
– INTERVENTIONS

– BOURDIEU COMES TO TOWN: Pertinence, Principles, Applications

LOÏC WACQUANT

Abstract

This article frames the themes of the two-part Interventions section ‘Bourdieu Comes to Town’. I first establish the pertinence of Bourdieu’s sociology for students of the city by revisiting his youthful work on power, space, and the diffusion of urban forms in provincial Béarn and colonial Algeria. In both cases, urbanization is the key vector of transformation, and the city, town, or camp the site anchoring the forces dissolving the social fabric of the French countryside and overturning French imperialism in North Africa. These early studies establish that all social and mental structures have spatial correlates and conditions of possibility; that social distance and power relations are both expressed in and reinforced by spatial distance; and that propinquity to the center of accumulation of capital (economic, military, or cultural) is a key determinant of the force and velocity of social change. Next, I discuss four principles that undergird Bourdieu’s investigations and can profitably drive urban inquiry: the Bachelardian moment of epistemological rupture, the Weberian invitation to historicize the agent (habitus), the world (social space) and the categories of the analyst (epistemic reflexivity); the Leibnizian-Durkheimian imperative to deploy the topological mode of reasoning; and Cassirer’s command to heed the constitutive efficacy of symbolic structures. The plasticity and productivity of his concepts suggest that Bourdieu can not only energize urban inquiry but also merge it into a broader analytic of the trialectic of symbolic division, social space, and the built environment. This paves a pathway for reconceptualizing the urban as the domain of accumulation, differentiation and contestation of manifold forms of capital, which makes the city a central ground, product, and prize of historical struggles.

Bourdieu comes to York, England

In May 2012, an international roster of researchers spanning sociology, anthropology, political science, geography and urban design gathered at the University of York at the invitation of Mike Savage and myself for a two-day workshop co-sponsored by the *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* aimed at assessing the prospects, profits and pitfalls of ‘Taking Bourdieu to Town’, that is, bringing the distinctive concepts, methods and arguments of the author of *Distinction*

I would like to thank the participants to the York research seminar on ‘Taking Bourdieu to Town’: first among them Mike Savage, who shouldered its organization and guided it to intellectual fruition; Simon Parker and Liza Weinstein for corraling the papers for this special Interventions section, and the editors of IJURR for their boundless patience and equanimity. I am indebted to Megan Comfort, Chris Herring, Franck Poupeau and David Showalter for their deft comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this article.

(Bourdieu, 1979) squarely to bear upon urban inquiry.¹ The agenda of the meeting was set out as follows:

At this century's start, the city is again the privileged site of rapid techno-economic innovation, resurging social inequality, entrenched marginality, and festering cultural divisions. These assume new and acute forms and generate innovative forms of protest that call for novel analytic approaches. The work of Pierre Bourdieu is a major untapped theoretical and empirical resource for probing them and, in the process, enriching urban sociology. This workshop will bring together scholars who have used Bourdieu's signal concepts (habitus, capital, field, symbolic power, doxa) to dissect gyrations of practice, structure and politics in the city. They will take stock of their findings, clarify the implications of their work, and specify the merits and limits of Bourdieu's framework for urban analysis.

The idea for that meeting arose after I read Mike Savage's provocative 'The lost urban sociology of Pierre Bourdieu' (2011) while teaching my fall 2011 course on 'Metropolis Unbound: Whither Urban Sociology?' at Berkeley. The persistent difficulty in identifying the strands of Bourdieu most pertinent to research on and in the city, the continuing confusion surrounding the origins and purpose of his theoretical constructs, together with the slowly rising tide of publications (now turned into a tsunami) making rhetorical invocations of his concepts without actually putting them to work,² convinced me that the moment was ripe for bringing Bourdieu expressly into urban studies.

This would entail three complementary moves: first, to retrieve his early and late empirical *concern for urbanization and the spatial dimension of domination*, contrary to the conventional story that Bourdieu had 'minimized if not neglected' the latter (Ripoll, 2013: 365); secondly, to explicate the place of the *topological mode of reasoning* and the trialectic of symbolic, social and physical space at the heart of Bourdieu's vision of society and history (Wacquant, 2013); and thirdly, and most importantly, to gather and showcase the significant body of urban research and theorizing *already produced* by a new generation of scholars around the world who fruitfully employ Bourdieu's principles and propositions.³ This quickly led to the idea of a working conference designed to create momentum for this project, which Mike Savage enthusiastically and generously organized at York the following spring just prior to his move to the London School of Economics.

By all accounts, the event was energetic and energizing for the participants and audience alike. The first day featured four extended sessions with researchers who

- 1 The workshop was held under the aegis of the Centre for Urban Research (CURB) and the York European Centre for Cultural Exploration (YECCE), with YECCE providing most of the financial support. We wish to thank Josine Opmeer and Jack Denham for their invaluable administrative support, and all the speakers and delegates who made the conference such a stimulative event. We are grateful also to Simon Parker for his onsite contributions and patient help afterwards in shepherding the papers through the review process, and the authors for agreeing to go through multiple (and seemingly endless) rounds of revisions.
- 2 This was in sharp contrast to the inability of readers (including my own students) of my book *Urban Outcasts* (2008) to discern the parameters of a Bourdieu-inspired investigation, because his conceptual idiolect is not expressly flaunted in it. In a half-dozen symposia, not a single critic of the book discerned its theoretical inspiration and implications for rethinking the nexus of symbolic power and physical space in the city. This led me to write a reflexive postscript specifying how *Urban Outcasts* implements five analytic principles propounded by Bourdieu (Wacquant, 2015).
- 3 This generation builds on the exemplary works of predecessors who deserve flagging at the outset. Along with the pioneering books of Monique and Michel Pinçon (1989; 1992; 2010) from the 1990s onward, mapping Bourdieu's analysis of class, power and culture onto the upscale districts of greater Paris (about which more below), two monographs boldly extend both the theoretical model and the original methodology of *Distinction* to encompass the spatial makeup of the city: Virgílio Pereira's (2005) exploration of the connections between class, neighborhood and sociability in Porto and Lennart Rosenlund's (2009) study of the postindustrial transformation of the Norwegian harbor of Stavanger. The activities of the Leverhulme Network on Advanced Urban Marginality (2008–2012) also took Bourdieu's theories into territories of relegation on four continents (see Wacquant et al., 2014).

have deployed Bourdieu on the metropolitan front, devoted to territorial seclusion and the spatialization of inequality; urban migration, ethnicity and precarity; public policy and the remaking of city space; and symbolic domination, cultural capital and the urban middle classes. The second day featured intense discussion around shorter papers by junior scholars (including doctoral students) from places as far-flung as Oslo, Los Angeles, Bristol, Winnipeg, Amsterdam and Paris, on such topics as power and privilege in the city, deprivation and disorder in public housing estates, methods for probing community and cultural divisions, and metropolitan policy. This first part of the Interventions debate draws on a selection of the papers presented at York along with additional essays recruited especially for it (from colleagues who were invited to the British gig but could not attend owing to scheduling conflicts).

One of the major virtues of Bourdieu's framework is its ability to range along levels of abstraction and to travel smoothly across analytic scales to link large structures of power (a country, state or metropolis) and the meso level of institutions (such as fields of cultural production, science, journalism and politics) to the minutiae of everyday interaction and the phenomenological texture of subjectivity encapsulated by the term of practice. A second attractive feature of Bourdieu's sociology is its abiding commitment to treat material and symbolic determinants not as final causes, but as meshing moments in an analysis that endlessly rotates between these two constituents of social life and as resources that may be mobilized as well as converted in social strategies. A third is its enticing practice of methodological polytheism that frontally challenges the conventional opposition between established techniques of inquiry, exemplified nowadays by the yawning chasm and mutual ignorance of quantitative studies of 'global urbanism' and qualitative investigations of urban sociability and culture at ground level.⁴

The contributions gathered here collectively exemplify these qualities. The first batch of six papers published in this issue takes a macroscopic view from above, relying on quantitative analysis (surveys and multiple correspondence analysis, the statistical technique favored and fostered by Bourdieu—*cf.* Lebaron and le Roux, 2015) and the tracking of strategies of key protagonists in and about the field of power to illumine the production and reproduction of urban inequality and change at the structural level through the fashioning of categories of spatial perception, distinctively urban forms of cultural capital, and class strategies of control over place and home. A second batch of essays to follow will migrate down the class and urban structure to offer a complementary microscopic view from below, relying on ethnographic observation and in-depth interviews to take the reader deep into the cognitive, emotional, aesthetic, religious, criminal and political fabric of ordinary existence in La Paz, Istanbul, Buenos Aires, the housing estates of the Parisian periphery, an Argentine shanty town, small-town Denmark, and a violent corner of inner-city Philadelphia.

Bourdieu's urban pertinence: a brief youthful excursus

This is not the place to scour the voluminous writings of Bourdieu (some 37 books and circa 400 articles) to extract a comprehensive recapitulation of his direct or indirect investigations of urban forms and forces over the four decades of his prolific scientific life. But to establish the baseline *pertinence of the French sociologist to the classical and contemporary agendas of urban researchers*, it is instructive to focus on a little known cluster of linked studies that tackle urbanization obliquely, namely, his early

4 These three features are best showcased in *La Noblesse d'État* (Bourdieu, 1989), which combines ethnographic observation and interviews, prosopography and archival data, and quantitative analyses to track the mutual conversion of social structures and mental structures at multiple scales, from the ordinary experiences and academic strategies of students at elite schools to the structural correspondence between the economic field and the field of power to the historical invention of the bureaucratic state associated with the rise of cultural capital.

writings on social upheaval, cultural rupture and subject formation in colonial Algeria and provincial France.⁵

In a string of lengthy articles and three books (solo and co-authored with his Kabyle student and field assistant Abdelmalek Sayad and with a group of mathematicians from the French office of statistics based in Algiers), published between 1958 and 1964, the young Bourdieu dissects the contradictions and conflicts ravaging the colonial society of Algeria, where he had been sent to fulfill his military service, and the crisis of the peasant society of Béarn, a remote rural region of the Pyrénées mountain range where he had grown up before moving to Paris to take up his postsecondary schooling.⁶ On both sites, *urbanization is the key vector and expression of social transformation*, and the city, town or camp the site anchoring and materializing the forces dissolving the social fabric of the French countryside, on the one side, and overturning French imperialism in North Africa, on the other.

Based on a study of marriage patterns in his childhood village combining social history, statistics and ethnography, Bourdieu shows how economic and social standing influences the rising rates of bachelorhood in a peasant society based on primogeniture through the mediation of the embodied consciousness that men acquire of this standing. The scene of a Saturday ball at the margins of which local bachelors gather without dancing serves to dissect the *cultural collision between country and city* and the resulting devaluation of the men from the hamlet as urban categories of judgment penetrate the rural world:

This small country ball is the scene of real clash of civilizations. Through it, the whole world of the city, with its cultural models, its music, its dances, its techniques of the body, bursts into peasant life. The traditional patterns of festive behavior have been lost or have been superseded by urban patterns. In this realm as in others, the lead belongs to the people of the town (*bourg*) (Bourdieu, [1962] 2002: 582).

Because their upbringing and position in the gender division of labor led them to be sensitive to '*tendue*' (clothing, bearing, conduct) as well as open to the ideals of the town, which for them represents emancipation, young women assimilate the cultural patterns issued from the city quicker than the men; this dooms the latter to be measured by yardsticks that make them worthless in the eyes of potential marriage partners. As the peasant internalizes the devalued image that others form of him through the prism of urban categories, he comes to perceive his own body as 'em-peasanted', burdened by the traces of the activities and attitudes associated with agricultural life. The wretched consciousness that he gains of his body leads him to adopt an introverted attitude that amplifies the shyness and gaucheness produced by social relations marked by extreme segregation between the sexes and repression of the sharing of emotions. The falling rates of unions that ensue derail the system of strategies of social reproduction and consign the peasant society to 'a mortal crisis' (Bourdieu, [1962] 2002: 126).

5 Bourdieu's cross-Mediterranean, mixed-method exploration of the death of village society in imperial Kabylia and his home region of Béarn is the empirical and emotional matrix spawning his epicentral concern for the dialectic of social and mental structures, his discovery of the specificity of practical logics, and his pragmatic conception of epistemic reflexivity. It also refutes the academic myth of Bourdieu 'the reproduction theorist' by revealing him to be a shrewd analyst of historical transformation, cultural disjuncture and the fissuring of consciousness (Wacquant, 2004), three properties that are quintessentially urban.

6 These publications are the fluvial 1962 article on 'Bachelorhood and the peasant condition', later incorporated into *The Ball of Bachelors* (Bourdieu, 2002); the 1958 monograph *Sociologie de l'Algérie* (with a revamped English translation appearing in 1962 as *The Algerians*); the paired studies *Le déracinement: la crise de l'agriculture traditionnelle en Algérie* (Bourdieu and Sayad, 1964) and *Travail et travailleurs en Algérie* (Bourdieu et al., 1963), and a string of articles posthumously collected as *Esquisses algériennes* (Bourdieu, 2008). To locate and link these investigations, see the special issue of *Ethnography* from December 2005 on 'Pierre Bourdieu in the field'.

In this study, the city emerges as the invisible locus of the school, the mass media and commercial occupations, that is, institutions whose magnetic attraction and distant stimuli foster the ‘opening’ of the local social and symbolic space. As a result, ‘the opposition between the *urbanite* of the town and the *peasant* of the hamlets’ comes to supplant the opposition between the eldest son and his younger brothers, between laborers and servants, and between large and small land-owning families (*ibid.*: 67, 75) and it gradually stamps all social ties and cultural hierarchies.⁷ Bourdieu maps the changing geographic distribution of people, occupations and activities over a half century, as well as the spatial organization of the home, to reveal how ‘the opposition between the peasant and the urbanite arises at the very heart of the village community’ (*ibid.*: 97) and undermines it from within. He tracks the intensity and directionality of matrimonial flows between the hamlets and the town by geographic distance between partners and finds that the proportion of ‘outside marriages’ increases over time as residents of the town turn away from the hamlets to seek partners in other towns and cities. It follows that ‘social distance imposes much more stringent limitations than spatial distance. The circuits of matrimonial exchanges become detached from their geographic base to become organized around new social units defined by the sharing of definite conditions of existence and a definite lifestyle’ (Bourdieu, *ibid.*: 85). In other words, urban forces cause social space to become autonomized from physical space through the diffusion of mental constructs spawned by the city—what the mature Bourdieu ([1992] 2002: 229) will later call ‘the unification of the market in symbolic goods’. What is more, their effects extend far beyond city limits, which urban sociology naively takes as the boundary of its empirical domain.

Across the Mediterranean, we find the young Bourdieu probing the two sides of the cataclysmic makeover of the French colony of Algeria caught in the throes of a bloody war of independence (1954–1962) that pivoted on the violent control of both rural and urban spaces. In *Le Déracinement* (The uprooting) (Bourdieu and Sayad, 1964; see also chapter 6 of Bourdieu, 1958), the French philosopher-turned-sociologist pairs survey and ethnography to chart the destruction of the native peasantry and its domestic mode of production based on kinship and honor, through land spoliation, the commodification of crops fostered by the development of urban markets, and the forced displacement and resettlement of millions of *fellahin* (peasants).⁸ The massive population transfer imposed by the French military in a desperate bid to undercut support for the nationalist uprising spawned two distinctive urban constellations: military-controlled camps and shanty towns mushrooming in and around the colony’s main cities. *Travail et travailleurs en Algérie* (Work and workers in Algeria) (Bourdieu *et al.*, 1963) picks up the story on the urban side to document the arrested formation of the working class massed in the sprawling popular districts and housing estates of Algiers. It delves deeply into the dialectic of ‘economic structures and temporal structures’ to track how the former peasants come to acquire (or not) the mental schemata required for participating in the capitalist economy and for navigating the disconcerting social scene of the city, including the ‘spirit of calculation’ fostering the ‘rationalization of conduct’ characteristic of modern urbanity.

From these twin studies we learn that the control and marking of space and settlements are epicentral to both the imposition of colonial power and indigenous resistance (involving both Berbers versus Arabs and Algerians versus French), and that the appropriation of housing in the city is pivotal to the restructuring of the material and

7 The socio-symbolic asymmetry between city and countryside is captured in this pithy observation: ‘While a native of the hamlet would never, in ordinary circumstances, dream of going to a ball in a nearby town, the urbanites come often in groups to the countryside balls, where their urban allure gives them a considerable advantage over the peasants’ (Bourdieu, [1962] 2002: 84).

8 By 1960, some 2.1 million Algerians had been forcibly relocated to militarized camps, while migrants to the cities numbered another million. Together they amounted to half of the total population of rural origin, making this ‘population displacement one of the most brutal known to history’ (Bourdieu and Sayad, 1964: 13).

moral economy of the household. Indeed, labor market position and differential access to housing jointly feed the divergence between a stable working class supporting the nationalist revolution and a floating subproletariat drawn to millenarism (Bourdieu, 1977). But, surprisingly, it is the meticulous sociography of the making, structure and functioning of the camps for displaced peasants that offers the clearest blueprint of Bourdieu's urban sociology. For *the camp is at once a proto-urban and an anti-urban formation*: on the one side, it devalues the customary ways of being, thinking and feeling of the relocated rural populations and operates as an acclimation chamber to the cultural models and social relations of the city; on the other side, it thwarts urbanization as it deprives its occupants of the resources, including the space and time needed, to adapt to their suspended condition, while scrambling principles of social vision and division. As an artificial socio-spatial formation born of coercion, the camp offers an accelerated and extreme social experiment in what Bourdieu christens 'real and fictive urbanization'.

The chapter of *Le Déracinement* entitled 'Urbanites without cities' is worth recapping here as it unspools the 'interdependence that unites the structure of the organization of space, the structure of social groups, and the type of sociability' (Bourdieu and Sayad, 1964: 118). Sudden agglomeration via forced relocation triggers a 'brutal and total transformation' of 'all levels of social reality'. The increased volume, density and heterogeneity of settlements—Louis Wirth's classic 1938 definition of 'urbanism as a way of life'—determines a closing of the social distance between established groups (tribes and lineages) and a swift shift in social organization from the clan to the nuclear household. The new self-standing housing units for individual families 'accentuate and accelerate the weakening of kinship ties' and foster 'the emergence of solidarities based on neighboring and, above all, on the similarity of conditions of existence' (Bourdieu and Sayad, 1964: 119, 121). Residence in the compact compound effectively 'breaks up the group' by dispersing its member and increases 'cultural contagion' by fueling 'the confrontation of differences' and 'enlarging one's awareness and knowledge of the world' (*ibid.*: 123). By creating 'a social field of the urban type' (*ibid.*: 132) wherein anonymity replaces mutual familiarity, the camp fosters the emergence of a new type of sociability, symbolized by the coffee house and the spread of the veil among women in response to the disruptive overlap of masculine and feminine spaces. Solidarity 'inspired by customary imperatives' and 'the sentiment of brotherhood' is replaced by 'the solidarity of misery imposed by promiscuity' (*ibid.*: 136–37).

In the 'quasi-urban situation' of the camp, the dominant models of behavior and consumption are those of the city—the camp is called *blad*, the Berber word for *city*. These models 'devalue peasant virtues, henceforth useless and misplaced', undermine age as basis for authority and 'effect a reversal of traditional hierarchies' (*ibid.*: 141) to the benefit of those lineages most familiar with urban activities, occupations and norms. Moreover:

the rupture with the old environment and with the routines that used to be associated with it, the widening of the field of social relations, the very structure of inhabited space, whether the settlement or the home, incite urban behaviors and elicit concerns, interests, and aspirations which are those of the urbanite (*ibid.*: 142).

This is attested, for instance, by the rapid change in consumption profiles (attendance of coffee houses, medical expenses and tobacco smoking all rise spectacularly), dress (traditional hairdos are forsaken, the necktie is adopted and the veil makes its appearance) and the acquisition of a plethora of new domestic objects (metal beds, cupboards, tin cans and plates, etc.).⁹ In the camp, income and wealth are

⁹ The fine-grained statistically based analysis of changing food budgets and habits by location and occupation (Bourdieu and Sayad, 1964: 144–49) is a remarkable prefiguration of the chapter of *La Distinction* on class taste and eating profiles (Bourdieu, 1979).

no longer devoted to upholding kinship relations and collective peasant values. On the contrary, 'the newly rich of today, whose wealth rarely comes from the land, strive to imitate urban dwellers and to mark by every possible means their distance from peasants' (*ibid.*: 143). Strategic individualism and cultural anomie grow in concert:

Due to the scattering of social units, the slackening of traditional social ties, and the weakening control of opinion, transgression of the rule tends to become the rule; nothing stands in the way of the individualism introduced by the modern economy. Inside the resettlement as enormous and disparate aggregates of isolated individuals, each feels protected by his or her anonymity; everyone feels responsible of themselves but only of themselves and for themselves (*ibid.*: 149–50).

Forced proto-urbanization also triggers a transformation of the emotional profile of daily life: 'collective melancholia' sets in, which 'betrays despair and anxiety'. Revealingly, the residents of the Kerkeria camp use three idioms to express their sense of being trapped in an untoward space: those of the *prison*, *nakedness* and the *obscurity of nighttime* (reminiscent of the language of inmates in Nazi concentration camps).¹⁰ For everything in the organization of their built environment, from 'the functional uniformity of standardized housing units', to the internal layout of the houses (devoid of courtyards, fences and openings), the regimented location of shops and fountains, to the breadth and orientation of the streets, 'disappoints and contradicts expectations' brought from the countryside (*ibid.*: 152). This is most detectable in the 'body language' and patterns of circulation of the camp dwellers: instead of taking the quickest route between two points, the men make detours and walk furtively along the walls, while the women stay locked inside because they no longer enjoy the protection of exclusive feminine spaces.

Finally, 'by overturning the organization of the lifespace, site of technical and ritual action, the resettlement alters the temporal rhythms associated with it' and indeed 'impacts the whole experience of temporality' (*ibid.*: 156). In the camp, the *fellahin* and their kin discover the capitalist conception of labor and with it the notion of time as a scarce commodity, liable to be saved, spent or wasted. They are submitted to new tempos set by curfews, the opening and closing hours of the schools, bureaucratic offices, the clinic and the fountain, and by the increased duration of travel. Time is now carved and stamped, not by traditional activities such as the five prayers of the day that synchronize everyone, but by the periodic bells and regular telephone rings of the control tower. On all fronts, the same social and symbolic oppositions between the peasant and the urbanite as Bourdieu detected in Béarn crystallizes in the camp to hasten the dissolution of the village society of Kabylia.

This compact recapitulation of Bourdieu's youthful cross-Mediterranean investigations of contradiction and change in provincial Béarn and colonial Algeria demonstrates the direct pertinence of his work to core urban sociology. These works not only tackle the nexus of power, space and urbanization in two societies, if from the countryside. They establish that *all social and mental structures have spatial correlates and conditions of possibility*; that social distance and power relations are both expressed in and reinforced by spatial distance; and that propinquity to the center of accumulation of capital (economic, military or cultural) is a key determinant of the force and velocity of social change. Indeed, these early studies suggest that state power (colonial in Algeria, central in France) is wielded through the control and penetration of space,

10 The subjective disorientation of camp dwellers springs from the disjunction between their acquired dispositions and the space in which they are forced to evolve: 'Because his whole corporeal habitus is "made" by and for the space of his customary movements, the uprooted peasant is struck in his innermost being, so deeply that he cannot articulate his disarray and still less define its reason' (Bourdieu and Sayad, 1964: 152).

the organization of settlements (via complementary processes of concentration and dispersal), the geographic distribution of symbolic authorities and the regulation of physical mobility, according to the rudimentary formula:

power → physical space → social structure and relations → practice and subjectivity

(including the makeup of the self, aspirations, emotions and sense of time).¹¹ Furthermore, they portray the city as a distinctive social milieu, characterized by accelerating social and functional differentiation, the disembedding of symbolism from ordinary relations fostering cultural elaboration and innovation, the spread of anonymity and individuality, the increased internal heterogeneity and dispersion of habitus, and the routine dealignment of positions and dispositions. *In nuce*, Bourdieu's youthful studies of Béarn and Algeria constitute his true 'lost urban sociology' and the richest trove of observations and hypotheses he has offered to students of social structure and experience in the city.

Another virtue of these overlooked publications from the early 1960s is that they divulge the forgotten foundation for the general problematic of the *mutual projection-conversion of symbolic space, social space and physical space* through struggles over the appropriation and marking of the built environment that Bourdieu would articulate in his work on social suffering in the metropolis three decades later. In 1990, Bourdieu received funding from France's Caisse des Dépôts et Consignations (the state financial institution entrusted with fostering economic development and the building of low-income housing) to produce a sociological diagnostic of the deepening malaise of the country's urban periphery, which had risen to the rank of paramount national problem in the wake of recurrent street riots (Jazouli, 1992). To articulate the parameters of the team field study that would eventually grow into the collective book *The Weight of the World* (Bourdieu et al., 1993b), Bourdieu agreed to join William Julius Wilson in co-chairing an international conference on 'Poverty, Immigration and Urban Marginality in Advanced Societies' held at the Maison Suger in Paris in May 1991.¹² On that occasion, he presented a paper that opens and frames the present Interventions section, 'Bourdieu Comes to Town', entitled 'Social space and the genesis of appropriated physical space' (Bourdieu, [1991] 2018, this issue). In this piece, a portion of which would later grow to become the chapter of *The Weight of the World* devoted to 'Site effects' (Bourdieu, 1993a), the French sociologist warns against the fetishization of space and formulates at an abstract level the relations between social space and physical space that were concretely manifested in the Béarn and Algerian studies. But how to implement this analytic agenda? To answer this question we must turn to the principles of research practice Bourdieu invites students of the city to adopt.

Transversal principles for putting Bourdieu to work

There are many ways to 'slice and dice' Bourdieu for use in any domain of inquiry, and there already exist several standardized introductions and routinized overviews of his main writings intended for students of space and the city (see, for example, Painter,

11 That the causal chain is initiated by power is clear from the outset in *The Uprooting*: 'Algeria was the experimental site upon which the military mind imprinted its structures, as in a projective test' (Bourdieu and Sayad, 1964: 26-27), 'the disciplining of space' serving as vehicle for 'the disciplining of the population'. In his recapitulation of settler penetration, Bourdieu (1958: 106) stresses that colonization rides on 'disruptions deliberately and methodically produced to ensure control by the dominant power' and he singles out the capture of land as the 'instrument for the disintegration of the fundamental structures of the [native] economy and society'.

12 I organized this two-day working conference funded by the Russell Sage Foundation and the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme. Aside from my two mentors, Bourdieu and Wilson, the participants, coming from five countries, included Philippe Bourgois, Godfried Engbersen, Enzo Mingione, Alejandro Portes, Paul Osterman, Saskia Sassen, Roger Waldinger, Margaret Weir and several members of the Centre de Sociologie Européenne, including Abdelmalek Sayad. During this period, Bourdieu grew quite involved with the agencies administering France's new 'city policy'. In 1993, when the Collège de France received a small castle located in the outer ring of Paris by way of charitable donation, he seriously envisaged the creation there of a Center for Research on the City.

2000; Cresswell, 2002; Webster, 2010; Fogle, 2011; Lippuner, 2012).¹³ I provided elsewhere a detailed discussion of how to deploy and distribute habitus, social space, bureaucratic field and symbolic power in a comparative investigation of the triadic nexus of ‘Marginality, ethnicity and penalty in the neoliberal city’ (Wacquant, 2014); I sketched a cartography of the analytic division of labor between these concepts and indicated how they can serve to forge new ones. Here I want to shine a spotlight on four transversal *principles that undergird and animate Bourdieu’s research practice*; these principles are liable to escape the notice of the rushed reader, but they can more fruitfully guide urban inquiry than the exegesis of this or that writing. For purposes of mnemotechnic compression, I attach them to five authors who form central pillars of Bourdieu’s thought: Bachelard, Weber, Leibniz and Durkheim, and Cassirer.¹⁴ I also flag three correlative traps that Bourdieusian explorers of the city should exercise special care to avoid: the fetishization of concepts (which stops inquiry where it should start), the seductions of ‘speaking Bourdieuse’ because it is the academic *langue du jour*, and the forced imposition of his theoretical framework *en bloc* when it is more productively used as a kit through transposition.

1—*The Bachelard moment*: break with common sense (which comes in three varieties: ordinary, policy and scholarly) to question accepted categories of analysis, deconstruct prefabricated problematics, and forge robust analytic concepts, designed by and for empirical analysis, that encompass but depart sharply from folk notions (Wacquant, 2002). This is a straightforward application of the imperative of *epistemological rupture and vigilance*, the foremost teaching of ‘historical epistemology’, the philosophy of science developed by Bourdieu’s mentors Gaston Bachelard and Georges Canguilhem, which Bourdieu transplanted from the natural and life sciences to the social sciences (Bourdieu *et al.*, 1968; Bourdieu, 2001; see Rheinberger, 2010, for a compact profile of this current). This is a moment of inquiry too often ignored or skipped as a matter of course: vast sectors of urban research accept the terminology, queries and worries propounded by city managers, policymakers, journalists or academic fashion when they should instead detect and neutralize the historical unconscious and social biases embedded in them by including these in their object of analysis. As Bachelard ([1938] 1999: 26) warns: ‘The scientific mind forbids us to have an opinion on questions that we do not understand, on questions that we do not know how to formulate clearly. Above all, one must know how to pose problems’.

2—*The Weber moment*: effect the *triple historicization* of the agent (with the concept of habitus), the world (via the notion of social space, of which field is but a subtype) and the categories and methods of the analyst (epistemic reflexivity). This principle expresses Bourdieu’s radically historicist and agonistic vision of social action, structure and knowledge, which is most germane in spirit and method to the work of Max Weber—even as the latter was wedded to an analytic individualism thoroughly alien to Bourdieu’s relationalism (Bourdieu, [2000] 2011). For both authors, domination pervades social life but takes a multiplicity of forms that are irreducible to some economic basis and always entail the intercession of a symbolic authority framing the relation at hand, which leads Weber (1958) to focus on legitimacy and Bourdieu on the social production of doxa.¹⁵ Accordingly, one should grasp urban constellations,

13 These pedagogical capsules of his main theories (always limited to a few major translated publications in the author’s own language) typically overlook the majority of Bourdieu’s corpus, suffer from predictable disciplinary biases and blinders, and scarcely indicate how to translate these theories into practical research designs and operations.

14 That these are not the ‘usual suspects’ mentioned in standard presentations of Bourdieu is indicative of the yawning gap between the actual inspiration and inner makeup of his work and its academic image, formed by the accumulated layers of decades of truncated or mystified readings.

15 This is why Weber and not Marx is Bourdieu’s anchor here (despite the latter’s historical and relational approach): like the author of *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Bourdieu rejects economic determinism, the search for foundations, and the neo-Hegelian notion that history is endowed with a directional logic. He stands squarely in the neo-Kantian lineage that construes philosophy as duty-bound to start and end with ‘the fact of science’ (Bachelard) and engages a genetic conception of knowledge as a perpetually unfinished synthetic process (this anti-metaphysical view of Kant was enshrined by the Marburg School, where Cassirer was trained on the advice of Georg Simmel and which influenced Weber through the works of Windelband and Rickert, leaders of the rival school of Baden neo-Kantianism).

categories and practices as the products, weapons and stakes of struggles waged over multiple temporalities, ranging from the *longue durée* of secular macro-structures to the mid-level tempos of political cycles and institutional gyrations to the short-term phenomenological horizon of persons at ground level. This commandment belies the stale academic tale of Bourdieu ‘the reproduction theorist’ that continues to be spun even by urban scholars sympathetic to his approach (for example, Harding and Blokland, 2014: 129–30), but it accurately captures both his explicit instructions and his extant scientific practice (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992; Wacquant, 2017).

3—*The Leibnizian-Durkheimian moment*: deploy the *topological mode of reasoning* to track the mutual correspondences, transpositions and distortions between symbolic space (the grid of mental classifications that guide persons in their cognitive and conative construction of the world), social space (the fluctuating distribution of socially effective assets or capitals) and physical space (the built environment resulting from rival efforts to appropriate material and ideal goods in and through space). This way of thinking is indispensable because ‘social space tends to retranslate itself, in more or less deformed fashion, in the guise of a definite arrangement of agents and properties. It follows that all the divisions and distinctions of social space (high/low, left/right, etc.) are really and symbolically expressed in appropriated physical space as reified social space’ (Bourdieu, 1997: 162). This principle stands at the confluence of the *geometric* component of Bourdieu’s thought, grounded in his early avid reading of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (whose *analysis situs*, developed in reaction to Pascal’s perspective geometry, exemplifies the monist rationalism Bourdieu wishes to extend)¹⁶ and its *morphological* strand, derived from Durkheim and Mauss’s (1901) bold formulation of the correspondence between the physical substratum and layout of social groups and the ‘forms of classification’ through which they view themselves and the world.

4—*The Cassirer moment*: recognize the *constitutive efficacy of symbolic structures* and anatomize their twofold imprinting onto the subjective complexes of *dispositions* (categories, skills and desires) that make up the habitus on the one hand, and onto the objective mesh of *positions* (distributions of efficient resources) that compose institutions, on the other. Ernst Cassirer’s (1944) genetic ‘philosophy of symbolic forms’ is the main inspiration for Bourdieu’s potent concept of symbolic power that stands at the epicenter and apex of his work—and yet is often overlooked by conventional readings and uses of Bourdieu ossified in the incomplete and redundant tryptich of ‘habitus, capital and field’ (Wacquant, 2017). Because the human animal encounters the physical universe not as brute reality but through the medium of symbols (materialized, in Cassirer taxonomy, as language, myth, religion, art and science), the most objectivist science of the city must of necessity make room for the rival classificatory schemata through which agents give pattern and meaning to the world. And because the social world can always be experienced and constructed through a plurality of points of view, these competing symbolic systems constitute many weapons in the ‘struggle to produce and impose the dominant vision of the world’ (Bourdieu, [1982] 1991: 159). Applied to urban space, this principle implies paying attention not only to the phenomenology of urban life as lived reality situated in specific sites but also to the words through which people, objects, activities and places in the city are named because *consequential categorization* is an especially powerful vector of conservation or transformation of reality, given the concentration of symbolic authorities (religious, political, legal, journalistic, artistic, academic and scientific) in the metropolis.¹⁷

16 Weik (2010) is right to point out the similarities and affinities between Leibniz and Bourdieu: the creative force that constitutes the world is god for the former and history itself for the latter. But he focuses mostly on habitus when the stronger linkage between the two thinkers is their shared relational philosophy of space (see de Risi, 2007, on Leibniz’s view). It bears noting here that Cassirer’s first book (1902) was a dissection of the thought of Leibniz in its scientific context.

17 The material stamping of urban reality through its symbolic casting assumes a paradigmatic and paroxysmic form with territorial stigmatization, whose sites and circuits of production, diffusion and consumption permeate the city even as it fastens on districts of socio-moral perdition at the edges and bottom of urban space (Wacquant, 2018)

Taken together, these principles inform a scientific outlook on the city sharply divergent from those fostered by positivism, realism and hermeneutics, the alternative epistemologies that reign across social science. This stance commands investigations centered on the wide-awake and active ‘construction of the object’ that eschews both empty formalism and blind empiricism to enter into the specificities of historical cases with the benefit of a generalizing analytic (Bourdieu, 2001). Along with these principles one can distill from Bourdieu’s scientific practice three general warnings that will benefit students of the city wishing to appropriate his work, whether in letter or in spirit. First, *avoid the fetishization of concepts*: Bourdieu is frequently misread as a ‘theorist’ when he was a dogged detractor of ‘conspicuous theorizing’. He construed theory not as the haughty master but as the humble servant of empirical inquiry, and he never advanced the one but through developing the other (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 29–35, and *passim*). The corrective to this common scholastic distortion, exemplified by many articles recently published in *Progress in Human Geography*, is to background the textual definition of concepts and to pay close attention to how Bourdieu converts them into concrete research operations to forge his empirical objects.

Secondly, and relatedly, *beware of the rhetorical trap*: countless authors paint their inquiries in the color of Bourdieu when in reality the latter’s notions play no role in their analysis. The words are there, but the concepts are not. Proof is that their findings and arguments are no different than if they had been derived from any number of alternative approaches (which they generally were). The concept of field is perhaps the most abused in this manner, as when it is invoked as a bland synonym for domain or arena, displaying none of the highly distinctive properties that characterize a field according to Bourdieu (differentiation, autonomy, monopolization, chiasmatic organization, prismatic effects, etc.). By ‘speaking Bourdieuse’ out of turn, these authors not only confuse rhetorics for analytics; they also occlude the theoretical and empirical profits that an effective deployment of Bourdieu’s tools would deliver. Such sterile soundings easily degenerate into nonsensical wordplay, as illustrated by the comical multiplication of urban-inflected habitus in recent scholarship: the ‘metropolitan habitus’, the ‘suburban habitus’, the ‘gentrification habitus’, the ‘dot.com habitus’, not to mention the absurdist ‘mini-habitus’ (perhaps paving the way for the imminent anointment of the nano-habitus), all of which indicate that their inventors do not understand the basic meaning and makeup of the concept of habitus (Wacquant, 2016).¹⁸

Thirdly, it is not only possible but generally desirable to *decouple Bourdieu’s concepts from one another* to ensure that there is a real payoff to their individual usage before they are eventually recombined as needed to frame and resolve the empirical puzzle at hand. The theological reading of the Bourdieusian scriptures stipulating that one implement his core notions *omni et simul* is in direct contradiction with the pragmatics of any research project and clashes with the way Bourdieu himself employed them. For instance, the French sociologist mines habitus and symbolic power without any mention of field throughout his Algerian work (Bourdieu, 1972; 1977; 1980; 2008), for the simple reason that no field exists in the agrarian communities of the Kabyle countryside. This cautious strategy is especially apposite for those investigators who are still groping to get beyond an elemental grasp of Bourdieu’s way of thinking: it is better to apply one concept well within its proper analytic purview than to invoke five at cross-purposes or for mere declamatory effect.

For illustration, Nathan Marom’s (2014) recapitulation of ‘One hundred years of spatial distinction in Tel Aviv’ offers a case model of an economical, efficient and

18 It is constitutive of the metropolis that it contains a diversity of populations and categories, a wide span of social conditions, and a plurality of bounded social microcosms, each fostering rival schemata of perception and appreciation. It follows logically that it spawns a great diversity of competing sets of dispositions (corresponding to broad classes of positions and trajectories), and not a singular unified habitus characteristic of the city as such. Talk of a ‘metropolitan (suburban, etc.) habitus’ is sonorous but empty Bourdieubabble.

fruitful use of Bourdieu that validates these three recommendations. To make sense of the trajectory of socio-spatial oppositions over the full lifecourse of this disputed city, Marom focuses on a single operation, ‘the translation of social space into physical space’. He draws elegantly on two concepts only—social space and symbolic power (a duo that happens to be the pivot of Bourdieu’s thought); he engages them to break with the naturalizing problematic of segregation inherited from urban ecology as well as to overcome the blindness of political economic approaches to the performative potency of symbolic classifications and classification struggles. Bourdieu goads Marom to formulate a new question, to historicize its terms, to dig up data enabling him to document novel empirical facets of the phenomenon and, ultimately, to produce an original interpretation of the changing principles of spatial vision and division of Tel Aviv across multiple scales that other theoretical perspectives could not have spawned. His article further confirms that, while every one of the seven major concepts organizing Bourdieu’s work (habitus, capital, social space, field, symbolic power, doxa and epistemic reflexivity) can be fruitfully mobilized by investigators of urban constellations, the most potent and generative of the lot is indisputably *social space*. Not only because it is anchored by a geographic metaphor but because it is the ‘mother-category’ from which flow the more restricted concepts of field, *corps* (body) and apparatus, as specific types of settings in which social action takes root and flows (Wacquant, 2018) and because it is a ‘natural fit’ for the city as a milieu fostering the incubation, differentiation, proliferation and accumulation of competing forms of capital.¹⁹

Applications: myriad paths into the Bourdieusian city

Having established the pertinence of Bourdieu for urban scholarship and having clarified the principles that propel his work, we now come to concrete applications. Urban scholars have consistently overlooked districts of wealth, power and privilege for the simple reason that they pose few ‘social problems’ to city managers and because sociologists have long harbored a romantic infatuation for subordinate social categories and territories.²⁰ No one has done more to plug that gap than ‘the Pinçons’ (as they are known to their French colleagues as well as to the wider public which devours their best-selling books) across two decades devoted to probing the mechanisms of production and perpetuation of urban inequality at the top (Pinçon and Pinçon-Charlot, 1989; 1992; 1996; 2010).

Their essay on ‘Social power and power over space’ (Pinçon-Charlot and Pinçon, 2018, this issue) synthesizes several of their books to ground the supremacy of France’s higher bourgeoisie (and remaining aristocracy) in its control of space and its capacity to shape place. By extending Bourdieu’s (1979) model of social space, class formation and cultural practice in *Distinction* to encompass physical space, they reveal that the elective seclusion of the dominant class in reserved upscale quarters is a decisive basis for its power. This segregative isolation is strengthened by group-specific institutions, such as

19 Indeed, social space is the one category that most decisively sets Bourdieu apart from and fills a gaping void at the center of all extant strands of urban theory: Chicago-style ecology and ethnography, political economy, postcolonial urbanism, assemblage theory, planetary urbanism and the urban land nexus approach (Storper and Scott, 2016).

20 This topical myopia fed by populist exoticism is exemplified by the elephantinesque *Urban Ethnography Reader* recently published by Oxford University Press (Duneier et al., 2014): its nearly 900 pages contain not a single analysis of upper-class spaces, institutions and practices. The terms ‘city hall’ and ‘bourgeoisie’ appear not once in the book; ‘upper class’ is mentioned incidentally less than a half dozen times; 39 of 52 chapters focus squarely on subordinate classes and ethnicities in dispossessed districts; and an astounding 27 chapters, over half of the entire volume, are devoted to poor blacks in the American ‘inner city’. The metropolis emerging through this lens is one teeming with derelicts, deviants and problematic black men (and even pigeon feeders), but curiously devoid of corporations, professions, politicians, prosecutors, patrician dynasties, realtors, bureaucrats, bishops, journalists and scientists. As is typical of the genre, this massive compendium also contains a single solitary chapter and author located outside the United States and only two anthropologists, in blissful ignorance of the rich traditions of urban fieldwork developed in foreign countries and by other disciplines.

society balls and social clubs that work alongside exclusive schools to effect rigid class closure. But in this case the spatial foundation of class rule extends beyond the city: in addition to their Paris homes, upper-class dynasties possess family properties (a castle or a large manor house) in the provincial hinterland that anchor paternalistic forms of sociability and link them to the local lower class via such ritualized practices as riding to hounds—in which the Pinçons participated by riding mountain bikes during their fieldwork (Pinçon and Pinçon-Charlot, 1993; 2005). Spaces reserved by and for the high bourgeoisie are major vectors of social reproduction in that they mold subjectivity and train heirs suited to safeguarding and valorizing their inherited assets. Here Pinçon-Charlot and Pinçon suggest that the ‘neighborhood effects’ that have obsessed students of urban poverty are vastly *more potent and consequential at the top than at the bottom of the urban order*, and in so doing they indicate how Bourdieu incites a wholesale reorientation of the study of space, place and inequality.

That analytic triad is at the center of ‘Urban distinctions: class, culture and sociability in Porto’ (Pereira, 2018, this issue), in which Virgílio Borges Pereira builds on his path-breaking book, *Classes e culturas de classe das famílias portuguesas* (2005), which extends Bourdieu’s model of social space and symbolic power in *Distinction* to probe social relations and cultural practices across the full gamut of neighborhoods in the Portuguese city. Pereira combines field observation with Bourdieu’s distinctive methodology of Multiple Correspondence Analysis to project a multi-layered cartography of the city’s social space onto its physical layout. He finds that differences in the volume and composition of capital among city residents undergird the patterned relations between social position, disposition and position-takings in various domains of cultural consumption, ranging from books and television to vacationing and outdoor leisure to artistic and religious activities. The threefold vertical clustering of ‘lifestyle modalities’ established by Bourdieu in the France of the 1970s, encapsulated by the triad of ‘distinction, pretention, and necessity’, obtains in the Portuguese city three decades later. More remarkably still, the horizontal opposition rooted in the chiasmatic distribution of economic and cultural capital emerges among both the Portuguese bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, while the spirit of resistance of the city’s working class is eroded by social atomization and negative individualism. With this Porto case study, Pereira delivers both a lucid analytic exemplification of the mutual mapping of social, symbolic and physical space in one metropolis and a ringing empirical refutation of the common critique that Bourdieu’s models reflect the peculiarities of French society.²¹

Like the Pinçons, Mike Savage, Laurie Hanquinet, Niall Cunningham and Johs Hjellbrekke adopt a view from above to draw a comparative profile of London and Brussels illustrating the rise of ‘Emerging cultural capital in the city’ (Savage *et al.*, 2018, this issue). This is a story of ‘big-city effects’ highlighting the crystallization and accumulation of what, after Ghassan Hage (1998), they call ‘cosmopolitan cultural capital’, in opposition to national forms of cultural authority. Drawing on large quantitative surveys conducted in Belgium and the United Kingdom, Savage *et al.* portray the rise of this new species of cultural predilection and competency as challenging the traditional dominance of highbrow culture founded on a contemplative Kantian aesthetic detached from any physical substrate insofar as it erodes the separation of art and life to ‘valorize activity, engagement and intense forms of contemporary cultural activity’ (this issue: 148). They stress that this cultural shift does not signal the erosion of social divisions but their reworking around new axes embedded in large urban centers where elite universities, sporting complexes and gentrified neighborhoods attract young professionals and foster novel patterns of consumption and entertainment. By linking the urban substrate to changing cultural forms,

21 Bourdieu’s own response to this concern was his ‘Introduction to a Japanese reading of *Distinction*’ (1991).

Savage *et al.* mobilize Bourdieu to disclose the shifting geography of cultural authority in and across cities.²²

Sylvie Tissot's contribution mines two previous research projects (Tissot, 2007 and 2011) to demonstrate the value of Bourdieu's emphasis on struggles over efficient nomination for analyzing the rapidly transforming landscape of contemporary cities. Her essay, 'Categorizing neighborhoods' (Tissot, 2018, this issue), stretches across the Atlantic to sketch the invention, diffusion and effects of spatial labels at the bottom and top of the metropolitan hierarchy. On the French side, the bureaucratic category of *quartier sensible* ('sensitive' or 'at-risk' district) coined by state officials in Paris served to frame and target city policy after the late 1980s, effectively reshaping the urban periphery by reformulating the social question of concentrated unemployment and job precarity into a spatial question of housing design and civic access. On the side of the United States, the marketing notion of 'historic' or 'heritage' neighborhood touted by local associations of incoming white residents allied with realtors and city hall was rolled out to facilitate and legitimize the gentrification of Boston's South End under the banner of 'diversity'. The political irony is that urban change detrimental to lower-class residents was fostered by a novel urban rhetoric promoted by progressive state professionals and politicians on both sides of the Atlantic. So much to remind us that the vocabulary used to cut up and represent the city and its geographic constituents is neither neutral nor idle,²³ and that elucidating the 'social conditions of production and reception' of those 'words that can make things' (Bourdieu, [1982] 1991: 328) is an indispensable component of a rigorous sociology of urban inequality.

Finally, in 'Heavy is the house', Matthew Desmond (2018, this issue) connects Bourdieu's early work on Algerian subproletarians migrating to the city with his late investigation into the political production of the single-home market in France to tackle the soaring rent burden put on the poor in the United States as their income fell while government support for low-income housing vanished. Desmond spotlights the glaring disconnect between the centrality of shelter to the life strategies of the poor and the persistent failure of American urban sociology to address housing and to acknowledge the prevalence of eviction and its role in the reproduction of acute poverty (Desmond, 2012). To remedy these lacunas requires replacing housing within the broader stream of struggles over space, jobs, money and power that mold the metropolis. Desmond astutely advocates 'bringing landlords back in' to chart their upward transactions with lenders, brokers and real-estate associations as well as the shifting material and moral standards guiding their downward relations with tenants (as displayed in a related ethnography of eviction in Milwaukee—see Desmond, 2016). He also recommends tracking the connections between the differentiated world of landlords and the bureaucratic field at the local, regional and national levels and how these impact on the production, allocation and stability of housing at the bottom of the metropolitan order. In short, elevating the status of housing as an empirical object requires revamping our theoretical model of the city as a product, site and target of classification and stratification.

Each of the essays gathered in this Interventions section, 'Bourdieu Comes to Town', stands alone as a rich and stimulating investigation into the elements and

22 An analytic caveat is in order here: one must beware of the uncontrolled proliferation of forms of capital stemming from a substantialist misreading of Bourdieu's theory that equates cultural capital with 'highbrow' culture or 'high-status cultural goods' and thence conflates empirical variation with conceptual variance. A given cultural capacity, object or title is never cultural capital by itself: it becomes such *only in relation to a particular arena of action* wherein it elicits collective belief, receives value and generates profits. For instance, the love of classical music and mastery of art history are cultural capital in the school system and in middle- and upper-class circles but not in the everyday sphere of working-class families; the ability to deliver and withstand physical violence is embodied cultural capital in the criminal world of the street but not in a firm or on a university campus. Read Neveu's (2013) caution against the rhetorical 'accumulation of capitals' resulting in a runaway 'sociological inventory à la Prévert'.

23 For effective critiques of the urban rhetoric of 'creative cities', 'slums', 'village' and 'renaissance', 'heritage' and 'diversity', and '(anti-)ghetto' and kindred labels for dispossessed and disparaged districts, see, respectively, Peck (2005), Gilbert (2007), Barnes *et al.* (2006), Modan (2007), Boyd (2008), and Wacquant *et al.* (2014).

determinants of a slice of urban life. Together, they demonstrate the plasticity and productivity of Bourdieu's key concepts, methodological moves and empirical pointers, as well as the rough analytic division of labor obtaining between them. They suggest how Bourdieu can excite, enrich and reorient urban inquiry, and even dissolve it in a *broader topological social science* capable of encompassing the city into a broader analytic of the *dynamic relationships between symbolic division, social space and the built environment*. Bourdieu does not merely add a new set of powerful and flexible notions (habitus, capital, social space, field, doxa, symbolic power and reflexivity) to the panoply of established theoretical perspectives: he paves a pathway for reconceptualizing the urban as the domain of accumulation, differentiation and contestation of manifold forms of capital, which effectively makes the city a central ground and prize of historical struggles.

Loïc Wacquant, University of California, Berkeley, 410 Barrows Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720-1980, USA, loic@berkeley.edu

References

- Bachelard, G. ([1938] 1999) *La formation de l'esprit scientifique: contribution à une psychanalyse de la connaissance objective* [The formation of the scientific spirit: contribution to a psychoanalysis of objective knowledge]. Vrin, Paris.
- Barnes, K., G. Waitt, N. Gill and C. Gibson (2006) Community and nostalgia in urban revitalisation: a critique of 'urban village' and 'creative class' strategies as remedies for social 'problems'. *Australian Geographer* 37.3, 335-54.
- Bourdieu, P. (1958) *Sociologie de l'Algérie*. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris. (Modified English translation, 1962: *The Algerians*, Beacon Press Boston, MA.)
- Bourdieu, P. (1962) Célibat et condition paysanne [Bachelorhood and the peasant condition]. *Études Rurales* 5/6 (April), 32-136. (English translation, 2008: abridged as Part 1 of *The ball of bachelors: the crisis of the peasant society in Béarn*, Polity, Cambridge.)
- Bourdieu, P. ([1962] 2002) *Le bal des célibataires: crise de la société paysanne en Béarn* [The ball of bachelors: the crisis of the peasant society in Béarn]. Seuil, Paris.
- Bourdieu, P. (1972) *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique, précédée de trois essais d'ethnologie Kabyle*. Droz, Geneva. (Modified English translation, 1977: *Outline of a theory of practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.)
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Algérie 60: structures temporelles et structures sociales* [Algeria 1960: temporal structures and social structures]. Minuit, Paris. (English translation, 1979: *Algeria 1960: the disenchantment of the world*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.)
- Bourdieu, P. (1979) *La distinction: critique sociale du jugement*. Minuit, Paris. (English translation, 1984: *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.)
- Bourdieu, P. (1980) *Le sens pratique*. Minuit, Paris. (English translation, 1990: *The Logic of Practice*, Polity, Cambridge.)
- Bourdieu, P. ([1982] 1991) *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989) *La noblesse d'état: grandes écoles et esprit de corps*. Minuit, Paris. (English translation, 1996: *The state nobility: elite schools in the field of power*, Polity, Cambridge.)
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) First lecture. Social space and symbolic space: introduction to a Japanese reading of *Distinction*. *Poetics Today* 12.4, 627-38.
- Bourdieu, P. ([1991] 2018) Social space and the genesis of appropriated physical space. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42.1, 106-14.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993a) Effets de lieux [Site effects]. In P. Bourdieu (ed.), *La misère du monde*, Seuil, Paris. (Modified English translation, 1999: *The weight of the world*, Polity, Cambridge.)
- Bourdieu, P. (ed.) (1993b) *La misère du monde*. Seuil, Paris. (English translation, 1999: *The weight of the world*, Polity, Cambridge.)
- Bourdieu, P. (1997) *Méditations pascaliennes*. Seuil, Paris. (English translation, 2000: *Pascalian meditations*, Polity, Cambridge.)
- Bourdieu, P. ([2000] 2011) With Weber, against Weber. In S. Susen and B.S. Turner (eds.), *The legacy of Pierre Bourdieu: critical essays*, Anthem Press, London.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001) *Science de la science et réflexivité. Raisons d'Agir Éditions*, Paris. (English translation, 2006: *The science of science and reflexivity*, Polity, Cambridge.)
- Bourdieu, P. (2008) *Esquisses algériennes*. Seuil, Paris. (English translation, 2013: *Algerian sketches*, Polity, Cambridge.)
- Bourdieu, P. and A. Sayad (1964) *Le déracinement: la crise de l'agriculture traditionnelle en Algérie* [The uprooting: the crisis of traditional Algerian agriculture]. Minuit, Paris.
- Bourdieu, P. and L. Wacquant (1992) *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, and Polity, Cambridge.
- Bourdieu, P., J.-C. Chamboredon and J.-C. Passeron (1968) *Le métier de sociologue: prélabes épistémologiques*. Mouton, Paris and The Hague. (English translation, 1991: *The Craft of Sociology: epistemological preliminaries*, Walter De Gruyter, New York, NY).
- Bourdieu, P., A. Darbel, J.-P. Rivet and C. Seibel (1963) *Travail et travailleurs en Algérie* [Work and workers in Algeria]. Mouton, Paris and The Hague.
- Boyd, M.R. (2008) *Jim Crow nostalgia: reconstructing race in Bronzeville*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Cassirer, E. (1902) *Leibniz' System in seinen wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen* [Leibniz's system and its scientific basis]. Elwert, Marburg.
- Cassirer, E. (1944) *An essay on man: an introduction to a philosophy of human culture*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Cresswell, T. (2002) Bourdieu's geographies. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20.4, 379-82.
- de Risi, V. (2007) *Geometry and monadology: Leibniz's analysis situs and philosophy of space*. Birkhäuser, Basel.
- Desmond, M. (2012) Eviction and the reproduction of urban poverty. *American Journal of Sociology* 118.1 (May), 88-133.
- Desmond, M. (2016) *Evicted: poverty and profit in the American city*. Crown, New York, NY.
- Desmond, M. (2018) Heavy is the house: rent burden among the American urban poor. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42.1, 160-70.
- Duneier, M., P. Kasinitz and A. Murphy (eds.) (2014) *The urban ethnography reader*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

- Durkheim, É. and M. Mauss (1901) De quelques formes primitives de classification: contribution à l'étude des représentations collectives. *L'Année Sociologique* 6, 1-72. (English translation, 1963: *Primitive classification*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL).
- Ethnography* (2005) Pierre Bourdieu in the field. Special issue 5.4, December.
- Fogle, N. (2011) *The spatial logic of social struggle: a Bourdieuan topology*. Lexington Books, Lanham, MD.
- Gilbert, A. and T. Blokland (2014) *Urban theory: does language matter?* *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 31.4, 697-713.
- Hage, G. (1998) *White nation: fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. Pluto, Sydney.
- Harding, A. and T. Blokland (2014) *Urban theory: a critical introduction to power, cities and urbanism in the 21st century*. Sage, London.
- Jazouli, A. (1992) *Les années banlieues* [The outer city years]. Seuil, Paris.
- Lebaron, F. and B. le Roux (eds.) (2015) *La méthodologie de Pierre Bourdieu en action: espace culturel, espace social et analyse des données* [The methodology of Pierre Bourdieu in action: cultural space, social space and data analysis]. Dunod, Paris.
- Lippuner, R. (2012) Pierre Bourdieu. In F. Eckard (ed.), *Handbuch Stadtsoziologie* [Handbook of urban sociology], Springer VS, Berlin.
- Marom, N. (2014) Relating a city's history and geography with Bourdieu: one hundred years of spatial distinction in Tel Aviv. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38.4, 1344-62.
- Modan, G.G. (2007) *Turf wars: discourse, diversity, and the politics of place*. Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Neveu, É. (2013) Les sciences sociales doivent-elles accumuler les capitaux? [Should the social sciences accumulate capital?] *Revue Française de Science Politique* 63.2, 337-58.
- Painter, J. (2000) Pierre Bourdieu. In M. Crang and N. Thrift (eds.), *Thinking space*, Routledge, London.
- Peck, J. (2005) Struggling with the creative class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29.4, 740-70.
- Pereira, V.B. (2005) *Classes e culturas de classe das famílias portuguesas* [Classes and class cultures of Porto families]. Afrontamento, Porto.
- Pereira, V.B. (2018) Urban distinctions: class, culture and sociability in Porto. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42.1, 126-37.
- Pinçon, M. and M. Pinçon-Charlot (1989) *Dans les beaux quartiers* [In the upscale districts]. Seuil, Paris.
- Pinçon, M. and M. Pinçon-Charlot (1992) *Quartiers bourgeois, quartiers d'affaires* [Bourgeois districts, business districts]. Payot, Paris.
- Pinçon, M. and M. Pinçon-Charlot (1993) *La chasse à courre: ses rites et ses enjeux* [Riding to hounds: rites and stakes]. Payot, Paris.
- Pinçon, M. and M. Pinçon-Charlot (1996) *Grandes fortunes: dynasties familiales et formes de richesse en France*. Payot, Paris. (English translation, 1998: *Grand fortunes: dynasties and forms of wealth in France*, Algora, New York, NY.)
- Pinçon, M. and M. Pinçon-Charlot (2005) *Voyage en grande bourgeoisie: journal d'enquête* [Journey amongst the High Bourdieu: diary of a study]. PUF, Paris.
- Pinçon, M. and M. Pinçon-Charlot ([2007] 2010) *Les ghettos du gotha: comment la bourgeoisie défend ses espaces* [The gilded ghetto: how the bourgeoisie defends its spaces]. Second edition, Points/Seuil, Paris.
- Pinçon-Charlot, M. and M. Pinçon (2018) Social power and power over space: how the bourgeoisie reproduces itself in the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42.1, 115-25.
- Rheinberger, H.-J. (2010) *On historicizing epistemology: an essay*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Ripoll, F. (2013) Quelle dimension spatiale des structures sociales chez Bourdieu? Localisations résidentielles et jeux d'échelles dans *La Distinction* [What is the spatial dimension of social structures in Bourdieu? Residential locations and the play of scales in *Distinction*]. In P. Coulangeon and J. Duval (eds.), *Trente ans après 'La Distinction' de Pierre Bourdieu* [Thirty years after *Distinction* by Pierre Bourdieu], La Découverte, Paris.
- Rosenlund, L. (2009) *Exploring the city with Bourdieu: applying Pierre Bourdieu's theories and methods to study the community*. VDM, Saarbrücken.
- Savage, M. (2011) The lost urban sociology of Pierre Bourdieu. In G. Bridge and S. Watson (eds.), *The new Blackwell companion to the city*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Savage, M., L. Hanquinet, N. Cunningham and J. Hjellbrekke (2018) Emerging cultural capital in the metropolis: profiling London and Brussels. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42.1, 138-49.
- Storper, M. and A.J. Scott (2016) Current debates in urban theory: a critical assessment. *Urban Studies* 53.6, 1114-36.
- Tissot, S. (2007) *L'État et les quartiers: enquête sur une catégorie de l'action publique* [The state and at-risk neighborhoods: an inquiry into a category of public action]. Seuil, Paris.
- Tissot, S. (2011) *De bons voisins: enquête dans un quartier de la bourgeoisie progressiste* [Good neighbors: a study of a progressive bourgeois neighborhood]. Raisons d'Agir Éditions, Paris.
- Tissot, S. (2018) Categorizing neighborhoods: the invention of 'sensitive areas' in France and 'heritage districts' in the United States. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42.1, 150-58.
- Wacquant, L. (2002) Scrutinizing the street: poverty, morality, and the pitfalls of urban ethnography. *American Journal of Sociology* 107.6, 1468-532.
- Wacquant, L. (2004) Following Pierre Bourdieu into the field. *Ethnography* 5.4, 387-414.
- Wacquant, L. (2008) *Urban outcasts: a comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Polity, Cambridge.
- Wacquant, L. (2013) Symbolic power and group-making: on Bourdieu's reframing of class. *Journal of Classical Sociology* 13.2, 274-91.
- Wacquant, L. (2014) Marginality, ethnicity and penalty in the neoliberal city: an analytic cartography. Symposium with responses from A. Clarno, M. Dawson, M. Desmond, A. Lerman, M. Loveman, D. Massey, D. Roberts, R. Sampson, W.J. Wilson and A. Wimmer. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37.10, 1687-711.
- Wacquant, L. (2015) Revisiting territories of relegation: class, ethnicity and the state in the making of advanced marginality. Symposium with responses by N. Marwell, J. Ladanyi, T. Schultz Larsen, O. Patterson and E. Shaw Crane. *Urban Studies* 53.6, 1077-88.
- Wacquant, L. (2016) A concise genealogy and anatomy of habitus. *The Sociological Review* 64.1, 64-72.
- Wacquant, L. (2017) Practice and symbolic power in Bourdieu: the view from Berkeley. *Journal of Classical Sociology* 17.1, 55-69.
- Wacquant, L. (2018) *The two faces of the ghetto*. Polity, Cambridge.
- Wacquant, L., T. Slater and V. Pereira (2014) Territorial stigmatization in action. *Environment and Planning A* 46.6, special issue, 1270-80.
- Webster, H. (2010) *Bourdieu for architects*. Routledge, London.
- Weber, M. (1958) *From Max Weber: essays in sociology*. New edition, edited by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Weik, E. (2010) Research note: Bourdieu and Leibniz: mediated dualisms. *The Sociological Review* 58.3, 486-96.
- Wirth, L. (1938) Urbanism as a way of life. *American Journal of Sociology* 44.1 (July), 1-24.