Symposium / The International Circulation of Sociological Ideas: The Case of Pierre Bourdieu, 2

The Double Character of the German 'Bourdieu'

On the Twofold Use of Pierre Bourdieu's Work in the German-speaking Social Sciences

by Michael Gemperle

doi: 10.2383/29573

German-speaking social sciences seem to be literally captured by 'Bourdieu' today. Hardly any other author is so much discussed and cited. And the veneration has never been like this before, hence the strong growth of literature for the last years. This collective hysteria conveys the impression that the history of the reception of Pierre Bourdieu's work in German-speaking countries is a success story. Nothing could be further from the truth. 'Bourdieu' gained this significance only in recent years. Before, he was considered for instance as *Geheimtipp* (insider's tip), as (highly esteemed) *Kultursoziologe* (sociologist of culture) or – during the last years of his life – as *Störenfried* (trouble-maker). The reception of Bourdieu's work in German-speaking countries is not even a continual process that follows a specific logic, as one would assume from the perspective of the history of ideas. As with the reception of every author, it proceeds (often) in boosts, (rarely) in leaps and (more rarely) in paradigmatic changes. It is therefore necessary to break with the internal interpretation of the process of reception. Likewise, nor do we either engage in an external lecture of the reception, which often follows the logic of the *Ereignisgeschichte* (history of events) or the history of 'great men' and neglects that the appropriation of the work of a foreign author is due to field dynamics and not possible without the work of certain collective and individual agents projecting their ambitions on it.

This article examines the reception of Bourdieu's work in German-speaking countries from the angle of its determination by the social, intellectual, political etc.

conditions.[1] It is based on the finding that the adaptation of an author proceeds through operations of *selection*, of *labeling* and of *reading*[2] [Bourdieu 2002a] and that "in general, it's the titles that circulate," through "a sort of intellectual rumor where circulate keywords" and "a bit reducing slogans" [Bourdieu 1996a]. The work of an author can be a source of new principles of vision and division allowing to amplify the knowledge on the social world. In any case, it is a symbolic resource of the first order to make oneself visible and assert one's position [Bourdieu 1987a].

This article examines the subsequent moments of the German reception of Bourdieu's work. In the first section, I will discuss the conditions of the first selection of the texts of Pierre Bourdieu. Even though, *La distinction* is the book, which made 'Bourdieu' famous at the beginning of the 1980s, previous adaptations are at the origin of the ways it is perceived then. The second section presents the major lines of the appropriation of Bourdieu's work in the German social sciences in the 1980s and 1990s. Section three treats the rise and sudden cease of the 'political Bourdieu' and looks at its appropriation since Pierre Bourdieu's death.

The point of reference of my analysis is above all the sociology of the German Federal Republic. This is due to the fact that the adaptation of 'Bourdieu' in this context is not only much more ample but also much more decisive than in Austria, in German-speaking Switzerland, and (before 1989) in the German Democratic Republic.[3] This is perhaps due to the cultural dominance of the FRG vis-à-vis the other three German-speaking national contexts, which is enhanced by the relative structural weakness of sociology in these spaces.[4] Sociologists in the later contexts have therefore had difficulties in imposing their definition on certain topics, such as the legitimate interpretation of an author.[5] For this reason, even if my analysis refers mainly to the adaptation of 'Bourdieu' in the FRG, it covers as well the main structural

[1] This article is based on the most important reviews of translations of Pierre Bourdieu's work and of articles and books about it. Unfortunately, this analysis does not take into account the sales and circulation figures of the publications, because publishers in German-speaking countries keep this information to themselves.

[2] I understand by 1) *selection* the choice of the texts of the author that should be translated or commented, by 2) *labeling* the transfer of the social significations of the 'setting' of the publication (the writer of the preface, the publishing house, the series, the translator), and by 3) *reading* the conception of the work according to the categories of thinking, of action and of perception of the field of reception [Bourdieu 2002a].

[3] According to Beate Krais [2005], Bourdieu's work attracted the attention of only a few social scientists in the GDR.

[4] It is notorious that in the humanities of the culturally dominated contexts, the proportion of university professors educated in the German Federal Republic has been high for decades.

[5] For example, Michael Pollak, active member of the student movement in Austria at the beginning of the 1970s, before joining Bourdieu's *Centre de sociologie européenne* in 1973, fled the provincial narrowness of Austria and Austrian Sociology [Mörth 2002].

dimensions of the reception of Bourdieu's work in German-speaking social sciences in general (with the exception of the GDR).

The reception of Bourdieu's work in the German-speaking social sciences has specific characteristics. Firstly, the most decisive phase of the adaptation of Pierre Bourdieu's work happened during the author's lifetime, offering him the possibility to take influence on its appropriation.[6] Secondly, as emphasized by Bourdieu [2002a] himself, the reciprocal definition of the French and German intellectual fields is responsible for the fact, that authors from the other side of the Rhine are often subject to strategies of marginal and ambitious intellectuals, aiming to undermine dominant powers associated with the "national thinking." Bourdieu himself for instance was susceptible to German authors and the recognition of his work in Germany during his lifetime.[7] It appears also when in the German-speaking social sciences, French authors are associated with lefty radicalism and chic lifestyle, whilst the sociological mainstream is generally oriented towards the United States.

A Double Label: Social Criticism and Sociology of Culture

The work of Pierre Bourdieu was introduced into and labeled by German-speaking social sciences during the intellectual renewal at the turn of the 1970s, one that would transform the system of references fundamentally. The legitimacy of the post-war philosophy, governing up to then all academic disciplines, was undermined by the social and political demand for social sciences (especially sociology and psychology). As a result of the politicization of higher education through the student protests in the second half of the 1960s, the *critical theory* of the Frankfurt School and orthodox Marxism were imposed in very few years as an alternative to the fading intellectual cosmos of the post-war period. However, their influence remained generally limited to universities, where the predominance of philosophy allowed speculative tendencies.

New entrants in the intellectual field were interested in turning towards (foreign) authors, who were not associated with the predominant (national) traditions. To found one's position on French authors seemed to be a promising strategy to adopt an innovative or critical position and overcome, extend or renew critical theory

[6] Pierre Bourdieu's reactions to adaptations of his work in the German-speaking social sciences [e.g. Bourdieu 1989a] are only the most visible part of this. Among other things, Bourdieu wrote prefaces for some German translations of his texts, selected some of its translators, revised older texts before translation and made public appearances in Germany, Austria and Switzerland.

[7] It is also significant that Bourdieu, in order to bypass the dominant French media, published his *Eléments pour une auto-socioanalyse* first in German [Bourdieu 2002b].

or orthodox Marxism, focused on political-economic conditions and critical revolutionary consciousness – all the more so as in France even philosophers have adopted an attitude appreciating the collection of positive knowledge on the social world. Pierre Bourdieu attracted attention among other French authors combining philosophy with the rising social sciences (above all: Claude Lévi-Strauss, Jacques Lacan, Michel Foucault), which were mobilized to contrast with the antiquated philosophy of the post-war period as well as with critical theory (Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer and Jürgen Habermas) and orthodox Marxism.

Bourdieu's work was initially introduced in empirical sociology of art. Alphons Silberman (1909-2000), art sociologist, co-editor of the *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* (in the following: *KZfSS*) in the second half of the 1960s, edited book reviews of *Un art moyen* [Busch 1967a], *Les héritiers* [Busch 1967b], and *L'amour de l'art* [Silberman 1968]. As a specialist in music, designated to a scientific career early in his life (Dr. iur. with Hans Kelsen in 1933), but having entered the university only in 1958 (due to the interruption of his career by National Socialism in 1933) and in sociology at the pole of quantitative research on contemporary problems (René König), Silbermann was not only opposed to the predominant study of art, which worships the legitimate culture (Hans Sendlmayr and Arnold Gehlen), but also to the sociology of music of Theodor Adorno [e.g. Silbermann 1963]. His reviews of Bourdieu's work emphasized the social conditionality of the exercise of culture, the virtues of empirical work and the utility of applied research for fundamental research. 'Bourdieu' seemed to offer the opportunity to interpret cultural practices alternatively to the dominant view and with the claim to be closer to social reality. Former lecturer at the Sorbonne in the 1950s and professor of sociology and mass communication in Lausanne between 1964 and 1969, Silbermann, was not only familiar with the French intellectual world but also interested in referring to a new analysis of Art produced in the growing and rising French social sciences, as seen in his numerous book reviews in the *KZfSS* journal. Being mobilized to affirm the position of the co-editor of the *KZfSS* (the mainstream periodical of German Sociology under the direction of René König), lecturer for Mass Media and Art Sociology at the University of Cologne from 1958 to 1974 and director of the *Institut für Massenkommunikation* in Cologne from 1970 on, endowed with forms of cultural legitimacy from outside the German university system [cf. Silbermann 1989], 'Bourdieu' becomes a symbolically efficient sociological instrument to combat at the same time the obsolete post-war university Philosophy and the *Critical Theory* and orthodox Marxism then *en vogue*. This initial appropriation seems to establish the foundations for the further use of 'Bourdieu,' even though, at the end of the 1960s, the French author appeared to get much more attention from other intellectual agents.

The events of May 1968 seemed to make the critical side of Bourdieu's work visible also to francophile German intellectuals. After editing the laudatory reviews on Bourdieu's works, Alphons Silbermann, harsh critic of the student movement, no longer accorded any privileged attention to Bourdieu's work. In his standard work *Empirische Kunstsoziologie* [Silbermann 1973], he refers to 'Bourdieu' only once within a huge bibliography aiming to list all contemporary research in the Sociology of Art, and in his reader of theoretical writings on Art Sociology [Silbermann 1976], he reprinted only one article that can be read against orthodox Marxism (*Eléments d'une théorie sociologique de la perception artistique*).[8] In a contrary fashion, mainly undogmatic leftist intellectuals saw in Bourdieu's work an interesting instrument to use against the traditional university Philosophy, accused during the student protests of complicity with German Nazism, and at the same time against the predominant *Critical Theory* and orthodox Marxism.

Around 1970, marginal agents in the field of Education Research were interested in the work of Bourdieu, doubtless because they would identify themselves with the battle of Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron against "reformist or pseudo-revolutionary sociologists and against the objectivism of the neopositivist school" [Goldschmidt 1971]. The field of Education Research was dominated by the opposition between the *Geisteswissenschaftliche Pädagogik*, which governed with its subject philosophy at the university since World War II, on the one side, and the quantifying empirism of the applied Education Research outside university, backed by the demands of the administration in the 1960s, on the other. The work of Bourdieu and Passeron seems to have attracted attention because it offered a critical analysis of education in terms of class analysis without neglecting the autonomy of the education system, as orthodox Marxism did.

Incited by young researchers looking for an alternative social critique to orthodox Marxism, the Max Planck-Institute for Educational Research published in 1971 the German translations of revised texts of *Les héritiers* and *La reproduction* and thereby made this other mode of Education Research accessible to German-speaking social sciences. However, in the context of the reform euphoria (of the education expansion) of the first half of the 1970s, a book introduced by the director of the Max Planck-Institute for Educational Research and member of the *Bildungsrat* of the German government (Dietrich Goldschmidt), mainly attacking "the discourse of the liberating function of the education system" [Goldschmidt 1971], co-translated by the son of the famous advocate of education expansion Robert Picht (Georg Picht)

[8] This text was already published in Bourdieu 1970 and was reprinted again in introductory books to literature and art Sociology [Bürger 1978; Gerhards 1997].

and entitled *Die Illusion der Chancengleichheit* (The illusion of equal opportunities), could not be used as an instrument to question the social function of the education system. Its book review in the *KZfSS* indeed appreciated the extensive analysis of the mechanisms that reproduce inequality in the education system, but also represented Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron as reformists that certainly criticized technocratic views, but proposed a "reform concept" that was "just as disputable" since it was "limited to the education system" [Kaupen-Haas 1972].

Parallel to this, Klaus Mollenhauer, leading protagonist of the renewal of university pedagogy, referred to Bourdieu's works in order to establish his *Kritische Erziehungswissenschaft* as an empirical science. In mobilizing Bourdieu's concept of habitus and the typology of the forms of capital in a central chapter of *Theorien zum Erziehungsprozess* [Mollenhauer 1972], the university professor of Pedagogy seemed to contribute much more to the making of Bourdieu as a figure of critical education research than the publication of *Illusion der Chancengleichheit*. Anyhow, in the face of the predominance of the subject philosophy in university pedagogy, an author branded with the label of *Kritische Erziehungswissenschaft* could only attract interest at the fringes of academia and in critical Education Research [Krais 2005; Liebau 2006].

Nevertheless, the most decisive impact on its later reception arose from the appropriation of Bourdieu's work by the intellectual *avant-garde*. 'Bourdieu' was published between 1970 and 1976 under the direction of the leftist publisher Karl Markus Michel,[9] firstly by *the* emblematic publishing house for the intellectual renewal between the mid-1960s and the mid-1970s (the Suhrkamp publishing house)[10] and then by organs of the intellectual *avant-garde* (*Kursbuch* and *Syndicat*). Michel is renowned for putting in circulation authors of 'Structuralism,' which was imposed in the second half of the 1960s as general term for contemporary French authors [Neumeister 2000]. Invented by literary journalism to brand 'French essayists,' as these authors are presented in the *avant-garde* periodical *Alternative* [1965], the label 'Structuralism' suggests to meet better the cultural aspirations of intellectuals than the *Critical Theory*. Associated with the (noble) study of foreign cultures of Claude Lévi-Strauss, and suggesting to allow an *Ethnologie unserer Kultur* (Anthropology of our own culture) [Neumeister 2000], this "new philosophy" and "universalistic research ideology" [Oppitz 2008] attracted the ambitions of young intellectuals destined for ca-

[9] Director of the collection *Theorie* for the publishing house Suhrkamp from 1962 to 1974, co-editor (from 1971 onwards) of the periodical *Kursbuch* (which he co-founded in 1965), and co-editor of *Syndikat* from 1976 on, organ of leftist intellectuals in Western Germany, Karl Markus Michel (1929-2000), previous employee of the Frankfurt-based Institute for Social Research from 1955 to 1958, was a central protagonist of the renewal of intellectual points of reference in the 1960s and the 1970s.

[10] Suhrkamp not only put in circulation the works of the Frankfurt School but also numerous works of Claude Lévi-Strauss and other (established) French authors.

reers in the cultural world and pressurized to overcome the Frankfurt School and orthodox Marxism. 'Structuralism' became a symbolically efficient instrument, as the ambivalent reaction of members of the undogmatic left [e.g. Jaeggi 1968; Lepenies 1966] and the harsh reactions of partisans of orthodox Marxism [e.g. Hund 1973; Kröber 1968] show.[11]

In selecting Bourdieu's work, Karl Markus Michel labeled it as 'Structuralism.' The first collection of texts from Pierre Bourdieu's work, published by Suhrkamp, was destined already to show "the relevance of the structural method in the field of sociology," as remarked on the editorial page of the book. *Zur Soziologie der symbolischen Formen* [Bourdieu 1970] opposes both orthodox Marxism and the *Kulturanthropologie* of Wilhelm Mühlmann, symbol of the conservative post-war university philosophy.[12] The subsequent collection of texts [Bourdieu 1973] was rendered by the translator of the entire work of Claude Lévi-Strauss (Eva Moldenhauer). The publication of the German translation of *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*, together with *La maison kabyle ou le monde renversé* [Bourdieu 1976], makes 'Bourdieu' appear as a successor of sorts of Claude Lévi-Strauss [Schultheis 2008].[13] The periodical *Kursbuch* brought out *Le couturier et sa griffe* under the title *Die neuen Kleider der Bourgeoise* (the new clothes of the bourgeoisie), shoulder to shoulder with well-known undogmatic leftist intellectuals, and the edition *Syndikat* printed *Die politische Ontologie von Martin Heidegger* with good resonance, whilst not in philosophy.[14] Selected by Karl Markus Michel, Bourdieu's work became an irrefutable reference for the cultural *avant-garde* just after its introduction, as Frank Hartmann [2002b]

[11] 'Structuralism' was the object of discussions in the second half of the 1960s, especially in the critical culture periodicals *Kursbuch* (1966), *Alternative* (1967, 1968 and 1970), and *Neues Forum* (1968), as well as in periodicals such as the *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* (1964, 1969, and 1972), *Das Argument* (1968), and *Sociologus* (1968 and 1969). For precise references, see Oppitz 2008.

[12] In promoting an undogmatic Marxist revision of the supposed founding father of Wilhelm Mühlmann's *Kulturanthropologie,* Ernst Cassirer [Mühlmann 1966; Mühlmann 1968], this book was aimed at abstracting the prestige from the scientifically most renowned and most social sciences-oriented German anthropologist of the post war period [Rössler 2007]. The student movement, in their accounting for the German Nazi past, had transformed Mühlmann into a symbol of an intellectual pillar of the Third Reich [Klee 2003], provoking his early retirement in 1970 [Michel 1991].

[13] Even if Bourdieu's work entered into social science-oriented anthropological literature in this way, German-speaking *Ethnologie* did not appropriate it at that time. At the social science pole of this discipline, opposing historically oriented anthropology, neither the partisans of Claude Lévi-Strauss nor the Francophile adherents of an ethnology in extension to 'Marx' were interested in referring to 'Bourdieu.' For the former, his work was too Marxist [e.g. Oppitz 1975], for the latter, it was too lévistraussian.

[14] This publication met the demand in the German public, after the death of Martin Heidegger, for a sound critique of his involvement with National Socialism. Pierre Bourdieu received high recognition for his analyses even on the part of the chief-editor of the magazine *Spiegel*, Rudolf Augstein, who's interview with the German philosopher in 1966 had already attracted attention.

accounts as a witness of that period. However, towards the end of the 1970s the intellectual *avant-garde*, increasingly under the influence of the *Neue Linke* (New Left) movement and its concepts (a critique of orthodox Marxism, gender etc.), seemed to lose their interest in 'Bourdieu' and turned instead towards authors like Michel Foucault, Georges Bataille and Gilles Deleuze, probably because the work of these authors was more qualified to serve as an instrument of virulent criticism of *Critical Theory* and orthodox Marxism than that of an author associated with sociology.

In summary, the adaptation of Bourdieu's work in the German intellectual field in the process of transformation between the mid-1960s and the mid-1970s labeled it twice: on the one hand, its appropriation in critical education research identified it with research-based social criticism. On the other, its reception by the intellectual *avant-garde* fighting against *Critical Theory* labelled it as 'Structuralism.' Thus, Bourdieu's work in German social sciences is subject to uses that can be characterized according to Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello [1999] as social criticism and cultural criticism. 'Bourdieu' seems to represent a "critical" alternative to the *Critical Theory*. It is only in a transformed intellectual cosmos that a demand for such a label could raise and 'Bourdieu' could be subject to a re-adaptation, by which it got ideed endowed with an other significance.

Consecrated Through the Notion of Culture

Bourdieu was consecrated as a legitimate sociological author in German-speaking social sciences in the 1980s, when the field of sociology was again in a process of fundamental transformation. Due to political upheavals and the arrival of a new generation of intellectuals the sociological world was subjected to important changes. 1) After the oil price shocks in 1973 and 1979, the social democratic German government successively ceased reform politics and, from 1982 on, under the conservative government of Helmut Kohl, forced through neoliberal austerity policies. Unprecedented mass employment and other new phenomena following the oil shocks dominated public debates. This also challenged the established sociological vision of society. 2) From the mid 1970s on, the dynamic of the intellectual field was characterized by the arrival of the first generation born after World War II and affected by the expansion of education (1945-1955): to establish their place, the members of this generation promoted a virulent criticism of orthodox Marxism – all the more so as the established movements, raised in the second half of the 1960s, receded successively and the *Neue Linke* (New Left) movements emerged. This resulted in orthodox Marxism being completely delegitimized after the German Autumn in 1977. This in-

tellectual change was boosted by the general political situation. French authors were a preferred instruments of the *Neue Linke* in their battle against the monopoly on criticism held by the legitimate representative of *Critical Theory* (Jürgen Habermas) [Neumeister 2000]. 3) The third dimension of importance was the relative decline of the intellectual and institutional position of sociology in favour of philosophy and history in the 1980s and 1990s, evinced by the debate on post-modernity and the *Historikerstreit*, by the considerable increase in the adaptation of foreign theoretical references [Müller 1992b], by the degradation of the supervision ratios in the universities [Knoll *et al.* 2002] and by the spread of an anti-Sociological rhetoric [e.g. Beck 1989; Beck and Bonss 1989; Bonss and Hartmann 1985]. New entrants into the sociological field turned increasingly either towards philosophy and history on the one hand, or towards contract research, sociological expertise and the media industry on the other hand. The gap between the "social philosophy" (typical of the university) and the "empirical sociology" (outside academia), which got obvious by the virulent *Positivismusstreit* in the 1960s, grew bigger [Müller 1992b].

In this context, work labelled as a "critical" sociological alternative to *Critical Theory*, was condemned to be subjected to the strategies of heterodox sociological agents. All the more so as it brought together theoretical considerations, empirical work and an analysis of contemporary society, enabling a combination of the benefits of a rejection of "Grand Theory" and the benefits of rejecting the quantifying "empirism." According to its double label, 'Bourdieu' was adapted in two ways, as the book reviews of the much noticed German translation of *La distinction* in sociological periodicals [Burkart 1984; Kowalski 1983; Rittner 1984] and subsequent articles [Honneth 1984; Hradil 1989; Müller 1986] show: Bourdieu's work was perceived as "class theory" on the one hand and as "sociology of culture" on the other. It was adapted above all 1) by the theoretical discourse on the legitimate principles of the analysis of society, 2) by the critical empirical education research, and 3) by the culture criticism oriented intellectual *avant-garde*.

1) Most directly related to the decline of orthodox Marxism was the adaptation or appropriation of Bourdieu's work within the "new theoretical discourse on social inequality" [Müller 1992a]. Dealing with the definition of the legitimate principles of analysis of society, this debate was not only related to the sociological debate in general but also to political and media debates. Due to the decline of orthodox Marxism, the opposition in the analyses of social structure between class theories and theories of stratification, which was the heart of very controversial debates from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s, was fading. This antagonism was increasingly replaced by a debate about the notion of *Soziale Ungleichheiten* (social inequalities), as suggested by the title of a collection of articles edited by Reinhard Kreckel in 1983. Attempts arose

that promised to interlock macro social structures on the one hand and the acts and thoughts of agents on the other. 'Bourdieu' was adapted in this movement along with authors such as Anthony Giddens and Peter Blau.

In this "new theoretical discourse on social inequality," after being introduced by Beate Krais [1983] against substantialistic class analysis, 'Bourdieu' was rapidly recognized as "class theory" [eg. Eder 1989; Honneth 1984; Müller 1989a; Müller 1992]. This might be the reason why market research-oriented sociologist Stefan Hradil rejected Bourdieu's work in his well-known study *Sozialstrukturanalyse in einer fortgeschrittenen Gesellschaft* [Hradil 1987], with which he imports the SINUS Market-Research typology of social milieus into Sociology. Referring to *La distinction*, the two market-researchers Ulrich Becker and Horst Nowak [1982] had identified within the German Federal Republic eight milieus, defined by the attitude and lifestyle of their members. Stefan Hradil is part of the Sociological movement, which – under direction of Ulrich Beck – contributed via the "new discourse on social inequality" to the break-through of a new paradigm that suggests that classes and stratifications would disappear with the progress of modernization.[15] This individualistic theorem received some credit because it met to a certain extent the *zeitgeist* of members of the generation that was subject to an educational upward mobility compared to that of their parents. Stefan Hradil's book, bearing the subtitle *Von Klassen und Schichten zu Lagen und Milieus* (From classes and stratifications to positions and milieus), focussed on inequalities between "lifestyles," defined as detached from social positions. The SINUS milieu-typology was imposed in the 1990s as a legitimate model for the analysis of the social differences, as the enormous success of Gerhard Schulze's *Die Erlebnisgesellschaft* [Schulze 1992], in which it is applied, illustrates.

The mobilization of Bourdieu's "class theory" in empirical studies arose only later. Under the direction of Michael Vester, members of the *Institut für Politikwissenschaft* of the University of Hannover established – based on the model of *La distinction* – an analysis of the structural change and of new milieus within the German Federal Republic [Vester *et al.* 1993]. Further research advanced this approach by accounting for the dynamic of education expansion, referring to Marx's antagonism between the productive forces and the production relations [Vester *et al.* 2001; Vester

[15] The central organ of this movement was the periodical *Soziale Welt*, pubished by Ulrich Beck. The editor of this periodical, Peter A. Berger, put in circulation concepts such as "destructurized class society" [Berger 1986]. Ulrich Beck [1986] himself included in his book *Risikogesellschaft* (Risk Society) a chapter entitled "Jenseits von Klasse und Schicht" (Beyond class and condition). On the basis of this book, Beck, Professor of Sociology at the University of Bamberg since 1981, was elected by the predominant media as a "diagnostic of our time," which he supplied thenceforth with analogous concepts [cf. Stork 2001]. In 1989 Ulrich Beck published a collection of essays of renowned sociologists proclaiming the end of sociology as science and the rise of "feuilletonistic sociology."

et al. 2007], and the gender dimension [Vester and Gardemin 2001]. Comparable analyses of the East German society have been accomplished [Hofmann and Rink 2006; Vester *et al.* 1995]. The model established by Michael Vester *et al.* [2001] aims much more than the rival model to explain the structural changes of the last decades such as the impact of education expansion on the dynamics between milieus [eg. Vester 2005]. However, the predominance of the principles of vision and division of the individualism theorem in social structure research remains solid: in their critical analysis, Vester *et al.* refer to the typology of the SINUS-market-researchers and use the notion of milieu, even if their work is much more a class analysis than a subject-oriented analysis of lifestyle in the service of the enlargement of consumer markets.[16]

2) In critical education research, Bourdieu's work attracted much attention already at the beginning of the 1980s, when the effects of the education expansion became obvious. Critical education researchers at the margins of the university were bound to be interested in works that help them to assess that the promises of the education expansion were not fulfilled. 'Bourdieu' allowed them to explain the reasons for the failure of the great education reforms and at the same time to account for the changes caused by them nonetheless [Liebau 2006]. Bourdieu's "theory of social practice" and concepts such as the reproduction of social inequality permitted them to challenge the predominant subject philosophy of the *Geisteswissenschaftliche Pädagogik* [Krais 1981].

The success of the publication of *Die feinen Unterschiede* gave these attempts to renew empirical education research visibility and credibility [Liebau 1984; Liebau 1987a; Liebau 1987b], as Bourdieu's books published by Suhrkamp in the 1970s had already done [Rieger-Ladich 2006]. Consecrated by the high-priests of "culture," Bourdieu seemed to represent by now academic credit to the critical researchers at the margins of the university, as the title of Markus Shroer's book review in 1995 ("Theoretisches Kapital") suggests. The critical education periodical *Neue Sammlung* [Liebau and Müller-Rolli 1985] published a special issue ("Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology of culture") including writings of Pierre Bourdieu [1985a; Bourdieu 1985b; Bourdieu 1985c] and applications of his concepts [Liebau and Huber 1985; Müller-Rolli 1985; Portele 1985].

However, most of the researchers referring to 'Bourdieu' tended to focus on research purposes rather than on theoretical debates. They produced studies on university socialization [e.g. Funke *et al.* 1986; Friebertshäuser 1992; Huber *et al.* 1983; Liebau 1982; Müller-Rolli 1985], on youth [e.g. Büchner 1994; Fuhs 1999; Zinneck-

[16] For a direct confrontation between the partisans of the individualism theorem and class analysis *à la* Bourdieu, [see Mörth and Fröhlich 1994].

er 1987], in education research [e.g. Krais and Trommler 1995] and in pedagogy [e.g. Liebau 1991]. Following the publication of the German translation of *Homo academicus* [Bourdieu 1988], research on female academics developed [Engler 1993; Engler 1997; Engler 2001; Engler and Krais 2004; Krais 2000]. From critical education research referring to 'Bourdieu' for instance work also arose on the recruitment of the economic elites [e.g. Hartmann 2002a], discussions about the heuristic potentials of Bourdieu's concepts [e.g. Friebertshäuser 2006], or, inspired by the works of Michael Vester *et al.*, the development and application of a methodology to define habitus types [Bremer and Teiwes-Kügler 2003; Bremer and Vester 2006; Lange-Vester 2007]. The German translation of *La noblesse d'Etat* [1998b], one of the highlights of Bourdieu's work, was published late and did not attract much attention, perhaps because the French education system is not easy accessible for intellectuals socialized in a world that rather disguises than names the hierarchy between institutions of higher education.

In the same logic, Bourdieu's work was adapted between the poles of research based social criticism and culture theory also in other fields of the humanities: Scholars on language and literature appropriated the work particularily to affirm a phenomenological theory of culture [e.g. Jarchow and Winter 1993; Lobsien 1988; Stephan and Winter 1990]. Romanist Joseph Jurt adapted it as an instrument to overcome the opposition between the internalist and the externalist interpretation of literature activities [e.g. Jurt 1994; Jurt 1995]. Jurt also contributed to the raise of the interest for Bourdieu's work due to his position as Professor and director of the *Frankreichzentrum* at the University of Freiburg i.Br. from 1989 on, hub for German-French relations. Researchers in sociology of art under direction of Ulf Wuggenig made a comparative survey on art worlds, by questioning the visitors of *avant-garde* art museums in Vienna and Hamburg about art socialization, art perception and exposition visiting habits [e.g. Tarnai and Wuggenig 1995]. Petra Frerichs und Margareta Steinrücke refered to 'Bourdieu' in order to link "class" and "gender" [Frerichs and Steinrücke 2000]. And historians appropriated 'Bourdieu' essentially to renew and to affirm phenomenological and hermeneutic traditions [e.g. Bourdieu 1996e; Gilcher-Holtey 1996; Raphael 1989; Reichardt 1997].

3) The most important adaptation of 'Bourdieu' for its further reception arose from cultural critics. Published by Suhrkamp, rendered by the translator of Bourdieu's 'Structuralist' works (Bernd Schwibs), and entitled *Die feinen Unterschiede* (The fine differences), *La distinction* could not not be seen by culture critics as an "ethno-sociology of the present French society" [Schmeiser 1986]. Bourdieu's work was perceived in the light of both its "scientific anchorage in structuralism" [Burkart 1984] or its "structuralist credo" [Müller 1986], and the earlier translations

Zur Soziologie symbolischer Formen [1970], *Politische Ontologie Martin Heideggers* [1975] and *Entwurf einer Theorie der Praxis* [1976]. Bourdieu's analysis of cultural practices and especially his concept of "cultural capital" seemed to give the possibility of affirming the intrinsic value of "culture" [e.g. Burkart 1984; Honneth 1984; Kowalski 1983].

At the beginning of the 1980s, the notion "culture" became more and more at the centre of social constructivist approaches combatting orthodox Marxism, which itself considered culture only as an "epiphenomenon." The process was so prevalent, that Wolf Lepenies [1995] talked in retrospect of an *Ethnologisierung der Sozialwissenschaften* (Anthropologization of the social sciences).[17] In the middle of the 1980s, "culture" was the new leading notion in all the humanities. Associated with the notion that serves as a catalyst to reject orthodox Marxism, Bourdieu's work was itself an important symbolic resource in this battle: 'Bourdieu' was brought into sections of the German Society of Sociology, for instance on during the 22nd German sociologist meeting in 1984 [cf. Gerhards 1985; Müller 1985]; the "Soziologische Theorie" section of the German Society of Sociology especially put 'Bourdieu' in circulation and organized a conference in his honor [e.g. Eder 1989]. The interest in 'Bourdieu' is due to the fact, that it "brings the sociology of culture back into the analysis of society," according to one of the protagonists [Müller 1986]. The cultural *avant-garde* periodical *Ästhetik und Kommunikation* [61/62, 1987] dedicated an issue to the work of Pierre Bourdieu. The translations of *Le sens pratique* [1987b], being introduced with a subtitle opposing it to *Critical Theory* (*Kritik der theoretischen Vernunft*, critique of the theoretical reason), and of *Homo academicus* [1988], making the fame of Bourdieu in the French intellectual world more evident, amplified this effect. At the end of the 1980s, German sociology saw in Pierre Bourdieu a "cultural myth chaser" [Miller 1989] and "a witness of French intellectuality in a virtually monumental sense," who could be contrasted at the same time with German sociology and American sociology [Hahn 1989].

The rewards to the historical person were not long in coming. Pierre Bourdieu became Honorary Doctor of the *Freie Universität Berlin* in 1989, Honorary Doctor of the *Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität* in Frankfurt in 1996 and received the *Ernst-Bloch-Preis* of the city Ludwigshafen in 1997, one of the most prestigious intellectual prizes in Germany. In the 1990s, various works introducing 'Bourdieu' [e.g. Bohn

[17] In sociology, the "Culture" section of the German Society of Sociology, founded at the end of the 1970s, succeeded more and more to establish the notion "culture" [Gebhardt 2001]. 1986, a special number of the *KZfSS* was published, under the title "Kultur und Gesellschaft" (culture and society), edited by Friedhelm Neidhardt, Rainer Lepsius and Johannes Weiss; "Kultur und Gesellschaft" was also the title of the Congress of the German, Austrian and Swiss Sociological Associations in 1988.

1991; Janning 1991; Müller 1992a; Schwingel 1993; Schwingel 1995], by 'Bourdieu' [e.g. Bourdieu 1992a; Bourdieu 1993; Bourdieu *et al.* 1991; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1996], or discussing 'Bourdieu' [e.g. Gebauer and Wulf 1993; Mörth and Fröhlich 1994] were published. The rename of 'Bourdieu' in the German-speaking world was also amplified by its success in the English-speaking world, through some introductory works [e.g. Harker *et al.* 1990; Robbins 1991]. In a review of literature on and about him in the mid-1990s, Pierre Bourdieu was considered as "certainly one of to the most emblematic figures of contemporary sociology" [Schroer 1995]. 'Bourdieu,' introduced by Cornelia Bohn and Alois Hahn [1999], was incorporated into the re-edition of the gallery of "sociological classics" under direction of Dirk Kaesler.

Nevertheless, the promoters of cultural criticism could not adopt 'Bourdieu' completely, perhaps because they needed to keep distance from the devaluation attached to sociology – all the more so, as Bourdieu's work was similarly used for social criticism, the alternative and concurring form of critical excellence. Hence, the cultural critics use of Bourdieu's work remained more or less ambivalent: on the one hand, they worshipped Bourdieu's work as highly-esteemed *Kultursoziologie*, on the other hand, they condemned it as a form of "determinism." It seems that they could not accept in Bourdieu's work the assertion of the legitimating aspect of cultural practices – as if they wanted to insist on an intrinsic value of (legitimate) "culture." They perceived Bourdieu's sociology of culture as "reductionism" [e.g. Honneth 1985], as "utilitarianism" [e.g. Scherr 1988], and as "economism" [e.g. Gebauer and Wulf 1993].

Ignoring the unconscious dimension of social action, the phenomena analysed by Bourdieu were seen as the result principally of conscious aspirations. Axel Honneth [1984], for instance, blamed Bourdieu for having a "malicious view," which would be the reason for his "reductionist behaviour model." Others disqualified Bourdieu's work in the logic of purely "theoretical" discussions, by denouncing him with his own concepts. Gunter Burkhart [1984], for example, declared that Bourdieu, standing "solidly on the grounds of the predominant aesthetics," condemns "mediocre taste" with a "conspicuous, although implicit disdain." Volker Rittner [1984] presented Bourdieu's analysis as "voyeuristic" and "a little sardonic," and Max Miller [1989] saw a "voyeuristic view on social everyday cultures and cultural private life" at work and suspected the publication of *Le sens pratique* of being part of a strategy of the "maximation of symbolic profits." In the same manner, quantitative empiricists referring to the German title of *La distinction*, asserted that the social differences between cultural practices in German Federal Republic are not *fein* (fine) but *gross* (coarse) [Blasius and Winkler 1989]. It is self-evident, that such comments contribute less to a content-based discussion on Bourdieu's work than that they are

witness to the ambition to tower above either this kind of intellectual production or Sociology or both. Everything takes place as if the appropriation of 'Bourdieu' by the culture critics wished to follow the logic of the strategy of "Canada Dry:" to distance oneself from what one borrows, in order to accumulate the profits both of the borrowings from 'Bourdieu' as well as from its rejection.

The fact that Pierre Bourdieu was seen as a representative of the highly-esteemed Parisian intellectual scene, also seemed to be an important burden in the transmission of his writings to the German-speaking context. Most of his translators seemed to associate their work with high intellectual ambitions. At least, the translations by Suhrkamp in the 1980s seemed to be driven by the effort to reproduce the profundity and complexity of the language rather than the attempt to make the ideas and arguments accessible. Bourdieu's writing style is indeed idiosyncratic. But the application of such a strategy of translation actually mystifies the text. An example of this is the obvious and often commented on high ratio of Gallicisms, which is characteristic in these translations. It is of course important for the reconstruction of a work to restitute its concepts, but too many unfamiliar notions (to sociology) may also be an obstacle for the (sociological) understanding – and reception – of the work. Bernd Schwibs for instance translates Bourdieu's concept *consecration* with *Konsekration*, although it is borrowed from Max Weber's concept of *Weihung*, which would be understood by German speakers and sociologists much more immediately. It also detracts from clarity when Bourdieu's concept *sens pratique* is cryptically translated as *sozialer Sinn* (social sense), a concept which not only does not exist in German, but which also does not make any sens as allusion to anything existing – not even in the eyes of sociologists. In this way, the "already high percentage of foreign words" are increased, as a book reviewer of the German translation of *La distinction* noted typically [Kowalski 1983]. This makes the texts rather more interesting in appearance than understandable. As a result, while the French texts of Bourdieu are accessible even for foreign French speakers, some German translations are "not easy to read and to understand" for German speakers [Rehbein 2006]. The mobilization of a lot of language capital in translations increases above all the celebrity of the author and the reknown of the translator. However, this benefits an aesthetic appropriation of Bourdieu's work rather than its comprehension. Because of the predominance of the culture critics, 'Bourdieu' gets associated less with the analysis of the production and reproduction of social inequality than to the perfecting of distinction strategies through the knowledge of one's own culture and that of others.[18]

[18] This might also be the reason, why protagonists of the culture critic adaptation of 'Bourdieu' are generally very little interested in the objectifying concepts of Bourdieu's work. It is a phenomenon,

Which reasons are responsible for making of 'Bourdieu' *the* French author in West German sociology during the 1980s? Here is not the place to give an exhaustive explanation to this phenomenon. However, the following factors seem to be crucial: Firstly, associated to the polysemantic notion "culture" like hardly any other French author, 'Bourdieu' benefits from the effect of the allodoxie, the confusion of things with others. Secondly, Bourdieu's work is much less susceptible to be mobilized by the *Neue Linke* to challenge (Habermasian) "rationalism" than the work of other known French authors (e.g. Michel Foucault, George Bataille, and Gilles Deleuze). A work, which is ported much more by an attention to account for the empirical relevance of different rationalities than the aim to denounce a certain type of rationality, and which is moreover already associated with sociology, seems to be destined to attract the attention of the agents of the declining discipline. Thirdly, Axel Honneth – despite his reserve – acknowledged 'Bourdieu' being a "Marxist" [Honneth 1984], whilst disqualifying "Foucault" as "positivist" without normative basis [Honneth 1985]. The successor-to-be of the contemporary representative of *Critical Theory* (Jürgen Habermas) favored 'Bourdieu' perhaps because it was less associated with the virulent criticism of *Critical Theory* than "Foucault & Co." Anyhow, Honneth's ambivalent appropriation of 'Bourdieu' seems to render it to an acceptable theoretical reference in sociology.

The rise and fall of the "political Bourdieu"

In the 1990s, Pierre Bourdieu was perceived more and more as a political intellectual.

1) This was on the one hand due to the increasing lack of critical intellectuals in the political and medial debate of Germany. From the middle of the 1980s, Ulrich Beck, herald of the theories of "individualization," supported by the dominant liberal media (e.g. *Die Zeit*) and the dominant publication in social sciences (Suhrkamp), took the place of Jürgen Habermas as the central media intellectual.[19] Social scientists at the margins of academia saw in French authors an alternative to the fading German tradition of *Critical Theory*. 'Bourdieu' promised academic recognition for their engagement against the orthodoxy in politics and in sociology. This

that German-speaking social sciences ignore, what Pierre Bourdieu has adopted from the work of Max Weber, whereas in France this nexus was made long ago [Pollak 1986; Pollack 1988]. Out of the confrontation with Max Weber results for instance the concept of field.

[19] At the theoretical pole of sociology, Niklas Luhmann, professor of sociology at the University of Bielefeld since 1968, replaced Jürgen Habermas in the 1980s increasingly as represenatative of Grand Theory.

movement was accelerated after the fall of the Wall in Berlin in November 1989 and the reunion of the two German states, when the predominance of the "German question" in public debate drove back left-wing positions. Around the turn of the 1990s, 'Bourdieu' was increasingly published in periodicals and publications of the marginal left as well as of the politically-engaged cultural *avant-garde* such as *Das Argument, Vorwärts, Freibeuter, Die neue Rundschau* and Raben Verlag, Wagenbach Verlag, and VSA-Verlag.[20] After adopting Bourdieu's sociology of culture since the 1980s, Irene Dölling [1986a; Dölling 1986b; Dölling 1989], professor at the University of Potsdam, published a collection of articles by Bourdieu on the "role of intellectuals in a modern world" [Bourdieu 1991]. Margareta Steinrücke, working for the *Arbeitnehmerkammer Bremen* (Employee's chamber of Bremen), edited for the publishing house VSA the collection *Schriften zur Politik und Kultur* (Writings on politics and culture), bringing together political and scientific texts of Pierre Bourdieu on a certain topic [Bourdieu 1992b; Bourdieu 1997b; Bourdieu 1998d; Bourdieu 2001b]. At the latest with the translations of *Choses dites* [Bourdieu 1992a] and *Questions de sociologie* [Bourdieu 1993, Pierre Bourdieu was known as an intellectual, "who is not shy of intervention in actual political debates" [Schroer 1995]. The media organs of the politically engaged cultural *avant-garde* disseminated interviews with Pierre Bourdieu and his texts [e.g. *Die Tageszeitung*]. The left-wing newspaper *Die Tageszeitung* acquired the publication of the periodical *LIBER: The European review of books* from 1995 on.

2) A second major reason for the rise of Pierre Bourdieu as a figure of critical intellectualism lies on the other hand in the fact that Bourdieu himself acted to unite intellectuals sustaining political movements against neo-liberal politics [Lenoir 2005]. Because of the European dimension of this engagement, German-speaking countries were crucially affected by this activity. Pierre Bourdieu put in circulation *LIBER* and made known to the German public a form of intellectual production combining science and political engagement. The position taking in support of the railway-workers during the strike of December 1995, met a demand for the "critical intellectual" also in the German-speaking world [e.g. Bourdieu 1995; Bourdieu 1996b-d; Barets and Bourdieu 1997; Bourdieu and Hensche *et al.* 1997; Beaud and Bourdieu *et al.* 1997].[21] While the German-speaking social sciences were captured

[20] At that time, Suhrkamp was subject to a crisis of succession, turned away from critical sociology and elected Ulrich Beck as their new intellectual.

[21] *Die Zeit*, for instance, in the aftermath a revised version of the article *Sciences sociales et démocratie*, in which Bourdieu exposes the reason of his political commitment. This text will be republished together with the other contributions of the series *Wozu heute noch Soziologie?* ("Why today still sociology?").

by the triumphing rhetoric of "globalization," 'Bourdieu' offered the possibility to criticize the predominant politics with scientific means. His participation at debates with renowned intellectuals and politicians [e.g. Bourdieu 1997a] transformed him into an unavoidable reference in German intellectual life.

The way in which the demand for a figure engaged against predominant politics matched the attempt of Bourdieu himself to employ his symbolic capital to combat the "neoliberal invasion," is nowhere more evident than in the event which raised him up into a legitime (critical) media intellectual. At the acceptance speech for the (highly esteemed) Ernst-Bloch-Preis of the city of Ludwigshafen in 1997, after the laudatory speech by Ulrich Beck, Bourdieu [1998a] used his prestige to criticize the predominant neoliberal politics and call for a European movement against it. This was received with major publicity by the scandal seeking media organs. *Die Zeit*, dominant moderator of "intellectual debates," began to publish texts of Pierre Bourdieu. 'Bourdieu' became as well a frequent reference in the left-wing newspapers *Kalaschnikow* and *Die Tageszeitung*. The televised debate with Günter Grass, newly nominated as Nobel Laureate for Literature of 1999, gave another boost to this dynamic. Bourdieu seemed to be a legitimate figure of the German media. The Westdeutscher Rundfunk for instance transmitted an extensive documentary portrait of Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu, co-founder of the anti-globalization network *Attac*, gave speeches at political meetings in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.

A crucial element of Bourdieu's image as a critical intellectual was the German translation of the study *La misère du monde*. Presented to the German public just before the ceremony of the Ernst-Bloch-Preis (1998), *Das Elend der Welt* is the book to which Pierre Bourdieu referred most in his acceptance speech for the prize and which was ubiquitous in the debate with Günter Grass. It became a symbol for the possibility to combine the most progressed state of science with political engagement. From 1999 on, the collection *Raisons d'agir* of the Universitätsverlag Konstanz made accessible to the German public some of the French books against neoliberalism, shortly after their release in France [e.g. Bourdieu 1998c; Bourdieu 2001a].

This reception of 'Bourdieu' as a political intellectual would not have been possible without the investment of Franz Schultheis. After studying in Germany and in France, working with Bourdieu at the *Centre de sociologie européenne* for many years, being habilitated by Bourdieu at the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales* in 1993, and being responsible for the German translation of *La misère du monde* [1997], Franz Schultheis was predisposed to serve as a mediator between Pierre Bourdieu and the demand for 'Bourdieu' in the German-speaking world. Franz Schultheis acted as go-between to realize contacts in both directions and, due to his connections

to the Universitäsverlag Konstanz made the engaged writings of Pierre Bourdieu accessible to the German public (by *Raisons d'agir*) as well as other texts of him and of members of the *Centre de Sociologie Européenne* (by the collection *edition discours*). In his central research, he invested amongst other things in the adaptation of the approach of *La misère du monde* to contemporary German society, published under the title *Gesellschaft mit begrenzter Haftung* [Schultheis and Schulz 2005]. 'Bourdieu' attracted progressively more the attention of social scientists at the margins of academia. For instance out of the research seminar *Gesellschaftstheorie und Zeitdiagnose* at the University of Münster, under direction of Rolf Eickelpasch, sociological adepts invested in social research and theoretical work following the "political Bourdieu" [e.g. Bittlingmayer *et al.* 2002].

The more 'Bourdieu' was appropriated by engaged social scientists, the more the distinguished culture critics lost their interest in referring to it. 'Bourdieu' brings back politics into the social sciences, to which the elite of the German social sciences kept distance since the disillusionment after the events of May 1968. Through his political engagement, Bourdieu furthermore displayed that his habitus is definitely not one of a "radical-chic" Parisian intellectual. Therefore, as the "political Bourdieu" rose, the culture critiques turned away from 'Bourdieu' or they stridently accused it of "reductionism," like the Romanist Karlheinz Stierle [1999] in his savage book review of the translation of *Les règles de L'art* [1999] in *Die Zeit*.

The "political Bourdieu" came to a sudden end, when Pierre Bourdieu died on January 23, 2002. Bound to the historical person, his high reputation disappeared. Social movements against neoliberal politics, in their need for mobilizing forces, were constrained to turn to (lively) figures, bearing symbolic capital. One could refer to Pierre Bourdieus "theory" without being associated to his political commitement. In addition to that, 'Bourdieu' cannot sanction any more appropriations of his work.[22] Politically bleached and unable to sanction, 'Bourdieu' is condemned to be subject to scholastic appropriations by agents of the academic world.

Whereas the reception of Pierre Bourdieu's work in German sociology in the 1990s was "with some difficulties and sluggish" [Schroer 1995], he advanced after his death to the most discussed and utilized author. We can identify reconstructions of Bourdieu's research method [e.g. Fuchs-Heinritz and König 2005], of Bourdieu's basic concepts [e.g. Krais and Gebauer 2002; Rehbein 2006], of Bourdieu's "forms of thinking" [e.g. Colliot-Thélène 2005], Bourdieu's "regard" [e.g. Rehbein *et al.* 2003]

[22] This point is not to be underestimated in the German-speaking context, because Pierre Bourdieu intervened in discussions here numerous times to answer objections to his work [much noticed in Eder 1989]. An author who might refuse comment on his work represents a risk, which not every commentator can or will bear.

or "thinking" [e.g. Papilloud 2003], and of the stages of the content of Bourdieu's German reception [e.g. Barlösius 2006]. Bourdieu's "theory" is compared to "Luhmann" [e.g. Nassehi and Nollmann 2004], to "Geertz" [e.g. Kumoll 2005], and classified, for instance into the "Cultural Turn" [e.g. Reckwitz 2000] or other systematics or typologies [e.g. Colliot-Thélène 2005].

'Bourdieu' has also been applied to micro social phenomena, mostly in a social constructivist manner [e.g. Diaz-Bone 2002; Elbrecht and Hillebrandt 2002; Florian and Hillebrandt 2006; Füssel 2006; Hillebrand 2006]. All these works suggest an intrinsic force of "Bourdieu's work" and most of them aim to rehabilitate its "theory of culture" [e.g. Bongaerts 2008; Hillebrandt 2008; Kumoll 2005; Nassehi and Nollmann 2004]. It seems now as if 'Bourdieu' is appropriated by the "eclecticism," which Émile Durkheim [1975] identified as the core structural characteristic of the German academic culture.

Even the critical sociologists seem to have difficulties to resist this dynamic. Mostly, they tend to emphasize that Pierre Bourdieu's political commitement has to be understood as quasi-practical consequence of his "theory" [e.g. Böhlke 2007]. Or, allegorically, they outline the singularity and the exemplary manner of his political "engagement" [e.g. Steinrücke 2004]. This production seems to aim rather at raising the market value of 'Bourdieu' than at giving social scientists reasons to be engaged against neoliberal politics. What would matter today is the active participation in the construction of an international network of critical social scientists, which can symbolically support social movements within this political framework on national and international levels. The network ESSE, aiming to create a European space for the social sciences, might be a first step to this. 'Bourdieu' can fulfill herein at best an integrative function as symbol for the shared orientation.

To conclude, we can state that the appropriations of 'Bourdieu' by the German-speaking social sciences have led to mainly two types of uses: Pierre Bourdieu's work was subject to adoptions above all by intellectuals affirming either (research based) social criticism on the one hand or (distinctive) cultural criticism on the other. Since its first introduction these two types of uses maintain an amazing consistency. Even though, since Pierre Bourdieu's death, the association to the cultural criticism seems to prevail and the association to social critical to fade into the background. However, to combat the ongoing devaluation and economization of "culture," the affirmation of its supposed intrinsic value seems to be less promising than demonstrating the social, political and other conditioning of the cultural production and achievements. Such sociological analyses can really achieve rational symbolic conditions for collective actions that sustain or create spaces of autonomous cultural production.

References

Barets, P., and Bourdieu, P.

1997 *Mobilisierung gegen den Neoliberalismus. Das Tagebuch der Streiks in Frankreich November/Dezember 1995*. Hamburg: VSA-Verlag.

Barlösius, E.

2006 *Pierre Bourdieu*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag.

Beaud, S., Bourdieu, P., and Pialoux, M.

1997 *Spaltungen in der Welt der Arbeit: vom alltäglichen Leiden an der Gesellschaft*. Hamburg: VSA-Verlag.

Beck, U.

1986 *Risikogesellschaft: auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Beck, U. (ed.)

1989 "Über Soziologie." *Soziale Welt* 40: 1-2.

Beck, U., and Bonss, W. (eds.)

1989 *Weder Sozialtechnologie noch Aufklärung? Analysen zur Verwendung sozialwissenschaftlichen Wissens*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Becker, U., and Nowak, H.

1982 "Lebensweltanalyse als neue Perspektive der Meinungs- und Marketingforschung. Bericht über die Entwicklung eines anwendungsorientierten Forschungsprogramms." Pp. 247-267 in *Fitting Research to Turbulent Times*, vol. 2, edited by European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research. Vienna.

Berger, P.A.

1986 *Entstrukturierte Klassengesellschaft? Klassenbildung und Strukturen sozialer Ungleichheit im historischen Wandel*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Bittlingmayer, U., Eickelpasch, R., Kastner, J., and Rademacher, C. (eds.)

2002 *Theorie als Kampf? Zur politischen Soziologie Pierre Bourdieus*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Blasius, J., and Winkler, J.

1989 "Gibt es die 'feinen Unterschiede'? Eine empirische Überprüfung der Bourdieuschen Theorie." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 41: 72-94.

Böhlke, E. (ed.)

2007 *Bourdieu und die Linke: Politik-Ökonomie-Kultur*. Berlin: Dietz.

Bohn, C.

1991 *Habitus und Kontext: ein kritischer Beitrag zur Sozialtheorie Bourdieus*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Bohn, C., and Hahn, A.

1999 "Pierre Bourdieu." Pp. 252-271 in *Klassiker der Soziologie. Vol. II: Von Talcott Parsons bis Anthony Giddens*, edited by D. Kaesler. München: C.H. Beck.

Boltanski, L., and Chiapello, È.

1999 *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*. Paris: Gallimard.

Bongaerts, G.

2008 *Verdrängungen des Ökonomischen. Bourdieus Theorie der Moderne*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Bonss, W., and Hartmann, H. (ed.)

1985 *Entzauberte Wissenschaft. Zur Relativität und Geltung soziologischer Forschung*. Soziale Welt, Sonderband 3. Göttingen: Otto Schwarz.

Bourdieu, P.

1970 *Zur Soziologie der symbolischen Formen*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

1976 *Die politische Ontologie Martin Heideggers*. Frankfurt am M.: Syndikat Verl.

1979 *Entwurf einer Theorie der Praxis: auf der ethnologischen Grundlage der kabylischen Gesellschaft.* Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

1981 *Titel und Stelle: über die Reproduktion sozialer Macht*. Frankfurt am M.: Europäische Verlagsanstalt.

1982 *Die feinen Unterschiede: Kritik der gesellschaftlichen Urteilskraft*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

1985a "Vernunft ist eine historische Errungenschaft wie die Sozialversicherung." *Neue Sammlung* 25/3: 376-394.

1985b "Vorschläge des Collège de France für das Bildsungswesen der Zukunft." *Neue Sammlung* 25/3: 395-414.

1985c "Hit-Parade der französischen Intellektuellen oder: Wer richtet über die Legitimität der Richter." *Neue Sammlung* 25/3: 415ff.

1987a *Choses dites*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

1987b *Sozialer Sinn: Kritik der theoretischen Vernunft*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

1988 *Homo academicus*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

1989a "Antworten auf einige Einwände." Pp. 395-410 in *Klassenlage, Lebensstil und kulturelle Praxis*, edited by K. Eder o.o.a.

1989b *Satz und Gegensatz: über die Verantwortung des Intellektuellen*. Berlin-West: Klaus Wagenbach.

1990 *Was heisst sprechen? Die Ökonomie des sprachlichen Tausches*. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller.

1991 *Die Intellektuellen und die Macht*. Hamburg: VSA.

1992a *Rede und Antwort*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

1992b *Die verborgenen Mechanismen der Macht*. Hamburg: VSA.

1993 *Soziologische Fragen*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

1995 "Interview von Thierry Chervel mit Pierre Bourdieu." *Basler Zeitung* 303 (29. Dezember 1995): 35.

1996a "Qu'est-ce que faire parler un auteur? À propos de Michel Foucault." *Sociétés et Représentations* 3: 13-18.

1996b "Pierre Bourdieu über 'Die Demokratie braucht Soziologie'" *Die Zeit* 26.

1996c "Warnung vor dem Modell Tietmeyer. Europa darf sich den neoliberalen Theorien des Bundesbankpräsidenten nicht unterwerfen." *Die Zeit* 45: 2.

1996d "'Wie Mao's rotes Buch'. Der französische Soziologe Pierre Bourdieu über die Bundesbank und die neoliberale Wirtschaftspolitik." *Der Spiegel* 50: 172-179.

1996e "Über die Beziehungen zwischen Geschichte und Soziologie in Frankreich (Gespräch mit Lutz Raphael)." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft: Zeitschrift für Historische Sozialwissenschaft* 22/1: 62-89.

1997a *Spiel ohne Grenzen. Im Zeichen der Globalisierung: Perspektiven europäischer Politik*. Podiumsdiskussion mit U. Beck u. J. Fischer, Moderation H. Bendkowski 8. 6.1997 in Frankfurt am M. (URL: http://www.ct.heise.de/tp/deutsch/special/pol/8035/1.html)

1997b *Der Tote packt den Lebenden*. Hamburg: VSA.

1998a "Neo-Liberalismus als konservative Revolution – Das Elend der Welt, der Skandal der Arbeitslosigkeit und eine Erinnerung an die Sozialutopie Ernst Blochs." Pp. 54 ff. in *Zukunft gestalten – Reden und Beiträge zum Ernst-Bloch-Preis 1997*, edited by K. Kufeld. Mössingen-Talheim: Talheimer.

1998b *Der Staatsadel*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

1998c *Gegenfeuer: Wortmeldungen im Dienste des Widerstands gegen die neoliberale Invasion*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

1998d *Der Einzige und sein Eigenheim*. Hamburg: VSA-Verlag.

1999 *Die Regeln der Kunst: Genese und Struktur des literarischen Feldes*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

2001a *Gegenfeuer 2: für eine europäische soziale Bewegung*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

2001b *Wie die Kultur zum Bauern kommt: über Bildung, Schule und Politik*. Hamburg: VSA-Verlag.

2002a "Les conditions sociales de la circulation internationale des idées." *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 145: 3-8.

2002b *Ein soziologischer Selbstversuch*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, P. *et al.*

1997 *Das Elend der Welt: Zeugnisse und Diagnosen alltäglichen Leidens an der Gesellschaft*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

Bourdieu, P., Chamboredon, J.-C., and Passeron, J.-C.

1991 *Soziologie als Beruf: wissenschaftstheoretische Voraussetzungen soziologischer Erkenntnis*. Berlin etc.: Walter de Gruyter.

Bourdieu, P., Hensche, D., Lutz, B., Hooge, D., and Pemet, M. (eds.)

1997 *Perspektiven des Protests: Initiativen für einen Europäischen Wohlfahrtsstaat* (3. Forum des Hessischen DGB am 7.6.1997, Frankfurt am M., Thema "Protest ohne Alternativen?"). Hamburg: VSA.

Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J.-C.

1971 *Die Illusion der Chancengleichheit: Untersuchungen zur Soziologie des Bildungswesens am Beispiel Frankreichs.* Stuttgart: Klett.

1973 *Grundlagen einer Theorie der symbolischen Gewalt*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, P., and Delsaut, Y.

1975 "Die neuen Kleider der Bourgeoisie." *Kursbuch* 42: 172-182.

Bourdieu, P., and Wacquant, L.

1996 *Reflexive Anthropologie*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Bremer, H., and Lange-Vester, A.

2006 *Soziale Milieus und Wandel der Sozialstruktur*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Bremer, H., and Teiwes-Kügler, Ch.

2003 "Die Gruppenwerkstatt. Ein mehrstufiges Verfahren zur vertiefenden Exploration von Mentalitäten und Milieus." Pp. 207-236 in *Probleme sozialer Integration. agis-Forschungen zum gesellschaftlichen Strukturwandel*, edited by H. Geiling. Münster: LIT.

Büchner, P.

1994 *Kindliche Lebenswelten*. Weinheim: Verlag Deutsches Jugendinstitut.

Bürger, P. (ed.)

1978 *Seminar: Literatur- und Kunstsoziologie*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Burkart, G.

1984 "Das Distinguierte und das Degoutante. Essay zu: Bourdieus *Die feinen Unterschiede*." *Soziologische Revue* 7: 9-14.

Busch, C.

1967a "Review: P. Bourdieu, and J.-Cl. Passeron: Les héritiers." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 19: 168-170.

1967b "Review: P. Bourdieu, L. Boltanski, R. Castel, and J.-Cl. Chamboredon: Un Art Moyen." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 19: 387-389.

Colliot-Thélène, C. *et al.*

2005 *Pierre Bourdieu: Deutsch-französische Perspektiven*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Diaz-Bone, R.

2002 *Kulturwelt, Diskurs und Lebensstil. Eine diskurstheoretische Erweiterung der Bourdieuschen Distinktionstheorie*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Dölling, I.

1986a "Review: P. Bourdieu: Die feinen Unterschiede." *Weimarer Beiträge* 32/4: 700-703.

1986b *Individuum und Kultur. Ein Beitrag zur Diskussion*. Berlin: Dietz Verlag.

1989 "Review: P. Bourdieu: Sozialer Sinn." *Weimarer Beiträge* 35/3: 513-518.

Durkheim, É.

1975 "La philosophie dans les universities allemandes." Pp. 436-486 in *Textes*. vol. 3 ("Fonctions sociales et institutions"). Paris: Éditions de Minuit.

Eder, K. (ed.)

1989 *Klassenlage, Lebensstil und kulturelle Praxis. Beiträge zur Auseinandersetzung mit Pierre Bourdieus Klassentheorie*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Elbrecht, J., and Hillebrandt, F. (eds.)

2002 *Pierre Bourdieus Theorie der Praxis*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Engler, S.

1993 *Fachkultur, Geschlecht und soziale Reproduktion: eine Untersuchung über Studentinnen und Studenten der Erziehungswissenschaft, Rechtswissenschaft, Elektrotechnik und des Maschinenbaus.* Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag.

1997 "Studentische Lebensstile und Geschlecht." Pp. 309-329 in *Ein alltägliches Spiel. Geschlechterkonstruktion in der sozialen Praxis*, edited by I. Dölling *et al*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

2001 *'In Einsamkeit und Freiheit?': zur Konstruktion der wissenschaftlichen Persönlichkeit auf dem Weg zur Professur*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

Engler, S., and Krais, B. (eds.)

2004 *Das kulturelle Kapital und die Macht der Klassenstrukturen: sozialstrukturelle Verschiebungen und Wandlungsprozesse des Habitus*. Weinheim: Juventa.

Florian, M., and Hillebrandt, F. (eds.)

2006 *Pierre Bourdieu: Neue Perspektiven für die Soziologie der Wirtschaft*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Frerichs, P., and Steinrücke, M.

2000 "Klasse und Geschlecht als Kategorien sozialer Ungleichheit." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 52: 36-59.

Friebertshäuser, B.

1992 *Übergangsphase Studienbeginn: eine Feldstudie über Riten der Initiation in eine studentische Fachkultur*. Weinheim: Juventa.

Friebertshäuser, B., Rieger-Ladich, M., and Wigger, L. (eds.)

2006 *Reflexive Erziehungswissenschaft: Forschungsperspektiven im Anschluss an Pierre Bourdieu*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Fuchs-Heinritz, W., and König, A.

2005 *Pierre Bourdieu: eine Einführung*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

Fuhs, B.

1999 *Kinderwelten aus Elternsicht: zur Modernisierung von Kindheit*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Funke, A., Hartung, D., Krais, B., and Nuthmann, R.

1986 *Karrieren ausser der Reihe. Bildungswege und Berufserfolg von Stipendiaten der gewerkschaftlichen Studienförderung*. Köln: Bund-Verlag.

Füssel, M.

2006 *Gelehrtenkultur als symbolische Praxis: Rang, Ritual und Konflikt an der Universität der Frühen Neuzeit*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Gebauer, G., and Wulf, C.

1993 *Praxis und Ästhetik: neue Perspektiven im Denken Pierre Bourdieus*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Gebhardt, W.

2001 "Vielfältiges Bemühen. Zum Stand kultursoziologischer Forschung im deutschsprachigen Raum." *Soziologie* 2: 40-52.

Gerhards, J.

1985 "Bericht über die Sektionsveranstaltung 'Kultursoziologie'." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 37: 198-200.

Gerhards, J. (ed.)

1997 *Soziologie der Kunst. Produzenten, Vermittler, Rezipienten*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Glicher-Holtey, I.

1996 "Kulturelle und symbolische Praktiken: das Unternehemen Pierre Bourdieu." In *Kulturgeschichte Heute*, edited by W. Hardtwig and H.-U. Wehler. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Goldschmidt, D.

1971 "Vorwort." Pp. 7-11 in *Die Illusion der Chancengleichheit: Untersuchungen zur Soziologie des Bildungswesens am Beispiel Frankreichs*, edited by P. Bourdieu and J.-C. Passeron. Stuttgart: Klett.

Hahn, A.

1989 "Review: P. Bourdieu: Sozialer Sinn." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 41: 168-171.

Harker, R., Mahar, Ch., and Wilkes, Ch.

1990 *An Introduction to the Work of Pierre Bourdieu – The Practice of Theory*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hartmann, M.

2002a *Der Mythos von den Leistungseliten*. Frankfurt am M.-New York: Campus.

Hartmann, F.

2002b "Apotheose eines Systemkritikers." *Telepolis* 25.1.2002 (URL: http://www.heise.de/tp/r4/artikel/11/11665/1.html).

Hillebrand, M.

2006 *Willkürliche Grenzen: das Werk Pierre Bourdieus in interdisziplinärer Anwendung*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Hofmann, M, and Rink, F.

2006 "Vom Arbeiterstaat zur de-klassierten Gesellschaft? Ostdeutsche Arbeitermilieus zwischen Auflösung und Aufmüpfigkeit." Pp. 262-284 in *Ungleichheitsforschung als Passion*, edited by H. Bremer and A. Lange-Vester. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Hillebrandt, F.

2008 "Bourdieus Soziologie als Forschungsfeld." *Soziologische Revue* 31: 231-242.

Honneth, A.

1984 "Die zerrissene Welt der symbolischen Formen. Zum kultursoziologischen Werk Pierre Bourdieus." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 36: 127-164.

1985 *Kritik der Macht: Reflexionsstufen einer kritischen Gesellschaftstheorie*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Hradil, S.

1987 *Sozialstrukturanalyse in einer fortgeschrittenen Gesellschaft: von Klassen und Schichten zu Lagen und Milieus*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.

1989 "System und Akteur. Eine empirische Kritik der soziologischen Kulturtheorie Pierre Bourdieus." Pp. 111-142 in Klassenlage, Lebensstil und kulturelle Praxis, edited by K. Eder o.o.a.

Huber, L., Liebau, E., Portele, G., and Schütte, W.

1983 "Fachcode und studentische Kultur. Zur Erforschung der Habitusbildung in der Hochschule." Pp. 144-170 in *Reflexionsprobleme der Hochschulforschung. Beiträge zur Theorie- und Methodendiskussion*, edited by E. Becker. Weinheim: Beltz.

Hund, W.D.

1973 "Der schamlose Idealismus. Polemik gegen eine reaktionäre Philosophie." Pp. 11-61 in *Strukturalismus. Ideologie und Dogmengeschichte*. Darmstadt, Neuwied: Luchterhand Verlag.

Jaeggi, U.

1968 *Ordnung und Chaos: der Strukturalismus als Methode und Mode*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Janning, F.

1991 *Pierre Bourdieus Theorie der Praxis: Analyse und Kritik der konzeptionellen Grundlegung einer praxeologischen Soziologie*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Jarchow, K. and Winter, H.-G.

1993 "Pierre Bourdieus Kultursoziologie als Herausforderung der Literaturwissenschaft." Pp. 93-134 in *Praxis und Ästhetik. Neue Perspektiven im Denken Pierre Bourdieus*, edited by G. Gebauer und C. Wulf. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Jurt, J.

1994 "Für eine Wissenschaft der Genese kultureller Werke. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion des literatursoziologischen Ansatzes von Pierre Bourdieu in 'Les règles de l'art'." *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 146/231: 319-347.

1995 *Das literarische Feld. Das Konzept Pierre Bourdieus in Theorie und Praxis*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Kaupen-Haas, H.

1972 "Review: P. Bourdieu and J.-Cl. Passeron: Die Illusion der Chancengleichheit." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 24: 395-397.

Klee, E.

2003 *Das Personenlexikon des Dritten Reiches. Wer war was vor und nach 1945*. Frankurt/M.: Fischer.

Kowalski, W.

1983 "Review: P. Bourdieu: Die feinen Unterschiede." *Das Argument* 140: 607-609.

Krais, B.

1981 "Einleitung." in *Titel und Stelle*, edited by P. Bourdieu. Frankfurt am M.: Europäische Verlagsanstalt.

1983 "Bildung als Kapital – neue Perspektiven für die Analyse der Sozialstruktur?" Pp. 199-220 in *Soziale Ungleichheiten*, edited by Reinhard Kreckel o.o.a.

2005 "Die moderne Gesellschaft und ihre Klassen: Bourdieus Konstrukt des sozialen Raums." Pp. 79-105 in *Pierre Bourdieu: Deutsch-französische Perspektiven*, edited by C. Colliot-Thélène, E. François *et al.* Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Krais, B. (ed.)

2000 *Wissenschaftskultur und Geschlechterordnung: über die verborgenen Mechanismen männlicher Dominanz in der akademischen Welt*. Frankfurt am M.: Campus Verlag.

Krais, B., and Gebauer, G.

2002 *Habitus*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Krais, B., and Trommler, L.

1995 *Akademiker-Beschäftigung: Sonderauswertung aus der Volkszählung 1987*. Berlin: Max-Planck-Institut für Bildungsforschung.

Kreckel, R. (ed.)

1983 *Soziale Ungleichheiten*. Soziale Welt, Sonderband 2. Göttingen: Verlag Otto Schwartz.

Kröber, G.

1968 "Die Kategorie 'Struktur' und der kategorische Strukturalismus." *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 1968: 1310-1324.

Knoll, T., Meyer, W., and Stockmann, R.

2002 *Soziologie im Abwärtstrend. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Situation der Soziologie an den bundesdeutschen Hochschulen*. Saarbrücken: Centrum für Evaluation.

Kumoll, K.

2005 *"From the Native's Point of View?" Kulturelle Globalisierung nach Clifford Geertz und Pierre Bourdieu*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Lange-Vester, A.

2007 *Habitus der Volksklassen. Kontinuität und Wandel seit dem 18. Jahrhundert in einer thüringischen Familie*. Münster: Lit.

Lenoir, R.

2005 "L'habitus scientifique: Pierre Bourdieu et l'intellectuel collectif." *Regards sociologiques* 30: 119-130.

Lepenies, W.

1995 "Die Sozialwissenschaften nach dem Ende der Geschichte." Pp. 39-61 In *Gesellschaften im Umbau. Identitäten, Konflikte, Differenzen*, edited by C. Honegger *et al.* Bern: Seismo.

Liebau, E.

1982 "Der Habitus der Ökonomen. Über Arbeitgebererwartungen an Hochschulabsolventen der Wirtschaftswissenschaften." *Arbeitspapier des Wissenschaftlichen Zentrums für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung an der gesamthochschule Kassel* 12.

1984 "Gesellschaftlichkeit und Bildsamkeit des Menschen. Nachdenken über Routine, Geschmack und das Selbstverständliche mit Pierre Bourdieu." *Neue Sammlung: Vierteljahres-Zeitschrift für Erziehung und Gesellschaft* 24: 245-261.

1987a "Klasse, Haut, Kultur oder: Bourdieu für Pädagogen." *Sozialwissenschaftliche Literaturrundschau* 15: 79-89.

1987b *Gesellschaftliches Subjekt und Erziehung: zur pädagogischen Bedeutung der Sozialisationstheorien von Pierre Bourdieu und Ulrich Oevermann*. Weinheim: Juventa.

1991 "Die Bildung des Geschmacks. Eine Studie zur pädagogischen Kultur." *Neue Sammlung* 31/2: 246-269.

2006 "Der Störenfried. Warum Pädagogen Bourdieu nicht mögen." Pp. 41-58 in *Reflexive Erziehungswissenschaft*, edited by B. Friebertshäuser *et al.* o.o.a.

Liebau, E., and Huber, L.

1985 "Die Kulturen der Fächer." *Neue Sammlung* 25/3: 314-339.

Liebau, E., and Müller-Rolli, S. (eds.)

1985 "Lebensstil und Lernform: zur Kultursoziologie Pierre Bourdieus." *Neue Sammlung: 25/3*.

Lobsien, E.

1988 *Das literarische Feld. Phänomenologie der Literaturwissenschaft*. München: Wilhelm Fink.

Michel, U.

1992 "Wilhelm Emil Mühlmann (1904-1988) – ein deutscher Professor. Amnesie und Amnestie: Zum Verhältnis von Ethnologie und Politik im Nationalsozialismus." *Jahrbuch für Soziologiegeschichte* 1991: 69-117.

Miller, M.

1989 "Die kulturelle Dressur des Leviathan und ihre epistemologischen Reflexe." *Soziologische Revue* 12, 19-24.

Mollenhauer, K.

1972 *Theorien zum Erziehungsprozess: zur Einführung in erziehungswissenschaftliche Fragestellungen*. München: Juventa.

Mörth, I.

2002 "Hier in Österreich hat man immerhin den Vorteil, dass wahre Gegner an der Macht sind und keine falschen Freunde." *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 27/3: 78-92.

Mörth, I., and Fröhlich, G.

1994 *Das symbolische Kapital der Lebensstile: zur Kultursoziologie der Moderne nach Pierre Bourdieu*. Frankfurt am M., New York: Campus.

Müller, H.-P.

1985 "Bericht über die Sektionsveranstaltung 'Soziologische Theorie und empirische Sozialforschung' der Sektion Soziologische Theorien." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 37: 193-195.

1986 "Kultur, Geschmack und Distinktion. Grundzüge der Kultursoziologie Pierre Bourdieus." Pp. 162-190, *Kultur und Gesellschaft*, edited by F. Neidhardt *et al.* o.o.a.

1989 "Lebensstile. Ein neues Paradigma der Differenzierungs- und Ungleichheitsforschung?" *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 41: 53-71.

1992a *Sozialstruktur und Lebensstile: der neuere theoretische Diskurs über soziale Ungleichheit*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

1992b "German Sociology at the Beginning of the 90s." *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 3: 751-762.

Müller-Rolli, S.

1985 "Familie und Schule im historischen Prozess der sozialen und kutlurellen Reproduktion." *Neue Sammlung* 25/3: 340-358.

Mühlmann, W.E.

1966 *Kulturanthropologie*. Köln, Berlin: Kiepenheuer und Witsch.

1968 *Geschichte der Anthropologie*. Frankfurt am M.: Athenäum Verlag.

Nassehi, A., and Nollmann, G. (eds.)

2004 *Bourdieu und Luhmann: ein Theorienvergleich*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Neidhardt, F., Lepsius, M.R., and Weiss, J. (eds.)

1986 *Kultur und Gesellschaft: René König, dem Begründer der Sonderhefte, zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Neumeister, B.

2000 *Kampf um die kritische Vernunft. Die westdeutsche Rezeption des Strukturalismus und des postmodernen Denkens*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

Oppitz, M.

1975 *Notwendige Beziehungen: Abriss der strukturalen Anthropologie*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

2008 "Unter den Plejaden." Pp. 158-174 in *Wirkungen des wilden Denkens. Zur strukturalen Anthropologie von Claude Lévi-Strauss*, edited by M. Kauppert und D. Funcke. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Papilloud, C.

2003 *Bourdieu lesen: Einführung in eine Soziologie des Unterschieds*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Pollak, M.

1986 "Max Weber en France: l'itinéraire d'une oeuvre." *Les Cahiers de l'IHTP* 3: 1-70.

1988 "La place de Max Weber dans le champ intellectuel français." *Droit et société* 9: 195-210.

Portele, G.

1985 "Habitus und Lernen." *Neue Sammlung* 25/3: 298-313.

Raphael, L.

1989 "Klassenkämpfe und politisches Feld: Plädoyer für eine Weiterführung Bourdieuscher Fragstellungen in der politischen Soziologie." Pp. 71-110 in *Klassenlage, Lebensstil und kulturelle Praxis*, edited by K. Eder o.o.a.

Reckwitz, A.

2000 *Die Transformation der Kulturtheorien: zur Entwicklung eines Theorieprogramms.* Weilerswist: Velbrück Wissenschaft.

Rehbein, B.

2006 *Die Soziologie Pierre Bourdieus*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

Rehbein, B., Saalmann, G., and Schwengel, H. (eds.)

2003 *Pierre Bourdieus Theorie des Sozialen: Probleme und Perspektiven*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

Reichardt, S.

1997 "Bourdieu für Historiker? Ein kultursoziologisches Angebot an die Sozialgeschichte." Pp. 71-94 in *Geschichte zwischen Kultur und Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Theoriedebatte,* edited by T. Mergel and T. Welskopp. München: C.H. Beck.

Rieger-Ladich, M.

2006 "Pierre Bourdieus Theorie des wissenschaftlichen Feldes: Ein Reflexionsangebot an die Erziehungswissenschaft." Pp. 157-191 in *Reflexive Erziehungswissenschaft*, edited by B. Friebertshäuser *et al*. o.o.a.

Rittner, V.

1984 "Review: P. Bourdieu: Die feinen Unterschiede." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 36: 372-378.

Robbins, D.

1991 *The Work of Pierre Bourdieu: Recognizing Society*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Rössler, J.

2007 "Die deutschsprachige Ethnologie bis ca. 1960." *Cologne Working Papers in Cultural and Social Anthropology* 1: 3-27.

Schmeiser, M.

1986 "Pierre Bourdieu – Von der Sozio-Ethnologie Algeriens zur Ethno-Soziologie der französischen Gegenwartsgesellschaft. Eine bio-bibliographische Einführung." *Ästhetik & Kommunikation* 16: 167-183.

Scherr, A.

1988 "Review: P. Bourdieu: Sozialer Sinn." *Das Argument* 170: 598-599.

Schroer, M.

1995 "Theoretisches Kapital – Bourdieus Soziologie in der Diskussion." *Soziologische Revue* 18: 360-368.

Schultheis, F.

2008 "Pierre Bourdieu und Claude Lévi-Strauss." Pp. 98-110 in *Wirkungen des wilden Denkens. Zur strukturalen Anthropologie von Claude Lévi-Strauss*, edited by M. Kauppert und D. Funcke. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Schultheis, F., and Schulz, K. (eds.)

2005 *Gesellschaft mit begrenzter Haftung: Zumutungen und Leiden im deutsche Alltag*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

Schulze, G.

1992 *Die Erlebnisgesellschaft. Kultursoziologie der Gegenwart.* Frankfurt am M., New York: Campus.

Schwingel, M.

1993 *Analytik der Kämpfe: Macht und Herrschaft in der Soziologie Bourdieus*. Hamburg: Argument.

1995 *Bourdieu zur Einführung*. Hamburg: Junius.

Silbermann, A.

1963 "Die Pole der Musiksoziologie." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 15: 425-448.

1968 "Review: Pierre Bourdieu *et al*.: L'amour de l'art." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 20: 387-390.

1973 *Empirische Kunstsoziologie. Eine Einführung mit kommentierter Bibliographie*. Stuttgart: Enke.

1989 *Verwandlungen. Eine Autobiographie*. Bergisch Gladbach: Gustav Lübbe.

Silbermann, A. (ed.)

1976 *Theoretische Ansätze der Kunstsoziologie*. Stuttgart: F. Enke.

Steinrücke, M. (ed.)

2004 *Pierre Bourdieu: Politisches Forschen, Denken und Eingreifen*. Hamburg: VSA.

Stierle, K.

1999 "Glanz und Elend der Kunstsoziologie. Pierre Bourdieus 'Die Regeln der Kunst' ist der fixen Idee des Feldes verfallen." *Die Zeit* 34.

Stephan, I., and Winter, H.-G. (eds.)

1990 *'Liebe, die im Abgrund Anker wirft'. Autoren und literarisches Feld in Hamburg des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: Argument.

Stork, V.

2001 *Die 'Zweite Moderne' – ein Markenartikel? Zur Antiquiertheit und Negativität der Gesellschaftsutopie von Ulrich Beck*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.

Tarnai, Ch., and Wuggenig, U.

1995 "Stil und Wert." *Angewandte Sozialforschung* 19: 51-75.

Vester, M.

2005 "Die Illusion der Bildungsexpansion. Bildungsöffnungen und soziale Segregation in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland." in *Das kulturelle Kapital und die Macht der Klassenstrukturen*, edited by S. Engler and B. Krais. Weinheim: Juventa.

Vester, M., von Oertzen, P. *et al.* (ed.)

1993 *Soziale Milieus im gesellschaftlichen Strukturwandel*. Köln: Bund.

Vester, M., von Oertzen, P., Geiling, H., Hermann, T., and Müller, D. (ed.)

2001 *Soziale Milieus im gesellschaftlichen Strukturwandel: zwischen Integration und Ausgrenzung*. Frankfurt am M.: Suhrkamp.

Vester, M., Teiwes-Kügler, C., *and* Lange-Vester, A.

2007 *Die neuen Arbeitnehmer: Zunehmende Kompetenzen – wachsende Unsicherheit*. Hamburg: VSA.

Vester, M., and Gardemin, D.

2001 "Milieu, Klasse und Geschlecht. Das Feld der Geschlechterungleichheit und die 'protestantische Alltagsethik'." Pp. 454-486 in *Geschlecht als (Un-)Ordnungsprinzip. Entwicklungen und Perspektiven der Geschlechtersoziologie*, edited by B. Heintz. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Vester, M., Hofmann, M., and Ziercke, I. (eds.)

1995 *Soziale Milieus in Ostdeutschland*. Köln: Bund.

Westdeutscher Rundfunk

1999 "Pierre Bourdieu." *Sendung "Nachtkultur"* Köln, 2.6.1999.

Zinnecker, J. (ed.)

1987 *Jugendkultur 1940-1985*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

The Double Character of the German 'Bourdieu'

On the Twofold Use of Pierre Bourdieu's Work in the German-speaking Social Sciences

Abstract: This article examines the central moments of the reception of Bourdieu's work in German-speaking sociology, focusing on West Germany, where it was subject to the most important appropriations. The reciprocal definition of French and German intellectual fields and the intervention of Pierre Bourdieu himself in this context make the reception of his work on the east side of the Rhine a particularly interesting case. The article examines subsequent aspects of the appropriation, detailing translations, book reviews and articles on 'Bourdieu.' The first section deals with the introduction of 'Bourdieu' at the end of the 1960s that lead to its double labeling: Bourdieu's work was appropriated on the one hand by culture critics as part of the imagined tradition of 'structuralism,' and on the other by researchers at the margins of academia to affirm social criticism – both aiming to combat the prevailing Critical Theory. The second section addresses the re-adaptation of 'Bourdieu' in the new intellectual cosmos from the 1980s on, which contrasted it strongly with discredited orthodox Marxism. The double-labeled French author became a privileged symbol of research based social criticism on the one hand and an author of 'culture theory' on the other. It is the later use, holding French intellectuality in esteem but disqualifying the ambition of the sociological analysis, that consecrated 'Bourdieu'; this was therefore very formative for the conditions of possibility of the further use of Bourdieu's work in the German-speaking world. From the beginning of the 1990s on, treated in the third section, it is the social-critical 'Bourdieu' that prevails increasingly, especially from the moment when Pierre Bourdieu intervened in the public debate in Germany. Bourdieu's death put an end to this phase and opened the space again for appropriations of 'Bourdieu', above all by academics practicing 'cultural theory.'

Keywords: Bourdieu, reception, German sociology, international transfer of cultural goods, sociology of sociology.

Michael Gemperle is a Research Assistant at the Institute of Sociology of the University of St. Gallen, coordinating a three country study aiming to examine the metamorphosis in the sphere of work, after the model of *La misère du monde* and its German replication *Gesellschaft mit begrenzter Haftung* (2005). Michael Gemperle works on a thesis on the reception of Max Weber's work in French social sciences.