Bourdieu, Social Space, and Mobility

> As a body and biological individual, I am, in the way that things are, situated in a place: I occupy a position in physical space and social space.
>
> —*Pascalian Meditations* (1997/2000c, 131)

How is social mobility related to geographic mobility? How is mobility related to power and symbolic domination? What are the emotional implications of mobility and immobility? These are questions that Pierre Bourdieu addressed in his work. Bourdieu's concept of social space, which I view as the basis of his work, is highly relevant for critical issues in the humanities and social sciences regarding mobility and related processes of social inclusion and exclusion. Even more so than field, social space expresses articulations between physical spaces, embodied habitus, and sociality. Bourdieu's most significant contribution for spatial and mobility studies is that he developed a conceptual framework for connecting social practices and modes of sociality with physical space. As architectural historian Hélène Lipstadt (2008, 38) has pointed out, Bourdieu has much to contribute to "the spatial study of lives." In this book, I show that spatiality is integral to the development of Bourdieu's theory of practice and impossible to separate from the idea of habitus.

Although I agree with Charles Lemert (2006, 231) that social space is Bourdieu's "second most inventive concept" after that of habitus, its meaning remains elusive. Ideas of spatiality permeate Bourdieu's writings in ways that produce an almost *doxic*, invisible, and elusive quality for the reader. Grasping what Bourdieu means by social space, a concept that he was less explicit in defining than that of habitus or field, requires a broad view of the ways he approached spatiality and its relationship to sociality. It is

important to put Bourdieu's disparate writings, which often reach differ-
ent audiences and thereby shape somewhat different interpretations and
understandings of his work in various disciplines, into dialogue with each
other to show their connections. A thorough comprehension of Bourdieu's
theory of social space must take into account the wide corpus of his writings
on different topics and in multiple realms—from Algeria and rural France,
to art and literature, to language, to French education and academia, to
the housing market, and to the state. In order to understand the relation-
ship between physical space and social space in Bourdieu's thought, it is
particularly important to draw out the connections between the ways in
which he developed ideas of social space in his more ethnographic writings
and in his other work.

My aim in writing this book is to provide a comprehensive overview of
Bourdieu's theory of social space across the span of his career, with a par-
ticular focus on the implications of his thought for understandings of mo-
bility.[1] In Chapter One, I provide a critical analysis of Bourdieu's concepts
of "habitus," "capital," "field," and "symbolic power" in relationship to
social space. This chapter considers Bourdieu's own "world-making" in the
construction of his theoretical approach. In Chapters Two through Four, I
trace the chronological development of Bourdieu's thought on social space
from the earliest ethnographic writings on peasants in France and Algeria
to his later writings on the state. I then extend Bourdieu's ideas in order to
apply them to a consideration of the European Union as a social space in
Chapter Five. In each of these realms, the implications of viewing mobil-
ity and immobility in terms of social space(s) are explored. In this book's
Conclusion, I connect Bourdieu's theory of social space to the emerging
focus on emplacement in mobility studies and argue for an ethnographic
approach to mobility that is informed by the concept of social space.

The study of geographic mobility is not usually considered to have been
a major focus of Bourdieu's work. However, although it is true that Bour-
dieu did not address international migration extensively in his research and
writing, he was interested in movements across space that are associated
with mobility—conceived of as a much broader concept than migration. His
work speaks to the relationships between social and geographical mobility
and location. If, as Noel Salazar has proposed (2018), mobility is about
boundary crossing, then we can see Bourdieu's contributions to mobility
studies in his concern with symbolic classifications of social, linguistic, and
geographic boundaries. Bourdieu's theory of social space includes the anal-
ysis of trajectories across spatial and social boundaries and the workings of
symbolic power that produce immobility.

The term "migration" refers primarily to geographic movement across
physical space, whereas "mobility" and "immobility" can signal movement

or the lack thereof in either social positioning or physical space. Mobility can equally refer to human movement across space, in as simple a gesture as walking, and to social movement or social mobility whereby a person or group rises or falls in their position or status. Migration is often understood as a form of mobility that involves a more "permanent" relocation—the end of a trajectory in which someone was not mobile, became mobile, and then stopped being mobile again after "settling." However, this vastly oversimplifies the experiences of mobile people. Many questions are left unaddressed when something is labeled as migration. These include that of why the person moved, why some people move and others don't, questions of the temporal aspects of migration (when, for how long), as well as questions about social agency (was the mobility one of privilege and choice, or was it forced). All of these questions also need to be viewed as lying upon a continuum rather than either/or. For example, economic migrants who are frequently juxtaposed with refugees may also be "forced" to seek a better economic situation even when a clear-cut situation of persecution cannot be demonstrated. Due to national origins, socioeconomic status, or other factors, the ability or desire to move may be understood as associated with more or less privilege regarding travel (cf. Amit 2007).

Bourdieu addressed immigration most explicitly both in his early research in Algeria (especially in his coauthored publications with Abdelmalek Sayad)[2] and in his later collaborative work on social suffering (Bourdieu et al. 1993c). It is significant, however, that Bourdieu did not include immigrants in his analysis of French national social space in his major work *Distinction* (1979b/1984a). Despite many gaps in his attention to migrants and other mobile people, Bourdieu did provide insights on issues of belonging, and of both mobility and immobility, which I extend in my analysis of his work to explore their potential applications. Bourdieu's perspective is useful in understanding the positionings in and thresholds of social space that are associated with belonging and affinity—with feeling (and being perceived by others as) "at home," but also feeling close affinities with others in the same social position (and similar habitus). For Bourdieu, this was important for political mobilization in order to lessen social inequality. Bourdieu assumed that people want to feel at home and that mobility is connected to desires for the emotion of happiness that this entails. He described situations in which people can feel out of place and not at home due either to their own mobility or to the world changing around them.

A perennial problem in scholarship on Bourdieu is the sheer volume of his writings and the range of his interests, which has led to partial readings and sometimes to what he referred to as "fast readings" (1989a/1996c, 434, fn12) of his work. Bourdieu's concept of social space is most often associated with his book *Distinction*, which draws little attention to the re-

lationship between social and physical space. Bourdieu's relevance for the "spatial turn," an influential trend in the social sciences and humanities since the late 1980s that interrogates the relationship between power and spatial organization, is rarely acknowledged.[3] Those who have identified a more recent "mobility turn" linked to an explicit concern with inequality also rarely cite Bourdieu's work.[4] Sheller (2017) suggests that the mobilities turn extended the spatial turn by incorporating the relational aspect of space, yet overlooks Bourdieu's contributions to this very idea.

Most scholarship that does recognize Bourdieu's writing on social space fails to fully appreciate the ways in which his approach links the study of physical space and that of a more relational social space. Among anthropologists, Bourdieu's relevance for spatiality is most often taken from his analysis of the Kabyle house, in work deriving from very early in his career that was published in various places, including *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1972a/1977c). Henrietta Moore (1986) was one of the first social anthropologists to use Bourdieu's spatial approach, which she applied to a study of gender among the Marakwet of Kenya. Moore relies primarily on Bourdieu's analysis of the Kabyle house, and does not utilize his broader concept of social space that appears elsewhere in his work. Nageeb (2004) drew upon Bourdieu's concept to understand Muslim women's construction of social space in Sudan, and stretches it to locate social agency among these women while also incorporating both the spatial and social structural aspects of Bourdieu's approach. Such work has drawn attention to Bourdieu's relevance for feminist theory, and this has been noted by several authors who take up his emphasis on point of view and position-taking in social space to better understand gendered forms of agency and symbolic violence (see Butler 1997; Adkins and Skeggs 2005; see also Bourdieu 1998b/2001). In much of this literature, however, the emphasis is not on physical space, but on positionings in a more abstract social space.

One strand of attention to Bourdieu's concept of social space comes out of geography, urban planning, and architecture (e.g., Hillier and Rooksby 2002; Lipstadt 2008; Webster 2011), where the emphasis is placed on geographic or physical space.[5] Speller's book *Bourdieu and Literature* (2011) addresses the topic of social space in Bourdieu's writings on literature, but does not place them in the broader context of his other sociological and ethnographic work. In sociology and related disciplines, Bourdieu's concept of social space has most often been associated with the method of correspondence analysis he used in *Distinction*.[6] A retrospective volume dedicated to *Distinction* (Coulangeon and Duval 2013) focuses primarily on Bourdieu's contributions to social class theory and includes discussions of social space, but pays little explicit attention to the physical or geographical aspects of that concept in Bourdieu's thought. Because *Distinction* does

not address physical space in relationship to social space as much as does other work by Bourdieu that I discuss in subsequent chapters, the wider implications of social space in his overall theory are occluded when this book is taken as the primary source for understanding Bourdieu's concept of social space.

My position in this book is that social space is the key to understanding Bourdieu's work. Bourdieu's most cited concepts are habitus and cultural capital, with the consequence that less attention is paid to his broader view of the social world in which these two concepts have meaning. Bourdieu deployed social space in order to conceptualize the ways in which groups form and take shape in society, and to explore metaphors of social distance and proximity. Among scholars who focus on the relational aspect of social positionings in Bourdieu's concept of social space, there is a tendency to downplay his attention to geographic space. This has resulted in an overemphasis on Bourdieu's deployment of "field" at the expense of attention to social space.[7] There is evidence of Bourdieu's interest in the concept of social space across all of his work (from peasant societies to the housing market in contemporary France); whereas "field" is a more focused concept that Bourdieu used primarily in contexts of what he referred to as "differentiated," or class-stratified, societies.[8] The idea of field, which became more explicit in Bourdieu's work over time, is a framework intended to explain the ways in which power and knowledge coalesce in particular realms of society (education, literature, politics, journalism) that are understood as relatively autonomous "fields." Bourdieu viewed field as a region in social space. Although I view social space as a more useful concept for mobility and spatial studies than field, the two complement each other, and I will address the relationship between field and social space in greater detail in Chapter One.

Although not always in reference to Bourdieu's approach specifically, the term "social space" appears in scholarship in phrases like "social space of postmodernism" (Rouse 1991), "social space of ethnic identity" (Smith 1992), "transnational social fields" (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002; Amelina et al. 2012), and "transnational social spaces" (Pries 2001; Faist 2012; Faist and Özveren 2004). There are some important differences, however, in Bourdieu theory of social space and these uses of the term.

The dominant approach in migration studies since the 1990s has been a "transnational" one (Gupta 1992; Basch, Glick Schiller, and Blanc 1994; Hannerz 1996). It is viewed by most of its proponents as leading to a way out of the so-called "container" problem of methodological nationalism. Transnationalism emphasizes the ongoing ties that migrants maintain with the country from which they moved. In an early iteration of this concept,

Basch, Glick Schiller, and Blanc proposed that one of its major premises was that "transnationalism is a process by which migrants, through their daily activities and social, economic, and political relations, create social fields that cross national boundaries" (1994, 22).

Those who focus on transnationalism have sought to identify transnational spaces and transnational behaviors. There has, however, been a lack of appreciation of Bourdieu's contributions to understandings of spatiality in publications dealing with transnational social space. Pries claims that Bourdieu's concept of social space was primarily a spatial metaphor and not "an explicit concept of the relations between social and geographic space" (2001, 19). As the explication of Bourdieu's theory of social space conveyed in this book will show, such an interpretation can only be understood as based on a very narrow reading of Bourdieu's work. Thomas Faist defines transnational social spaces as "relatively stable, lasting, and dense sets of ties reaching beyond and across borders of sovereign states" (2004, 3). He adopts an actor-oriented transactional approach that views social space in terms of networks among individuals. This use of social space does link geographical space and social relationships but bears little resemblance to Bourdieu's approach. As in the case of Faist's approach, ethnographic studies that have been inspired by the concept of transnational social space emphasize social ties among mobile people living abroad with other coethnics (e.g., Wiles 2008; Richter 2012), which is different from attention to the position of habitus in social space.

The uses of Bourdieu's work by migration specialists who posit transnational social fields also miss some important aspects of his work. Although influenced by Bourdieu's idea of fields as sites of struggle, the concept of transnational field is primarily an ego-centered idea that uses network as a metaphor. Nina Glick Schiller has written that transnational social fields are "networks of networks that stretch across the borders of nation-states" (2005, 5). Bourdieu did not envision social fields in this way; he saw them, as I have noted earlier in this book, as regions within a wider social space. Unless the concept of transnational social field also takes into account the dispositions of habitus and the forms of capital that come into play in these fields, it retains an actor-oriented focus that, while avoiding methodological nationalism, risks adopting a methodological individualism.

Another term that has gained momentum in recent years is that of translocality (Conradson and McKay 2007; Greiner and Sakdapolrak 2013; Low 2016). Low defines a translocal space as one in which "a person who lives in two or more locations often separated by national boundaries and distance has emotional, linguistic, and material access to both simultaneously" (2016, 174). This is a primarily ego-centered perspective in which the body is a "mobile social field" (ibid., 5). Low addresses Bourdieu's approach to

space in developing what she calls a framework of "spatializing culture," but limits her analysis of his work to that published in the 1970s (especially the work on the Kabyle house). She views translocal space as compatible with ideas of transnationalism, but suggests that it has the potential to elucidate emerging affiliations that "bind people and places together" (ibid., 181).

Overview of Bourdieu's Concept of Social Space

I believe that Bourdieu's concept of social space is good to "think with" because it encourages us to view geographic mobilities and emplacements in relationship to movements and positions in social space. Social space is an idea that Bourdieu developed in tandem with that of habitus—an embodied orientation to the world, which includes dispositions, tastes, points of view, and so on. He viewed habitus as a position in social space. The concept of social space expresses articulations between physical space and sociality. The following brief overview of what Bourdieu meant by social space will help set the stage for what is to be discussed in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

For Bourdieu, physical and social space are closely related. He wrote in *Pascalian Meditations*, "social space tends to be translated, with more or less distortion, into physical space, in the form of a certain arrangement of agents and properties," and argued that physical space is "reified social space" (1997/2000c, 134). Places or spatial localizations that people inhabit are related to the position of their habitus in social space. It is important to realize that Bourdieu did not view social space as the physical place where social interactions occur. In this, he differs from those who consider physical space associated with human activity and materiality as social space. For Bourdieu, social space is an underlying structure of symbolic classifications that is expressed and constructed by positionings of and relationships between habituses in physical space. The concepts of habitus and social space are central to Bourdieu's theory of practice, through which he attempted to trouble the conceptual division between social structure and social practices. Social space is not, however, a given that people enter into; it is also composed by them. Social space is produced through the combination of various social actors engaged in social practices—their points of view, their positions, and their strategies.

Spatial practices imply spatial choices, which are connected to the dispositions of habitus and associated forms of capital (1993c/1999b). The main thread in all of Bourdieu's work is the idea that social space is constituted by the habituses of social agents in it and, in turn, their position in

social space shapes their understandings of what is possible (their aspirations). This affects their trajectories and strategies. Bourdieu imagined the social world as a social space that is a "system of relations" (1989c, 16), and a social hierarchy in which there are more or less dominating and dominated social positions. Habitus is not an attribute of an autonomous individual, but of a person who is positioned in social space and whose value, power, and trajectory within that social space can only be understood in a relational sense, in relationship to other habituses within the social space. Bourdieu's concepts are designed from the perspective of the social analyst, not the individual social actor. However, the social actor has a position and point of view in social space in relationship to others who are engaged with or enclosed by that social space or a field within it.

In his analysis of France as a national social space, Bourdieu considered social space to be coterminous with the limits of the nation-state. In other writings, however, he occasionally used the term "social space" to apply to more localized social units, such as a city or a region.[9] Even though he frequently took social space to be national social space (e.g., *Distinction* [1979b/1984a]), Bourdieu regarded emplacement or displacement in social space not primarily in terms of the territorial boundaries of the nation-state but, rather, in terms of commonsense ideas about the social world, its composition, and its hierarchies that are fostered by the state and its institutions (especially education).

Bourdieu was particularly interested in perceptions of distance and proximity in social space among social actors within it. These are related to the dispositions and affinities of habitus. These are also related to geographic distances. It is important to take into account, however, that social interactions among people in close physical proximity may hide social distances and underlying social hierarchies. Bourdieu wrote of geographic and social space:

> It is true that one can observe almost everywhere a tendency toward spatial segregation, people who are close together in social space tending to find themselves, by choice or by necessity, close to one another in geographic space; nevertheless, people who are very distant from each other in social space can encounter one another and interact, if only briefly and intermittently, in physical space. (1989c, 16)

The taken for granted divisions of geographic space (such as center and periphery) must be viewed, according to Bourdieu, as "the effect of distance in social space, i.e. the unequal distribution of the different kinds of capital in geographical space" (1985b, 726, fn5).

Bourdieu addressed the materiality of social space not only in his attention to physical space and place but also through visual images that he

incorporated into his published works. He depicted physical or geographic space (which was also social space) in his diagrams of the Kabyle house (1958; 1970a) and the Béarnaise house (1962); maps of villages and resettlement camps in Algeria (1958; Bourdieu and Sayad 1964a); and a map of Paris depicting the trajectory in social space of characters in a nineteenth century French novel (1975). Bourdieu also published photographs he took during fieldwork in rural France (1962) and in Algeria (2003a).

Because perceptions of distance and proximity in social space inform and are constructed by relations of inequality and social domination, Bourdieu's approach to social space has important implications for understandings of the circulation of people and ideas in the contemporary world. The lens of social space helps illuminate the relationship between spatial practices and position in social hierarchies—that is, the ways in which some people have more privileges associated with mobility than others. Social space also helps us explore social processes related to immobility, emplacement, and mooring. An important contribution of Bourdieu's theory of habitus and social space is his attention to emotions. Bourdieu viewed the habitus as shaping both thinking and feeling. He paid attention in his work to feelings of being in or out of place, either socially or physically or both, and the consequences of this for those who are in dominated positions in society. Bourdieu also, however, described his own privileged position in academia that resulted from social and geographical mobility, as connected to his feeling out of place.

Mobility and Reflexivity: Bourdieu's Trajectory

Distance and proximity in social space underlie not only Bourdieu's research questions, but also his reflexive methodology, in which the researcher should be aware of his or her position or point of view in social space. In comments about his former collaborator Abdelmalek Sayad, Bourdieu (2008b/2013, 299) wrote: "Research in social science, where analytical procedures are less strictly codified than elsewhere, always depends largely, for better or worse, on the habitus, more or less corrected and controlled, of the person conducting it." Bourdieu felt that a truly scientific sociology and anthropology depended on reflexivity on the part of the researcher, and by this, he meant being able to analyze one's own position in social space—including one's proximities and distances from those studied. Advocating a stance of "participant objectivation" (Bourdieu 2003), Bourdieu argued that being aware of one's own position in social space would aid the researcher in being careful not to mistake their own point of view for that of their interlocutors.

We can learn a great deal about Bourdieu's concept of social space by looking at how he applied the concepts of social space, field, and habitus to his own career trajectory in his *Sketch for a Self-Analysis* (2004a/2007). Completed toward the end of Bourdieu's life and published posthumously, this book was intended primarily for a younger academic audience who were themselves struggling with and questioning their role as researchers. Bourdieu wrote of his "path through social space," which linked two incompatible "social worlds" (2007, 1), by which he meant the world of academia and the world of rural Béarnaise society in which he spent his childhood. This had led to his split habitus (*habitus clivé*), whose two parts were often contradictory, leading him to have impulses at cross-purposes with each other. As a child, he tells us, Bourdieu desired recognition at school, but also disdained educational institutions.

Bourdieu viewed the dispositions he acquired as a child in rural France as the product both of his family upbringing and of regional characteristics (such as language, values, postures, and so on). He describes his family history and the mobilities experienced by his parents and grandparents in terms of loss, insecurity, and some emotional suffering. Bourdieu's father was a humble man who had left the life of sharecropping (to which he was born) to be first a mail carrier and then a clerk in the post office. In spite of his social mobility, Bourdieu's father felt guilty about his social distance from farmers in the township where they lived. Bourdieu's mother came from a family with higher social status, but suffered, like others in the petite bourgeoisie, from class insecurity. Although her father had come from a prosperous and well-established peasant family, he remained one of the lesser members of it and struggled financially while taking on several different ventures related to the rural economy.

Like the figure of "the stranger" analyzed by Georg Simmel (Wolff 1950) who is physically close but socially remote, Bourdieu felt a social distance from his colleagues in academia despite his spatial proximity to other scholars with whom he interacted. He felt that he had acquired, and retained throughout his life, certain habits of thought and language that marked him with a regional form of masculinity that was somewhat alien in the Parisian academic milieu in which he later found himself. He had migrated from a rural milieu to an urban and academic one; and much like any migrant, he experienced social distance. This emotional response of social distance is associated with not feeling "at home." Bourdieu wrote that he became aware of his own habitus through the gaze of others—especially those in Paris, but also beginning with his *lycée* days in the city of Pau—when fellow students and colleagues from higher social milieu would react to him. Because he was not a peasant child, Bourdieu was teased in primary school, yet also felt scorned in Paris many years later because of his provin-

cial and lower-class background by the majority of academics who came from higher social strata.

At *lycée* in Pau, where he boarded during the week, Bourdieu felt conflicted because although he desired to learn and read and was a good student, he also tended to make trouble and organize pranks, for which he was frequently disciplined.[10] As he came to feel an affinity with more urban children, he realized he was becoming more distant from his rural peers. Playing rugby permitted him to express a form of masculinity that could counter the interest in learning. Bourdieu was encouraged by both parents to pursue an education. On his father's side, this had to do with a left-leaning support for the Republican values of French education; while on his mother's, it had to do with a desire for social advancement and position.

In this "self-socioanalysis," Bourdieu discussed his movements in social space through an analysis of his own habitus and the axes of rural versus urban, higher versus lower social class status, Paris versus provinces, and also in terms of gender and sexuality (as when he distinguished himself from Foucault partly on the basis of Foucault's homosexuality in contrast to his heterosexuality). At the same time, he described his positions in the fields of philosophy, anthropology, and sociology. He explained the possible position-takings available to him through discussion of key figures and stances in each field, showing both his distances from and proximities to them and including stories about his interpersonal relations with several intellectuals. Bourdieu concluded that his "choice" of leaving the field of philosophy and turning toward anthropology and sociology was one based in his habitus. The themes that Bourdieu addressed in his self-analysis are all present in his approach to social space that will be approached in more detail in the chapters to follow.

Trajectory, Bourdieu wrote, is

> A series of successively occupied positions by the same agent (or the same group) in a space which itself is constantly evolving and which is subject to incessant transformations. . . . Biographical events are defined as just so many *investments* and *moves* in social space." (1986b/2000a, 302)

Bourdieu was an internal migrant in France, who was both geographically and socially mobile as he moved from being a child of modest origins in the region of Béarn to a highly respected figure in the world of Parisian academia and beyond. He was both a "scholarship boy" living "at the friction point between two cultures" (Hoggart [1957] 1992, 224) and a "class traveller" (Löfgren 1987, 88) who faced alienation and feelings of being out of place.[11] Although both Richard Hoggart and Orvar Löfgren use a vocab-

ulary of "class cultures" to discuss the boundary crossing of such figures, Bourdieu's approach is to posit the acquisition of a secondary habitus and new positionings in the wider social space. This leads to a situation of having a "split habitus" and never truly feeling at home in the world. Bourdieu's reflections on his life trajectory illustrate quite succinctly how closely habitus and social space are linked in his theory of practice. As Bourdieu argued in his essay "The Biographical Illusion" (1986b/2000a), a person's habitus should not be viewed in terms of unique individual traits and freely made choices. Habitus is a position in social space and has a social trajectory related to the choices and aspirations available.

Placing Bourdieu and Social Space

Bourdieu's concept of social space draws upon several different strands in social theory and philosophy, and constitutes a synthesis of anthropological approaches that emphasize physical space as a reflection of social organization and belief systems, and sociological approaches that focus on social positioning within a stratified and heterogeneous society. In this final section of the Introduction, I place Bourdieu in relationship to earlier thought about social space that influenced him and consider how his contemporaries used this concept in ways that were similar and different from his own.

The phrase "social space," which can be traced back to Durkheim,[12] appears frequently in recent scholarship, although, as I have previously shown (Reed-Danahay 2015c), its meanings and uses are quite varied—especially regarding the degree to which emphasis is placed either on the material and built environment or on issues of social distance or proximity. The paradigmatic view prevalent in social theory during most of the nineteenth and into the early twentieth century was that a social group was associated with a geographical territory and that this relationship was a central part of social structure and sociality. This was expressed in the approaches of Émile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss, who were fundamental figures in the development of ideas about social space and its relationship to physical space that continue to influence social thought today. Durkheim's emphasis on cognitive and empirical aspects of social life, as well as collective representations and systems of classification (Durkheim [1912] 1995; Durkheim and Mauss 1963), led him to see the built environment and its organization as reflecting social organization.[13]

Although Bourdieu distanced himself from structuralism in a now-famous comment he made about having been a "blissful structuralist" (1980b/ 1990, 9) when composing his classic essay on the Kabyle house, it is im-

portant not to ignore the influence of Claude Lévi-Strauss (who was in turn influenced by Durkheim) on Bourdieu's approach to social space. In his own extensive writings on the subject (see especially [1958] 1963), Lévi-Strauss outlined an approach to social space in traditional societies that linked social space and social time to perceptions of time and space. According to Lévi-Strauss, there is a relationship between social structure (as "surface structure") and "spatial structure," but these are not identical. In clarifying this point, he wrote:

> A large number of native societies have consciously chosen to project into space a schema of their institutions. . . . Study of these spatial phenomena permits us to grasp the natives' own conception of their social structure; and, through our examinations of the gaps and contradictions, the real structure, which is often very different from the natives' conception, becomes accessible. ([1958] 1963, 332)

When using the concept of social space (*l'espace social*), Lévi-Strauss referred to the physical or geographical aspects of space, but also to underlying mental systems for the classification of space. These perceptions were products of the social phenomena (underlying structures) that, as he phrased it, "furnished" them. Because he viewed social groups as "cultural units" that were also communication structures, Lévi-Strauss posited that the borders of these units were the thresholds to their social space—the limit where rates and forms of communication weaken.

Lévi-Strauss introduced the element of time to that of social space by pointing out that a spatial configuration could be temporary (as in ritual or dance) or more durable (as in village layout). He employed the idea of "isolates," a concept he borrowed from French demographers who looked at intermarrying groups and their prevalence of cross-cousin marriage, to suggest that cultural isolates can be found in urban as well as smaller-scale societies. Even though Bourdieu described social space as an underlying social structure, his explanation of how physical and social space were connected was, however, quite distinct from that of Lévi-Strauss. Bourdieu was more interested in seeing the interrelationships between social and spatial practices than was Lévi-Strauss, who did not focus on how social practices shape social structure, which was at the heart of Bourdieu's theory of practice (see Bourdieu 1972a/1977c). Bourdieu also went beyond the approach of Lévi-Strauss by exploring social space in wider scales of societal organization such as the nation-state. Lévi-Strauss maintained that anthropological research should confine itself to social space in face-to-face societies. When Marc Augé asked him during a published interview, "Is an ethnology of the modern world possible?" Lévi-Strauss replied that it was important to identify

> Limited areas [*aires*] where ethnological research feels able to operate because it finds there conditions which correspond to its needs: relative continuity in time, continuity within a space, and direct communication between people. The site may be a country village, a district within a town, or even the point of intersection of two or three streets in a metropolis of thousands or millions of inhabitants; these are all places where spatial proximity gives rise to habits or encourages their continuance. (Augé 1990, 90)

This statement illustrates the ways in which Lévi-Strauss viewed social space as a space of interaction, which differs from Bourdieu's understanding of social space as a space of positions and position-takings. Although it can be discerned from the observation of social interaction, social space for Bourdieu is the underlying social structure. Another key difference is that for Bourdieu, the social structure is not entirely a cognitive structure, as it was for Lévi-Strauss, but also one that is embodied and constructed through social practice. One commonality between the two theorists was their interest in the question of the threshold of social space and its relationship to communication. This was primarily a threshold in physical space for Lévi-Strauss, whereas for Bourdieu, social space was not entirely coterminous with the physical space of a collectivity. As I point out repeatedly in subsequent chapters, Bourdieu often referred to whatever social space he was describing as "enclosed," which echoes Lévi-Strauss's emphasis on "isolates."

When Bourdieu was creating his own view of social space that would become more explicitly articulated in his work during the 1980s, other scholars in France influenced by Durkheim and Lévi-Strauss were also developing ideas of social space. One of these figures was anthropologist Georges Condominas, who overlapped with Bourdieu in the late 1950s and early 1960s in Paris, although I am not sure if they had any contact with each other. Condominas was a Southeast Asian specialist who produced an influential book called *L'Espace Social—A propos de l'Asie du Sud-est* (1980) that offered a critical perspective on the concept of culture and proposed that social space be used instead. Condominas offered a comprehensive history of concepts of social space that cited many of his contemporaries in anthropology, but made no mention of Pierre Bourdieu. Condominas proposed that social space was composed of the social relations of a group. Similarly to Lévi-Strauss, he viewed social space in terms of limits to social action and communication and argued that social space, which he called "lived space," was both inhabited physical space and "used space" in an economic sense (1980, 13—my translations). He focused primarily on peasant societies, similar to Bourdieu's ethnographic work in the 1950s and 1960s, where one could identify what Lévi-Strauss referred to as "social isolates" as social spaces.

The idea of spatial settings as comprised of physical boundaries and communication networks, which may or may not coincide with the values and traditions associated with social space central to Lévi-Strauss's idea of cultural isolates, was also present in Paul-Henri Chombart de Lauwe's work, another influence on Bourdieu. Chombart de Lauwe utilized the concept of social space in his study of Paris. He viewed social space as the physical manifestation of collective representations and divisions in social life. Although Bourdieu does not cite him, he was acquainted with him[14] and probably read his work. Chombart de Lauwe viewed urban ethnography and sociology as an emancipatory enterprise that would help "the inhabitant of a large city situate themselves in a specific space" (1965, 28—my translation). He described social space as determined in part by symbolic representations of social difference and noted that there was a relationship between the types and locations of residence of people in Paris and particular habits and behaviors (which recalls Bourdieu's concept of habitus). As Ann Buttimer explains, Chombart de Lauwe introduced a hierarchy of urban social spaces that captured an ever-widening dimension of the "orbits of group social activity" (Buttimer 1969, 421), suggesting also that there are "thresholds in space beyond which certain groups cannot travel without experiencing frustrations, tensions, and feelings of anomie" (ibid., 421). This corresponds to Lévi-Strauss's emphasis on the weakening of communication at the boundaries of cultural "isolates" (social spaces).

Bourdieu's understanding of social space also draws from the ideas of Maurice Halbwachs ([1950] 1980) on the importance of "spatial frameworks" and the relationship between space and collective memory, as well as from Gaston Bachelard's ([1958] 1964) attention to the "poetics" of space and the emotional component of affinity as linked to physical surroundings. Another strand of influence on Bourdieu is the focus on distance and proximity in social space that developed in sociology. Although he did not explicitly address the links between this work and his own approach, there is also much in common between Bourdieu's concept of social space as a space of distances and proximities and that of Georg Simmel (Wolff 1950), as well as Pitirim Sorokin (1927) and urban sociologist Robert E. Park (1924 and 1952).

Whereas those writers focus primarily on the analysis of social interaction, another figure who influenced Bourdieu's thought, Kurt Lewin ([1939] 1967), was more interested in articulating social space as something to be understood by looking at what he referred to as the "topography" of individuals. Lewin described this as "relative positions which the different regions of activity of persons, or groups of persons bear to each other" (ibid., 8). Bourdieu's concept of trajectory in social space draws upon Lewin's concept of "life-space," although Lewin, a social psychologist, was more in-

terested in the individual as a generator of the social space than was Bourdieu—who viewed social space as the underlying social hierarchy and viewed social practices in social space as the product of habitus. The major influence of Lewin on Bourdieu's concept of social space, as others have pointed out,[15] is this relational aspect in which social groups are viewed in terms of social actors taking different positions within them relative to each other.

Another major influence on Bourdieu's concept of social space, and especially the ideas of being in one's place or knowing one's place, was the work of Erving Goffman, who is frequently cited by Bourdieu. Goffman developed the concept of "territories of the self" (Goffman 1971) and "regions" (Goffman 1959) as a way to explore an individual's social space and its contours and limits. Goffman was primarily interested in face-to-face interaction, and his contributions to spatial theory rely upon observations of encounters in physical space. Although Bourdieu drew heavily from Goffman's work, he was more interested in the underlying social space that informs visible social interactions in physical space.

Two French scholars who were contemporaries of Bourdieu have received much more attention in scholarship on social space, and it is, therefore, instructive to end this brief review of influences on Bourdieu's work with a consideration of the similarities and differences between Bourdieu's approach and theirs. The first is Michel de Certeau, who has been highly influential in studies of spatiality and sociality. Certeau distinguished between space (*l'espace*) and place (*lieu*) in his discussion of spatial practices and spatial stories but used the phrase "social space" only rarely in his work. A space, for Certeau, is a "practiced place" (1984, 117), which he likens to a word when it is spoken, or a street that has been walked upon. Like Bourdieu, he was critical of the idea of the autonomous individual and wrote that "each individual is a locus in which an incoherent (and often contradictory) plurality of such relational determinations interact" (ibid., xi). Also like Bourdieu, Certeau used the terms "practice," "structure," and "trajectory." In contrast to Bourdieu, however, Certeau was more interested in "tactics" utilized by the marginalized and dominated in order challenge forces of domination. In his criticisms of Bourdieu, Certeau zoomed in on the notion of habitus (charging that it masked tactical behavior in most instances) and failed to acknowledge the spatial aspects of Bourdieu's work or its relationship to his own (ibid., 45–60).

Among scholars interested in the relationship between space and society, the phrase "social space" is most often associated with Bourdieu's contemporary Henri Lefebvre.[16] Although there are many affinities between their approaches, there are also significant differences. Both scholars investigated the ways in which distance and proximity to power could occur in both social and physical space. Lefebvre viewed physical, mental, and social

space as domains that cannot be seen to neatly overlap ([1974] 1991, 11), and argued (ibid., 38–39) that space in capitalist societies includes social practice (linked to particular societies and economic structures); representations of space (that associated with planners and architects who create the dominant physical spaces in society); and representational spaces (space as lived and understood through symbols and images by users who are primarily those of the dominated classes in society). Lefebvre was also interested in structural relationships (by which he meant, in the Marxist sense, relations of production) that generate social space. Lefebvre placed more emphasis on the physical and material aspects of social space than did Bourdieu. Bourdieu, like Lefebvre, saw social space in terms of a system of relations, but not so much as relations of production (as did Lefebvre), than as relations of power based on different forms of capital (economic, cultural, social, and symbolic). I return to a discussion of the relationship between Lefebvre and Bourdieu in my discussion of Bourdieu's theory of the state and state space in Chapter Four.

As Marchetti (2011, 17) has observed, current thinking about social space interrogates the relationship between physical and social space. This is central to Bourdieu's approach and, as I have shown, has a long history going back to Durkheim. An important question regarding social space that was taken up by Bourdieu is the degree to which the physical environment, or geographic space, should (or can) be analytically separated from the more abstract idea of one's position in an imagined social space that has to do with moral values, status, prestige, affinity, identity, and so on. In Chapter One, I consider the ways in which Bourdieu's concept of social space works to address the articulation of physical space and a social space related to social organization and social hierarchy.

NOTES

1. Bourdieu's relevance for mobility or spatial studies is a topic that has received scant attention among Bourdieusian scholars, as evidenced in volumes dedicated to his legacy. See, for example, Encrevé and Lagrave (2003); Swartz and Zolberg (2004); Susen and Turner (2011); Coulangeon and Duval (2013); Leclercq, Lizé, and Stevens (2015); and Medvetz and Sallaz (2018). An exception is the recent volume edited by Thatcher et al. (2015).

2. Sayad, for his part, wrote extensively about immigration (see Sayad [1991] 2004), and Bourdieu wrote the preface to Sayad's book on immigration.

3. Key texts in the literature on the "spatial turn" that bear mentioning include Soja (1989); Massey (2005); Warf and Arias (2009); Tally (2013). In anthropology, see Ardener (1993); Pellow (1996); Gupta and Ferguson (1997); Low and Lawrence (2003); Coleman and Collins (2006); Baudin and Bonnin (2009); Roberts (2012);

and Low (2016). Several recent books that signal the growing interdisciplinary interest in spatial studies and are otherwise good reference points for approaches to space in social theory nevertheless fail to recognize Bourdieu's contributions. See Claval (1984); Simonsen (1996); Zieleniec (2007); Marchetti (2011); and Susen (2014). Of these, only Susen mentions Bourdieu, but very briefly.

4. See, for example, Urry (2000); Cresswell (2006); Sheller and Urry (2006); Franquesa (2011); and Faist (2013). Recent work aimed at conceptualizing an anthropology of mobility and immobility includes Svašek (2012); Salazar and Jayarim (2016); Bon and Repič (2016); and Salazar (2018). Bourdieu's relevance for mobility studies in anthropology is generally viewed primarily in terms of his concept of capital, adapted as "mobility capital," rather than his wider concept of social space.

5. Fogle (2011) similarly places emphasis on the built environment and physical space. Painter (2000), who engages in one of the most comprehensive ways with Bourdieu's attention to geography and spatiality in an overview of his reception by and relationship to approaches by geographers, tends, unfortunately, to view Bourdieu's concept of social space as primarily a spatial metaphor in ways that diminish its potential.

6. This can be seen in discussions of Bourdieu's theory of social space in such examples as Crossley (2005) and Hardy (2014). Atkinson (2017) adapts this to a different national context, the United Kingdom, but similarly pays little attention to physical space or place.

7. See Susen and Turner (2011); Grenfell et al. (2011); Gorski (2013); Swartz (2013); and Hilgers and Mangez (2015). An exception to this is Mike Savage's (2011) call for more attention to Bourdieu's contributions to urban sociology, although his focus is on what he refers to as Bourdieu's "field analysis" without a full appreciation of the implications of the wider concept of social space. Although I agree with Hilgers and Mangez (2015b, 1) that habitus has dominated scholarship on Bourdieu, they argue that his theory of fields "lies at the heart of his work," whereas I see field as secondary to the broader concept of social space.

8. Bourdieu's distinction between differentiated and undifferentiated societies is one that recalls Durkheim's division between organic and mechanical solidarity. I have previously offered a critique of this distinction, which is also one between traditional and modern societies in his work (see Reed-Danahay 1995; 2004; and 2005b). A more recent critique of his concept of more or less differentiated societies in relationship to Bourdieu's theory of fields, with implications for its application to postcolonial settings, can be found in Hilgers and Mangez (2015a).

9. For example, Bourdieu referenced the social space of academia in his essay on "Participant-Objectivation" (Bourdieu 2003b) in which the anthropological field, among other disciplinary fields, could be located. He also indicated in that essay that training in a particular discipline could produce shared *doxa* through the same process whereby commonsense notions are instilled in students by national institutions of education.

10. That Bourdieu attended boarding school should not be taken as a sign of high social status, as it might be in other national contexts. In rural France at the time when he was a child, anyone who advanced to high school (and this would be the minority for rural children who typically ended their education after primary school) lived at school at least during the week. This was primarily because of the geographic distances between cities, where such institutions were located, and rural towns and villages.

11. As I noted in *Locating Bourdieu* (Reed-Danahay 2005b, 30 and 168, fn3), the British sociologist Richard Hoggart, of working-class background himself, was influential in Bourdieu's thought. Moreover, Bourdieu was responsible for having Hoggart's translated work published in France. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer of *Bourdieu and Social Space* who pointed out the relevance of Löfgren's work to this discussion.

12. See in particular Durkheim's *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (1995, 339). Claval (1984) mentions this, and also cites Condominas (1980) for having pointed it out. Also see Buttimer (1969) and Claval (1984) for overviews of the history of ideas about social space.

13. Durkheim's contributions to social space have also been noted by Sorokin (1927), and more recently by Anne Buttimer (1969, 418–19), who points to his focus on social differentiation and social morphology. (See also the more recent discussion in Corsin Jiménez 2003.)

14. Based on personal communication with Bourdieu in the early 1980s.

15. Lewin's influence on Bourdieu is usually discussed in terms of his field theory (Lewin 1964), since both Lewin and Bourdieu used the term "field." However, Lewin also wrote about social space. See Friedman (2011) and the chapters in Hilgers and Mangez (2015b).

16. The relationship between the ideas of Lefebvre and Bourdieu is a topic for further exploration, although it is outside of the scope of this book to do so here. The two figures were born a generation apart, with Lefebvre born in 1901 and Bourdieu in 1930, but Lefebvre's most influential writings appeared after the 1970s. Significantly, Lefebvre is not of one of the academics mentioned in Bourdieu's *Homo Academicus* (1984b; 1988b) even though he was quite active in the events of May 1968. Pierce and Martin (2015, 6) claim that Lefebvre was influenced by Bourdieu in the development of his concept of social space, even though he never cited his work.