception of Bourdieu and his thinking in the German social sciences.

1 For an early assessment see Marinova (1997), recently Fröhlich and Rehbein (2009), Müller (2014) and Rehbein (2018).

¹Humboldt-University – Berlin, Germany. E-mail: hpmueller@sowi.hu-berlin.de
Received on: 05/15/2019. Accepted on: 03/27/2020

Bourdieu in education

The 1960ies and early 1970ies saw a remarkable renaissance of Neo-Marxism. Class theories emerged trying to show that despite the remarkable growth of prosperity after the second World War in “les trentes glorieuses”, as the French called the “economic miracle” of the post-war boom lasting approximately thirty years, classes with different world-views still exist and remarkable social inequalities persist. Was conventional stratification analysis predominantly geared to occupation, education and income trying to show the patterns of intergenerational mobility, the whole plethora of “inequalities” were gauged and heavily criticized. Most important among them was the “woman’s question” and the general discrimination against more than half of the population. Feminist class theories pointed to the intimate relationship between production and reproduction, men and women, that is the division of labor between occupation and paid labor on the one hand, household and unpaid labor on the other. Women’s participation was called for and a larger share in the realm of education. Educational scientists began to look for approaches suited to analyze inequities in the educational field.

Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron (1964) had published *Les héritiers* providing an analytical frame of reference for the relationship between students and culture showing differential participation patterns of classes according to social origin. It was positively reviewed by Charlotte Busch (1967) in the most influential journal of German sociology, the *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, but did not exert an immediate impact. This should change when Bourdieu’s and Passeron’s study entered the German political discourse on

education. Georg Picht (1964), one of the most renowned educational researchers of that time, famous for his call of a “Bildungskatastrophe” (“an educational catastrophe”) in Germany, and his wife Barbara translated parts of the study under the influential title *Die Illusion der Chancengleichheit* (Bourdieu; Passeron, 1971), i.e. “the illusion of equal opportunity”. Picht, Schulte and Stephan (1971) even added an afterword explaining meaning and relevance of this study for educational research. This book was widely received and became highly influential in pedagogy. In sociology, besides Picht it was Ralf Dahrendorf who as a sociologist became highly influential in the political discourse on education. On the one hand, he argued for a larger share of kids from the working class at German universities (Dahrendorf, 1965a). On the other hand, he claimed education to be a citizenship right: “Bildung ist Bürgerrecht” as the famous book title reads (Dahrendorf, 1965b).

The peak of this development defined Eckart Liebau’s and Sebastian Müller-Rolli’s (1985) reception of Bourdieu’s work debating the relationship between the style of life and forms of learning. And Eckart Liebau (1987) wrote his habilitation on the theories of socialization of Pierre Bourdieu and Ulrich Oevermann. At the time, Oevermann played a big part in theoretical debates on how to conceptualize socialization. Thanks to Liebau’s work, Bourdieu entered the theoretical discourse and became one of the most preeminent theorists of socialization.

Since the times of this early reception, Bourdieu’s work plays a decisive role in education studies and pedagogy. Three main areas prevail: first, empirical studies as to the unequal educational participation of different status groups and the reasons for it; second, the notion of habitus as the crucial

mechanism shaping the decisions about participation patterns in secondary and tertiary education; third, the field of education itself which forms institutions like school and university. This wide attraction of the French thinker holds true to this very day. Typical for his major impact in the educational field is the plea for “reflexive educational studies” (Friebertshäuser; Rieger-Ladich; Wigger, 2009). Another major source showing Bourdieu’s mounting importance is the handbook for socialization research (Hurrelmann *et al.*, 2015). It has seen many editions and with every new edition, Bourdieu’s impact seemed to be growing.

Bourdieu in Sociology I: class and the style of life

The wide reception of Bourdieu in sociology set in with the German translation of *La Distinction. Die feinen Unterschiede* (Bourdieu, 1982) or *The fine distinctions*, as the apt German title went, were indeed a bestseller transcending its readership well beyond the confines of academia. It was widely reviewed in newspapers and journals and the unequal distribution of tastes and their class character became a hotly debated topic in the public.

Furthermore, this book encountered a felicitous fate because it attracted one of the best translators in Germany, Bernd Schwibs. The German version turned out to be much more readable than the French original because Schwibs had the courage to dismantle Bourdieu’s overlong sentences sometimes covering one and half pages into short ones and ordering them into the logic of argumentation the author had intended from the outset. Only the most original translators can achieve such a result of enhanced readability without doing harm to the original

text. Bourdieu was obviously pleased with the result of the translation, also with the new telling title. “Die Distinktion”—the literal translation of the French title would have made no sense in German whereas the German “Die feinen Unterschiede” expressed exactly the vision and mission of the book: the relationship between class differences and distinctions of taste. In short: the relationship between class and life style.

The innovative theoretical approach was immediately acknowledged, and Bourdieu was praised for his creativity to combine class analysis with cultural sociology. Class and culture were bridged by taste and its class-specific patterns. This prompted a boom in studies on the styles of life in the 1980ies and the empirical results of Bourdieu’s work were widely discussed. Two articles triggered the reception of Bourdieu in German sociology at the outset. The first one was written by Axel Honneth (1984) who discussed his approach by comparing it to critical theory and opened up the reception of Bourdieu in social philosophy. The second one by Hans-Peter Müller (1986) showed Bourdieu’s importance for structuration theory and a new approach to class and the style of life, thereby introducing him to sociology proper. Despite their praise for a new and original voice in social theory, both Honneth and Müller criticized the lack of moral standards underlying Bourdieu’s critique of modern class society. Morality is more than the ideology of the powerful, stated Axel Honneth. Bourdieu’s theory seems to underlie an “over-structuralized concept of man” comparable to the “over-socialized concept of man” in Durkheim and Parsons, demonstrated Müller.

These initial criticisms notwithstanding, a widespread reception in German sociology set in. Analytically put, three main areas can

be distinguished: theory, analysis and concepts. To begin with *theory*, the discourse was two-fold: social theory and class theory. In terms of social theory, the early 1980ies was the time of the so-called structuration theories. Structuration theories were positioned against functionalism on the one hand, against structuralism in its American and French versions on the other hand. Furthermore, structuration was seen as a way to overcome classical dualisms in social theory like between micro and macro, action and structure, stability and change, theory and practice. In Great Britain, Anthony Giddens (1984) published *The constitution of society* in which he set out his structuration theory. In France, Bourdieu had much earlier begun to overcome the Marxism of Althusser and Balibar as well as the structuralism of Lévi-Strauss in favor of a theory of practice. The theoretical core of his approach turned out to be the triad of *structure—habitus—praxis*. An early formulation was given in his “Esquisse d’une Théorie de la Pratique” in 1972. An elaborated form was published in 1980 as “Le sens pratique”. The subtitle pointed into the direction of Bourdieu’s critique of Marxism and Structuralism respectively: “Critique de la raison théorique”.

The transition from classical structuralism to structuration theory was regarded as a significant step forward in theory building. In his “Sozialstruktur und Lebensstile”—“social structure and the style of life”—Müller (1992) compared the American structuralism of Peter Blau with Giddens’ and Bourdieu’s structuration theory, showing their analytical advantages on the level of social theory and demonstrating their strength substantially on the level of the studies of inequality. Although Peter Blau (1977) developed an interesting structural theory in “Inequality and Heterogeneity” giving rise

to multi-level-social-structural analysis, his “class theory” followed in the footsteps of classical status attainment research. Peter Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan (1967) themselves had delivered the model for this traditional kind of mobility research. Giddens, however, did not just give an elaborate design of structuration theory but had earlier argued for a new reading of class theory and analysis along the lines of Marx and Weber. How his new social theory though would fit his earlier assessment of the class structure of advanced societies (Giddens, 1973) remained largely unanswered. Eventually, it was Bourdieu who paved the way for an original research on class and the style of life. He managed to combine his praxis theory with his theory of social inequality. *La distinction* developed the analytical approach and presented empirical results, demonstrating the fruitfulness of his social and class theory.

With respect to *analysis*, the many empirical studies of class and life style in Germany seemed to reveal the “Frenchiness” of Bourdieu’s take on class. It was particularly Ulrich Beck (1983; 1986) who showed not only the many dangers and risks of a technological society in his famous book on “risk society”. The book became an immediate bestseller in the wake of the catastrophe of Tschernobyl. Even more profound was his impact on the studies of inequality because he convincingly demonstrated a deep-seated process of individualization that set in Germany after the second world war and particularly in the wake of 1968, the student rebellion. The freedom from tradition, from ascribed occupation, from family life for the first time in human history gave individuals of all walks of life the chance to lead one’s life according to one’s own taste—and not class taste as Bourdieu held. Beck unconsciously

continued a tradition of German thinking that Helmut Schelsky (1979) had begun in the 1950ies. He had proclaimed that West Germany was on its way to a “nivellierte Mittelstandsgesellschaft”. A “levelled middle class society” is in fact no class society anymore since it takes at least two classes to state such a type of social formation. Class and society become co-existent and mirror what is called in German “Volksgemeinschaft”, a folk community. During fascist times, the Nazis framed this concept of a folk community in such a racist manner that this term came on the index of polluted concepts. Yet, Schelsky’s concept served widespread feelings and ambitions of the West German postwar society to gain recognition again as a nation and a society in which the entire people commonly share growth and prosperity of the economic miracle. Ralf Dahrendorf (1965c), although heavily opposed to Schelsky who had a dishonorable Nazi past, painted a comparable picture of the stratified German house in his famous study “Gesellschaft und Demokratie in Deutschland” — “Society and Democracy in Germany”. Against this interpretative line set by Schelsky, Dahrendorf and Beck—yes, there is still social inequality but no, there are no classes in West Germany anymore—Bourdieu’s innovative combination of class and lifestyle came as a revelation and introduced a revolution in the studies of social inequality and the sociology of culture. Freed from the constraints of a Marxian class concept, Bourdieu managed to combine the realm of the economy with the realm of culture, in Marx’s words base and superstructure, in Weber’s language class and estate. Bourdieu’s concept of the style of life in a way mirrored Weber’s notion of the conduct of life.

Controversies always trigger debate and analysis. In this case it was Beck

against Bourdieu, post class against class society, German against French sociology. A whole plethora of conceptual discussions and empirical studies followed along the lines of this debate “individualization against class”. A first profound assessment of Bourdieu’s approach was given by Klaus Eder (1989) in a volume discussing class status, style of life and cultural practices. Bourdieu (1989) even commented upon these German attempts to understand his theory but criticized heavily the German “theoreticism” in the readings of his work. During his whole life it seems as if he felt consistently misunderstood by the reception of his thought but admitted that the author himself had difficulties to find a red thread through his own oeuvre. Peter A. Berger and Stefan Hradil (1990) discussed the different concepts of life position, life course and lifestyles in order to gain a conceptual clarification as to which concepts might best be suited for social structural analysis today. Peter A. Berger (1986) had already dealt with the de-structuration of class society in the wake of Beck whereas Stefan Hradil (1987) had developed a new analytical model of social positions and social milieus. Sighard Neckel (1993) investigated the more invisible sides of class and lifestyle by looking at the symbolic reproduction of social inequality. Reinhard Kreckel (1992) developed a political sociology of social inequality which favored a center-periphery-model over a class model. Kreckel (1983) was also crucial in starting the new debate of how to conceptualize social inequality in the 1980ies. Gerhard Schulze (1992) put forward a new cultural sociology following neither in the footsteps of Beck nor in the footsteps of Bourdieu. Rather, he showed that his “Erlebnisgesellschaft” (“experience society”) is structured

by different social milieus. These social milieus have a “class basis” but cannot be explained by their portfolio of material resources alone. Age, education and aesthetic preferences form the different tastes and status groups accordingly. Those milieus cannot be put into a class hierarchy but are different worlds of culture in a complex society. A research group of Michael Vester (1993) working too with a concept of class and milieu came to quite different insights. According to their results, class still matters profoundly. Gunter Gebauer and Christoph Wulf (1993) delineated new perspectives in the thought of Bourdieu and put “Praxis and Aesthetics” into the center of their debate. Jens Dangschat and Jörg Blasius (1994) discussed “Lifestyles in the cities” by linking conceptual debate and empirical analysis, introducing Bourdieu’s thought to urban sociology.

The longer the discourse on lifestyles lasted the more the debate moved away from the initial theoretical vantage point of Beck and Bourdieu. To analyze the distribution of styles of life became an end in itself without much reference to Beck or Bourdieu. Annette Spellerberg (1996) for instance demonstrated the social differentiation of lifestyles in West and East Germany, using the concept of life style by Müller (1989). *Lebensstilforschung* (Rössel; Otte, 2011) became a research field in and of itself.

The *style of life* was one *concept* that was intensely discussed in this first wave of the Bourdieu-reception. *Habitus* was the other one which was even more fiercely debated. What is a habitus? How can the habitus be conceptualized? How is a habitus formed, maintained and altered? This was the range of questions addressed. Cornelia Bohn (1991) put the habitus in context and used Luhmannian arguments to come to grips

with this difficult concept. Gunter Gebauer and Beate Kraus (2002) gave an apt characterization of the strengths and weaknesses of this concept. Dirk Jurich (2005) applied the concept to state socialism in the GDR and made an empirical study to elicit something like a socialist habitus. He showed the inner contradictions and chronic cleavages of the enactment of this habitus in the social life of GDR-socialism. Steffani Engler and Beate Kraus (2004) undertook a critical reconstruction of the concept of habitus already with respect to gender. Heinrich Wilhelm Schäfer (2015) discussed habitus with respect to epistemology—a book written in English. The most comprehensive assessment of the concept and its applicability was given by Alexander Lenger, Schneickert and Schumacher (2013) discussing all the relevant aspects and questions that the ongoing debates elicited. This book certainly reveals the state of art in this discourse on habitus.

Bourdieu was time and again criticized for his strong focus on class but not on *gender*. Beate Kraus (1993) first raised the question of gender and symbolic violence. This was the starting point for a long debate. Irene Dölling and Beate Kraus (1997) edited an influential volume on the gender game in everyday-life. Petra Frerichs and Margarete Steinrücke (1993) discussed the relationship between gender relationships and social inequality. Petra Frerichs (1997) pursued this line of thought by relating class, gender and work as did Maria Nickel and Birgit Riegraf (2000). Particularly in the wake of Bourdieu’s (2005) own attempt in *Die männliche Herrschaft* or *La domination masculine* to come to grips with the relationship of class and gender, the question of intersectionality (Klinger, 2003), i.e. the relationship between different dimensions of social inequality and

their interplay, was heavily debated. Claudia Radeemacher and Peter Wiechens (2001) put forward a volume that discussed these issues in a truly analytical vein, thereby showing the difficulties of intersectional bridging.

Robert Schmidt and Volker Woltersdorff (2008) took up a concept that became more and more important for the late Bourdieu: *symbolic violence*. He had characterized male domination as symbolic violence, soft in expression but hard in its consequences. Like structural violence by Johan Galtung (1969), symbolic violence is a highly attractive concept because it makes invisible power visible. On the other hand, it is a dangerous “Kompaktbegriff” as Luhmann called big concepts analytically underdeveloped. Frithjof Nungesser (2017) has quite recently put forward a devastating critique of this concept and its vicissitudes as a “pleonastic oxymoron” with the recommendation to abolish this term in favor of concrete forms of power and domination.

Bourdieu in Sociology II: field and field analysis

Bourdieu complained pretty often that the German reception focused exclusively on *La Distinction* but without to take into account the rest of his oeuvre. In this assessment he was certainly right. Until today, Bourdieu’s reputation is closely associated with this landmark study in academia and in the public. But over “Bourdieu, the class theorist” one should not forget “Bourdieu, the field theorist” (Kieserling, 2008). When Bourdieu published *Les règles de l’art*, a second opus magnum (Müller, 2014) was born. Not class and lifestyle analysis but field and field analysis formed an almost new paradigm of

Bourdieuian research. In terms of theoretical stamina, this part of his legacy has the chance to develop the highest staying power. This is obviously the case for several reasons. First of all, it is crucial for the sociology of culture but also for cultural studies (Müller, 1996; Reckwitz, 2000; Suber; Schäfer; Prinz, 2011); secondly, in theoretical terms it provides an alternative to classical or neo-classical institutional analysis on the one hand, systems theory on the other hand: neither institution nor system but field. It is no surprise then that Armin Nassehi and Gerd Nollmann (2004) published a reader on the theoretical comparison of Bourdieu and Luhmann. And Bauer *et al.* (2014) compared his work with the Frankfurt school and critical theory, in fact presenting Bourdieu as part of the critical camp. Furthermore, Bourdieu’s approach can be opened up in favor of a discourse analysis or, rather, field and discourse analysis might be fruitfully combined as Rainer Diaz-Bone (2002) demonstrated. Finally, it raises enormously the range of disciplines in the humanities that can work with Bourdieu. Sociology and literature or literary analysis can once again be fruitfully combined. Joseph Jurt (1995) has already declared Bourdieu to be a classic in this field and Tommek and Bogdal (2012) have analyzed the transformations of the literary field. Just to give one impressive example for the fruitful combination of Robert Musil and Pierre Bourdieu in a literary analysis. Norbert Christian Wolf (2011) has studied “Kakanien” (this is Musil’s notion of the Habsburg Empire) as a societal construction in order to elucidate Robert Musil’s socio-analysis of the 20th century. Ulrich, Musil’s man without qualities, is set into the configuration of Fin-de-Siècle Vienna

in the last year before the First World War (Müller, 2013).

Equally crucial is his approach for the sociology of art. As Bourdieu himself showed the art market is a crucial element of the field of art and a battlefield between pure art and valuable art. Florian Schumacher (2011) and Nina Tessa Zahner (2006) have adopted those new rules for the sociology of art. Heike Munder und Ulf Wuggenig (2012) have put forward the most comprehensive study of the art market, its actors and institutions, demonstrating the great value of Bourdieu's approach. Beatrice von Bismarck, Kaufmann and Wuggenig (2008) reflected upon the time "after Bourdieu" to discuss the ways how best to pursue his line of analysis in the future.

Field and field analysis have been developed into a new interdisciplinary research program connecting several sociologies like economic sociology (Kraemer; Brugger, 2017), sociology of organization, sociology of culture, sociology of art, sociology of law (Kretschmann, 2019) etc. Based upon Bourdieu but in continuous development of his theoretical legacy, the analytical approach is fleshed out to become the foundation for a theory of complex societies but also different fields of society and transnational fields. Stefan Bernhard and Christian Schmidt-Wellenburg (2012) have gathered several younger researchers working in the wake of Bourdieu and put together the results of the research within this new paradigm in two thick volumes. Larissa Buchholz (2016) has combined field analysis and globalization in order to show what happens once national fields are trans-nationalized.

One should not forget to mention though a certain disenchantment with Bourdieu and his oeuvre in Germany as well as elsewhere in Europe in the 1990ies when

he started to go public as an intellectual. In academic circles, this caused irritation and a certain misunderstanding of his fight against the intrusions of neoliberalism. At that time, even social democracy in Germany and Europe had discovered the charm of neoliberalism. But not all sociologists tried to ignore Bourdieu's struggle and shied away from his studies. Alessandro Pelizzari (2001) for instance reconstructs the economization of the political by looking at new public management with the lenses of Bourdieu. Frank Hillebrandt, Kneer and Kraemer (1998) discuss the loss of social security which situate styles of life between the poles of multi-optionality and scarcity, between choice and constraint. Uwe Bittlingmayer *et al.* (2002) understand Bourdieu's theory as struggle and show the underlying political connotations of his work. Jörg Ebrecht and Frank Hillebrandt (2002) discussed Bourdieu's theory of praxis and its implications for different research fields of sociology. Sebastian Herkommer (2004) elucidates the metamorphosis of ideology with respect to neoliberalism. Similarly, Effi Böhlke and Frank Rilling (2007) reflect the relationship of Bourdieu to the left and try to deduce lessons for protesting neoliberalism.

Sociologically and empirically most fruitful were the debates in the wake of Bourdieu's (1997) own study *Das Elend der Welt* or *La misère du monde* that delineated the practical experiences of people with different kinds of social inequality and impoverishment. In the German-speaking countries, interesting attempts were made to replicate this field of hidden poverty under the governance of neoliberalism. Claudia Honnegger, Bühler and Schallberger (2002) started in Switzerland, followed by Elisabeth Katschnig-Fasch (2003) in Austria and Franz Schultheis and Kristina Schulz (2005)

in Germany. These portraits of people and their misery were the result of ethnographic research of the “classes populaires” that is the most vulnerable people of a society.

Reading Bourdieu’s political interventions today, one can fully understand why he abolished Weber’s value freedom and gave up his impartial attitude. It was a serious misunderstanding back then to assume that Bourdieu had suddenly turned from a serious scholar into a furious public intellectual. He had always played both roles yet in different accentuation. And he saw more clearly that this new neoliberal regime would have the power to dismantle the welfare state and to undermine democracy in the long run. An avantgarde-position back then is nowadays mainstream in critical thinking. Yet, with Bourdieu’s death the grief over the loss of such a great thinker soon overweighed the qualms about his intellectual engagement.

Conclusion

As this brief sketch tried to illuminate Pierre Bourdieu is regarded as a contemporary classic in German sociology. He is equally important like Habermas, Luhmann and Beck. The mutual respect for this thinker was paid tribute at a German-French conference in Berlin after his death in order to assess the value of his oeuvre. As a result, a French-German team edited the German publication (Colliot-Thélène; François; Gebauer, 2005), a German-French team edited the French version (Müller; Sintomer, 2006). Although French, it seemed as if Bourdieu had almost become also a “German”. At the end of his life, he himself had the impression that he was better understood in Germany than in France since German scholars read more closely

and without the mental reservation Bourdieu experienced in France thanks to his powerful position in the academic field. As a result, he gave the Bourdieu-Foundation in Geneva to a German, Franz Schultheis (2007) who wrote a moving assessment of Bourdieu’s way into sociology. Even so, his autobiography was published first in German and then in French. Be this as it may, one anecdotal yet meaningful indicator of the high appreciation of person and work are obituaries. When Bourdieu died in 2002, newspapers (Habermas, 2002; Honneth, 2002) and scientific journals (Hahn, 2002; Müller, 2002; Peter, 2002; Schultheis; Vester, 2002) widely remembered him, stressed the prime importance of his oeuvre and his position as one of the great sociologists of the 20th century. Another important indicator is the number of introductions into his oeuvre. Here again, the number of books during the lifetime of the author and afterwards who was a living classic is quite impressive indeed. In the 1990ies, Markus Schwingel (1993; 1995) started with two introductions. In the 21st century and after the death of Bourdieu, a whole plethora of works followed. Christian Papilloud (2003), a French sociologist teaching at the University of Halle, started. Then Boike Rehbein (2003; 2011) followed with two books. Werner Fuchs-Heinritz and König published their introduction in 2005, Eva Barlösius in 2006. Hans-Peter Müller wrote his systematic interpretation in 2014.

Bourdieu’s studies resemble the oeuvre of Max Weber whom he cited most in his lectures at the Collège de France. Both sociologists work time and again on central categories because they saw in clear and lucid concepts the key to useful empirical analysis. For both of them,

capitalism and the economic order are of prime importance for “economy and society” as Weber’s opus magnum is called. To delineate the class structure of a society as its inegalitarian order Bourdieu reformulates Weber’s distinction between class and estate in terms of class and styles of life. With the concept of habitus that Weber himself already used in his sociology of religion, he finds the link and active mechanism for relating class to lifestyle. Weber distinguishes between value spheres and life orders, Bourdieu prefers the notion of fields. Both thinkers see culture as a crucial mechanism to understand the functioning and meaning of society. And both sociologists are not idealists because of this cultural orientation but sober and critical realists. This is

why Bourdieu is seen in German sociology as a kind of Weber *redivivus*.

Furthermore, his style of studying social reality—the relationship between conceptual work, methodological reflexivity and empirical research—is seen as paradigmatic for today’s social sciences. Bourdieu helps to transcend the cleavages and divisions within sociology: action and structure, micro and macro, qualitative and quantitative analysis etc. Studying his oeuvre is the best way to gain a critical understanding of how society works. And who has read Bourdieu will see society with different eyes (Müller, 2014). Given his enduring importance, the reception of Bourdieu will go on and social scientists of the 21st century will try to understand their society with the tool-kit of this great French thinker.

References

- BARLÖSIUS, E. **Pierre Bourdieu**. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus, 2006.
- BAUER, U. *et al.* **Bourdieu und die Frankfurter Schule: Kritische Gesellschaftstheorie im Zeitalter des Neoliberalismus**. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2014.
- BECK, U. Jenseits von Stand und Klasse? Soziale Ungleichheiten, gesellschaftliche Individualisierungsprozesse und die Entstehung neuer sozialer Formationen und Identitäten. *In*: KRECKEL, R. (ed.). **Soziale Ungleichheiten**. Göttingen: Schwartz, 1983. p. 35-74.
- BECK, U. **Risikogesellschaft: Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne**. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986.
- BERGER, P. A. **Entstrukturierte Klassengesellschaft? Klassenbildung und Strukturen sozialer Ungleichheit im historischen Wandel**. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 1986.
- BERGER, P. A.; HRADIL, S. **Lebenslagen, Lebensläufe, Lebensstile**. Göttingen: O. Schwartz, 1990.
- BERNHARD, S.; SCHMIDT-WELLENBURG, C. (ed.). **Feldanalyse als Forschungsprogramm**. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2012. 2 v.
- BISMARCK, B.; KAUFMANN, T.; WUGGENIG, U. (ed.). **Nach Bourdieu: Visualität, Kunst, Politik**. Wien: Turia + Kant, 2008.
- BITTLINGMAYER, U. H. *et al.* (ed.). **Theorie als Kampf? Zur politischen Soziologie Pierre Bourdieus**. Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 2002.

- BLAU, P. **Inequality and heterogeneity**: a primitive theory of social structure. New York: Free Press, 1977.
- BLAU, P.; DUNCAN, O. D. **The American Occupational Structure**. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.
- BÖHLKE, E.; RILLING, R. **Bourdieu und die Linke**: Politik – Ökonomie – Kultur. Berlin: Dietz, 2007.
- BOHN, C. **Habitus und Kontext**: Ein kritischer Beitrag zur Sozialtheorie Bourdieus. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1991.
- BOURDIEU, P. Antworten auf einige Einwände. In: EDER, K. (ed.). **Klassenlage, Lebensstil und kulturelle Praxis**: Beiträge zur Auseinandersetzung mit Pierre Bourdieus Klassentheorie. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989. p. 395-410.
- BOURDIEU, P. **Das Elend der Welt**: Zeugnisse und Diagnosen alltäglichen Leidens an der Gesellschaft. Konstanz: UVK, 1997.
- BOURDIEU, P. **Die feinen Unterschiede**: Kritik der gesellschaftlichen Urteilskraft. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1982.
- BOURDIEU, P. **Die männliche Herrschaft**. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2005.
- BOURDIEU, P.; PASSERON, J.-C. **Die Illusion der Chancengleichheit**: Untersuchungen zur Soziologie des Bildungswesens am Beispiel Frankreichs. Stuttgart: Klett, 1971.
- BOURDIEU, P.; PASSERON, J.-C. **Les héritiers**: Les étudiants et la culture. Paris : Les éd. de Minuit, 1964.
- BUCHHOLZ, L. What is a Global Field? Theorizing Fields Beyond the Nation-State. **Sociological Review**, v. 64, n. 2, p. 31-60, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2059-7932.12001>
- BUSCH, C. [REZENSION ZU:] BOURDIEU, P. und J. CL. PASSERON, 1964: Les héritiers – Les étudiants et la culture. Grands Documents Nr. 18. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit. **Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie**, v. 19, p. 168-170, 1967.
- COLLIOT-THÉLÈNE, C.; FRANÇOIS, E.; GEBAUER, G. (ed.). **Pierre Bourdieu**: Deutsch-französische Perspektiven. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2005.
- DAHRENDORF, R. **Arbeiterkinder an deutschen Universitäten**. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1965a.
- DAHRENDORF, R. **Bildung ist Bürgerrecht**: Plädoyer für eine aktive Bildungspolitik. Hamburg: Nannen, 1965b.
- DAHRENDORF, R. **Gesellschaft und Demokratie in Deutschland**. München: R. Piper, 1965c.
- DANGSCHAT, J.; BLASIUS, J. (ed.). **Lebensstile in Städten**: Konzepte und Methoden. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 1994.
- DIAZ-BONE, R. **Kulturwelt, Diskurs und Lebensstil**. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 2002.
- DÖLLING, I.; KRAIS, B. **Ein alltägliches Spiel**: Geschlechterkonstruktion in der sozialen Praxis. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997.
- EBRECHT, J.; HILLEBRANDT, F. **Bourdieu's Theorie der Praxis**: Erklärungskraft – Anwendung – Perspektiven. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 2002.
- EDER, K. (ED.). **Klassenlage, Lebensstil und kulturelle Praxis**: Beiträge zur Auseinandersetzung mit Pierre Bourdieus Klassentheorie. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989.

- ENGLER, S.; KRAIS, B. **Das kulturelle Kapital und die Macht der Klassenstrukturen:** Sozialstrukturelle Verschiebungen und Wandlungsprozesse des Habitus. Weinheim: Juventa, 2004.
- FRERICHS, P. **Klasse und Geschlecht 1:** Arbeit. Macht. Anerkennung. Interessen. Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 1997.
- FRERICHS, P.; STEINRÜCKE, M. **Soziale Ungleichheit und Geschlechterverhältnisse.** Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 1993.
- FRIEBERTSHÄUSER, B.; RIEGER-LADICH, M.; WIGGER, L. (ed.). **Reflexive Erziehungswissenschaft:** Forschungsperspektiven im Anschluss an Pierre Bourdieu. 2. ed. Wiesbaden: Springer, 2009.
- FRÖHLICH, G.; REHBEIN, B. Die Rezeption Bourdieus im deutschsprachigen Raum. In: FRÖHLICH, G.; REHBEIN, B. (ed.). **Bourdieu-Handbuch:** Leben-Werk-Wirkung. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2009. p. IX-XI.
- FUCHS-HEINRITZ, W.; KÖNIG, A. **Pierre Bourdieu:** Eine Einführung. Konstanz: UVK, 2005.
- GALTUNG, J. Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. **Journal of Peace Research**, v. 6, n. 3, p. 167-191, 1969.
- GEBAUER, G.; WULF, C. (ed.). **Praxis und Ästhetik:** Neue Perspektiven im Denken Pierre Bourdieus. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1993.
- GIDDENS, A. **The class structure of the advanced societies.** London: Hutchinson, 1973.
- GIDDENS, A. **The constitution of society:** outline of the theory of structuration. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984.
- HABERMAS, J. Nachruf auf Pierre Bourdieu. **Frankfurter Rundschau**, 2002.
- HAHN, A. In memoriam Pierre Bourdieu (01.08.1930–23.01.2002). **Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie**, v. 2, p. 403-405, 2002. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11577-002-0062-5>
- HERKOMMER, S. **Metamorphosen der Ideologie:** Zur Analyse des Neoliberalismus durch Pierre Bourdieu und aus marxistischer Perspektive. Hamburg: VSA-Verlag, 2004.
- HILLEBRANDT, F.; KNEER, G.; KRAEMER, K. (eds.). **Verlust der Sicherheit?** Lebensstile zwischen Multioptionalität und Knappheit. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1998.
- HONNEGGER, C.; BÜHLER, C.; SCHALLBERGER, P. (ed.). **Die Zukunft im Alltagsdenken.** Konstanz: UVK, 2002.
- HONNETH, A. Die zerrissene Welt der symbolischen Formen. **Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie**, v. 36, p. 147-164, 1984.
- HONNETH, A. Nachruf auf Pierre Bourdieu. **Frankfurter Rundschau**, 2002.
- HRADIL, S. **Sozialstrukturanalyse in einer fortgeschrittenen Gesellschaft:** Von Klassen und Schichten zu Lagen und Milieus. Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 1987.
- HURRELMANN, K. *et al.* (ed.). **Handbuch für Sozialisationsforschung.** 8. ed. Weinheim and Basel: Beltz, 2015.
- JURICH, D. **Staatssozialismus und gesellschaftliche Differenzierung:** Eine empirische Studie. Berlin: LIT, 2005.
- JURT, J. **Das literarische Feld:** Das Konzept Pierre Bourdieus in Theorie und Praxis. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995.

- KATSCHNIG-FASCH, E. (ed.). **Das ganz alltägliche Elend**. Wien: Löcker, 2003.
- KIESERLING, A. Felder und Klassen. Pierre Bourdieus Theorie der modernen Gesellschaft. **Zeitschrift für Soziologie**, v. 37, n. 1, p. 3-24, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zfsoz-2008-0101>
- KLINGER, C. Ungleichheit in den Verhältnissen von Klasse, Rasse und Geschlecht. In: KNAPP, G.-A.; WETTERER, A. (ed.). **Achsen der Differenz**. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2003. p. 14-48.
- KRAEMER, K.; BRUGGER, F. (ed.). **Schlüsselwerke der Wirtschaftssoziologie**. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2017.
- KRAIS, B. Geschlechterverhältnis und symbolische Gewalt. In: GEBAUER, G.; WULF, C. (ed.). **Praxis und Ästhetik: Neue Perspektiven im Denken Pierre Bourdieus**. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1993. p. 208-250.
- KRAIS, B.; GEBAUER, G. **Habitus**. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2002.
- KRECKEL, R. (ED.). **Soziale Ungleichheiten**. Göttingen: Schwartz, 1983.
- KRECKEL, R. **Politische Soziologie der sozialen Ungleichheit**. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus, 1992.
- KRETSCHMANN, A. (ed.). **Das Rechtsdenken Pierre Bourdieus: Mit einem Vorwort von Hans-Peter Müller**. Weilerswist: Velbrück, 2019.
- LENGER, A.; SCHNEICKERT, C.; SCHUMACHER, F. (ed.). **Pierre Bourdieus Konzeption des Habitus: Grundlagen, Zugänge, Forschungsperspektiven**. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2013.
- LIEBAU, E. **Gesellschaftliches Subjekt und Erziehung: Zur pädagogischen Bedeutung der Sozialisationstheorien von Pierre Bourdieu und Ulrich Oevermann**. Weinheim: Juventa-Verlag, 1987.
- LIEBAU, E.; MÜLLER-ROLLI, S. (ed.). **Lebensstil und Lernform**. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1985.
- MARINOVA, S. **Kultur und Macht: Die Rezeption Pierre Bourdieus in der deutschen Soziologie**. Marburg: Tectum, 1997.
- MÜLLER, H.-P. Bourdieu und Musil in Kakanien. **Merkur**, v. 67, n. 766, p. 258-264, 2013.
- MÜLLER, H.-P. Das wissenschaftliche Kapital der Kultur: Neuere kultursoziologische Analysen. **Berliner Journal für Soziologie**, v. 6, p. 113-126, 1996.
- MÜLLER, H.-P. Kultur, Geschmack und Distinktion: Grundzüge der Kultursoziologie Pierre Bourdieus. **Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie**, Sonderheft, v. 27, p. 162-190, 1986.
- MÜLLER, H.-P. Lebensstile: Ein neues Paradigma der Differenzierungs- und Ungleichheitsforschung. **Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie**, v. 41, n. 1, p. 53-71, 1989.
- MÜLLER, H.-P. Nachruf auf Pierre Bourdieu (1930–2002). **Berliner Journal für Soziologie**, v. 12, n. 1, p. 141-142, 2002.
- MÜLLER, H.-P. **Pierre Bourdieu: Eine systematische Einführung**. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2014.
- MÜLLER, H.-P. **Sozialstruktur und Lebensstile: Der neuere theoretische Diskurs über soziale Ungleichheit**. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1992.
- MÜLLER, H.-P.; Sintomer, Y. (ed.). **Pierre Bourdieu: Théorie et pratique**. Paris: La Découverte, 2006.
- MUNDER, H.; WUGGENIG, U. (ed.). **Das Kunstfeld: Eine Studie von Akteuren und Institutionen gegenwärtiger Kunst**. Zürich: Ringier, 2012.

- NASSEHI, A.; NOLLMANN, G. (ed.). **Bourdieu und Luhmann: Ein Theorienvergleich**. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2004.
- NECKEL, S. **Die Macht der Unterscheidung: Beutezüge durch den modernen Alltag**. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer-Taschenbuch-Verlag, 1993.
- NICKEL, H. M.; RIEGRAF, B. (ed.). **Geschlecht – Arbeit – Zukunft**. Münster: Verlag Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2000.
- NUNGESSER, F. Ein pleonastisches Oxymoron: Konstruktionsprobleme von Pierre Bourdieus Schlüsselkonzept der symbolischen Gewalt. **Berliner Journal für Soziologie**, v. 27, n. 1, p. 7-33, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11609-017-0335-5>
- PAPILLOUD, C. **Bourdieu lesen: Einführung in eine Soziologie des Unterschieds**. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2003.
- PELIZZARI, A. **Die Ökonomisierung des Politischen: New public management und der neoliberale Angriff auf die öffentlichen Dienste**. Konstanz: UVK, 2001.
- PETER, L. Analytiker der Macht und parteilicher Intellektueller: Zum Tode von Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002). **Das Argument**, v. 40, p. 99-103, 2002.
- PICHT, G. **Die deutsche Bildungskatastrophe: Analyse und Dokumentation**. Olten: Walter, 1964.
- PICHT, R.; SCHULTE, H.; STEPHAN, R. (ed.). Nachwort. In: BOURDIEU, P.; PASSERON, J.-C. (ed.). **Die Illusion der Chancengleichheit**. Untersuchungen zur Soziologie des Bildungswesens am Beispiel Frankreichs. Stuttgart: Klett, 1971. p. 291-302.
- RADEEMACHER, C., WIECHENS, P. (ed.). **Geschlecht-Ethnizität-Klasse**. Zur sozialen Konstruktion von Hierarchie und Differenz. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 2001.
- RECKWITZ, A. **Die Transformation der Kulturtheorien: Zur Entwicklung eines Theorieprogramms**. Weilerswist: Velbrück, 2000.
- REHBEIN, B. Bourdieu-Rezeption in der deutschsprachigen Soziologie. In: MOEBIUS, S.; PRODER, A. (ed.). **Handbuch Geschichte der deutschsprachigen Soziologie**. Wiesbaden: Springer, 2018. p. 683-694.
- REHBEIN, B. **Die Soziologie Pierre Bourdieus**. Konstanz: UVK, 2011.
- REHBEIN, B. **Pierre Bourdieus Theorie des Sozialen: Probleme und Perspektiven**. Konstanz: UVK, 2003.
- RÖSSEL, J.; OTTE, G. (ed.). **Lebensstilforschung**. Sonderband 51 der KZfSS. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2011.
- SCHÄFER, H. W. **Habitus Analysis 1: Epistemology and Language**. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2015.
- SCHELSKY, H. **Auf der Suche nach Wirklichkeit**. München: Goldmann, 1979.
- SCHMIDT, R.; WOLTERSDORFF, V. (ed.). **Symbolische Gewalt: Pierre Bourdieus Herrschaftsanalyse**. Konstanz: UVK, 2008.
- SCHULTHEIS, F. **Bourdieu's Wege in die Soziologie: Genese und Dynamik einer reflexiven Sozialwissenschaft**. Konstanz: UVK, 2007.
- SCHULTHEIS, F.; SCHULZ, K. (ed.). **Gesellschaft mit begrenzter Haftung: Zumutungen und Leiden im deutschen Alltag**. Konstanz: UVK, 2005.
- SCHULTHEIS, F.; VESTER, M. Soziologie als Beruf: Hommage an Pierre Bourdieu. **Mittelweg**, v. 36, n. 5, p. 41-58, 2002.

- SCHULZE, G. **Die Erlebnisgesellschaft**: Kulturosoziologie der Gegenwart. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus, 1992.
- SCHUMACHER, F. **Bourdieu's Kunstsoziologie**. Konstanz: UVK, 2011.
- SCHWINGEL, M. **Analytik der Kämpfe**: Macht und Herrschaft in der Soziologie Bourdieus. Hamburg: Argument Verlag, 1993.
- SCHWINGEL, M. **Bourdieu zur Einführung**. Hamburg: Junius, 1995.
- SPELLERBERG, A. **Soziale Differenzierung durch Lebensstile**: Eine empirische Untersuchung der Lebensqualität in West- und Ostdeutschland. Berlin: Sigma, 1996.
- SUBER, D.; SCHÄFER, H.; PRINZ, S. (ed.). **Pierre Bourdieu und die Kulturwissenschaften**: Zur Aktualität eines undisziplinierten Denkens. Konstanz: UVK, 2011.
- TOMMEK, H.; BOGDAL, K. **Transformationen des literarischen Feldes in der Gegenwart**: Sozialstruktur – Medien-Ökonomien – Autorpositionen. Heidelberg: Synchron, 2012.
- VESTER, M. *et al.* **Soziale Milieus im gesellschaftlichen Strukturwandel**: Zwischen Integration und Ausgrenzung. Köln: Bund-Verlag, 1993.
- WOLF, N. C. **Kakanien als Gesellschaftskonstruktion**: Robert Musils Sozioanalyse des 20. Jahrhunderts. Wien, Köln and Weimar: Böhlau, 2011.
- ZAHNER, N. T. **Die neuen Regeln der Kunst**: Andy Warhol und der Umbau des Kunstbetriebs im 20. Jahrhundert. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus, 2006.

Abstract

Pierre Bourdieu in Germany: reception and critique

Pierre Bourdieu is undoubtedly considered a classic sociologist in Germany nowadays. How did he achieve this status? This article reconstructs three reception waves. The first wave began in the field of education in the 1960s and 1970s, giving rise to studies on educational inequality. The second wave started with *La Distinction*, reviving the analysis of social classes and lifestyle in the 1980s. The third wave focused on his concept of “field” in the wake of “Les Règles de l’Art”. Field analysis is currently one of the most promising tools for the social sciences. In the 21st century, Bourdieu is seen as a Max Weber *redivivus* in Germany.

Keywords: Pierre Bourdieu; Bourdieu’s reception in Germany; French sociology.

Resumo

Pierre Bourdieu na Alemanha: recepção e crítica

Pierre Bourdieu é considerado, indubitavelmente, um sociólogo clássico na Alemanha atualmente. Como ele conseguiu esse status? Este artigo reconstrói três ondas de recepção. A primeira onda começou na área da educação, nas décadas de 1960 e 1970, dando origem aos estudos sobre a desigualdade educacional. A segunda onda começou com *La distinction*, recuperando as análises de classes sociais e estilo de vida na década de 1980. A terceira onda se concentrou em seu conceito de “campo” na esteira de *Les règles de l’art*. Atualmente, a análise de campo é uma das ferramentas mais promissoras nas ciências sociais. No século 21, Bourdieu é visto como um Max Weber *redivivus* na Alemanha.

Palavras-chave: Pierre Bourdieu; recepção de Bourdieu na Alemanha; sociologia francesa.

Résumé

Pierre Bourdieu en Allemagne : accueil et critique

Pierre Bourdieu est sans aucun doute considéré aujourd'hui comme un sociologue classique en Allemagne. Comment a-t-il atteint ce statut ? Cet article reconstruit trois vagues de sa réception. La première a commencé dans le domaine de l'éducation pendant les années 1960 et 1970, donnant lieu à des études sur les inégalités éducatives. La deuxième a commencé avec « La distinction », qui a mis en place des analyses des classes sociales et des styles de vie dans les années 1980. La troisième s'est concentrée sur son concept de « champ » à propos des « Règles de l'art ». De nos jours, l'étude de champ est l'un des outils les plus prometteurs des sciences sociales. Au 21^{ème} siècle, Bourdieu est considéré comme un Max Weber redivivus en Allemagne.

Mots-clés : Pierre Bourdieu ; Réception de Bourdieu en Allemagne ; sociologie française

