


READING BOURDIEU IN CASANOVA: FIELD THEORY, *ILLUSIO*, AND *HABITUS*

LEYENDO A BOURDIEU EN CASANOVA: TEORÍA DE CAMPO, *ILLUSIO* Y *HABITUS*

Thomas Nulley-Valdés 
The Australian National University
thomas.nulley-valdes@anu.edu.au

Fecha de recepción: 27/11/2021

Fecha de aceptación: 21/01/2021

<https://doi.org/10.30827/tn.v5i1.22865>

Abstract: Pascale Casanova's world literature theory and methodology developed in *The World Republic of Letters* draws heavily from Pierre Bourdieu's sociology. While criticism to date has noted (mostly in a superficial fashion) *that* Casanova builds explicitly on Bourdieu—for example, that she expands his nationally focused field theory into her ambitious theorisation of world literary space—, *how* and the extent to which Casanova implicitly draws and develops Bourdieu has not been fully uncovered. This paper analyses the implicit methodological and theoretical elements which Casanova has drawn from Bourdieu, specifically her subtle use and development of concepts such as the literary field, *illusio*, and *habitus*, as well as the role of critical reflexivity and epistemological vigilance in research. By reading Bourdieu in Casanova, it is possible to gain both a deeper understanding of Casanova's theory and methodology by considering these Bourdieusian underpinnings and, at the same time nuance and revise Casanova's proposal beyond the widespread Manichean critiques of her supposed inherent Gallocentrism.

Keywords: Pascale Casanova; Pierre Bourdieu; field theory; world literature; literary theory.

Resumen: La teoría y la metodología literarias de Pascale Casanova avanzadas en *La República mundial de las Letras* recurren en gran medida a la sociología de Pierre Bourdieu. Aunque la recepción crítica hasta la fecha ha notado (generalmente de manera superficial) *que* Casanova se basa explícitamente en Bourdieu —por ejemplo, que expande su teoría de campo de enfoque exclusivamente nacional a su ambiciosa teorización del campo literario mundial—, *cómo* y la medida en que Casanova toma y desarrolla a Bourdieu aún no han sido estudiados suficientemente. Este artículo analiza elementos metodológicos y teóricos implícitos que Casanova toma de Bourdieu, específicamente a través de su uso y sutil desarrollo de conceptos como el campo literario, *illusio*, y *habitus*, así como también el rol de la reflexividad crítica y vigilancia epistemológica en la investigación. Así, al leer la obra de Bourdieu en Casanova se logra una comprensión más profunda de la teoría y la metodología de Casanova considerando estos cimientos bourdieusianos, lo cual hace posible matizar y revisar la propuesta de Casanova más allá de las críticas maniqueístas dominantes de su supuesto galocentrismo inherente.

Palabras clave: Pascale Casanova; Pierre Bourdieu; teoría de campo; literatura mundial; teoría literaria.

1. Introduction

The reception of Pascale Casanova's theory of world literary space has constantly referenced her theoretical underpinnings in Pierre Bourdieu. This is unsurprising, firstly, given her doctoral dissertation was supervised by none other than Bourdieu and would later develop into her seminal work *La République mondiale des lettres* [*The World Republic of Letters*], and secondly, because "Bourdieu's thinking [...] is everywhere in the book" (Thomsen 213). The connection is apparent not least in the extensive use of Bourdieu's sociological concepts such as: *champ* or *espace* (field or space); *instances de consécration* (consecrating authorities); *le capital symbolique* (symbolic capital); *le capital littéraire* (literary capital); *tempo* (tempo); *champ de production restreinte* (sub-field of restricted production); *prises de position* (position-takings); *trajectoire* (trajectory); *l'autonomisation progressive du champ littéraire* (autonomization of the literary field), and adaptations of the terms *heteronomous* and *autonomous* used by Bourdieu in relation to the autonomous state of the artistic field and particular authors.

Despite the profusion of common terminology, critical reception of Casanova's work has mostly made (at best) superficial connections back to Bourdieu (See: Prendergast; Eagleton; Sánchez Prado; Perus; Franco; Poblete; and Damrosch). As James English has rightly noted, "[o]ne can readily deploy Bourdieu's theoretical concepts without undertaking the kinds of ethnographic fieldwork and multiple correspondence analysis from which he derived them" (364). Nevertheless, I posit that this is not the case with Pascale Casanova. Not only does she in many senses follow Bourdieu's methodology (illustrated more clearly in her sole authors works such as *Kafka, Angry Poet*), but her deployment of Bourdieusian concepts is as much explicit as it is implicit, as such we must consider closely *how* and to what extent Casanova draws and develops Bourdieu.

This paper proposes a closer analysis of Casanova's theory, concepts, and language, uncovering the extent to which her theory "builds explicitly" on Bourdieu's, as John Speller briefly notes (71). This paper argues that the above concepts and critical terms, far from being critically disembodied or used in a general sense, indicate intentional theoretical appropriations by Casanova. More specifically, as will be explored in this paper, Bourdieu's field theory, *illusio*, and *habitus* are central yet vary in how explicitly and implicitly they are apparent in Casanova's critical *oeuvre*. The final two concepts, for example, while not being named explicitly in *The World Republic of Letters*, underpin fundamental aspects of her theory. By reading Bourdieu in Casanova, and explicating these implied Bourdieusian elements, this paper also revises some of the longstanding critiques made of Casanova's theory which have been fixed, specifically her apparently inherent ethnocentrism.

2. Reading Bourdieu

Bourdieu's theory of fields was developed and positioned itself in response to three predominant sociological theories (which also had a large effect on literary studies): Claude Levi Strauss' structuralism, Jean-Paul Sartre's existentialism, and Jacques Derrida's post-structuralism. Bourdieu's sociology critiqued the position of the first two for their excesses in the agency/structure debate; structuralism, for its disregard for individual agency, and, existentialism, for the opposite reason, for overemphasising the role of the freely choosing subject and giving little or no acknowledgement of the structures which inform and determine decision-making (Bourdieu, "Structuralism and Theory of Sociological Knowledge"). Bourdieu's own critical position-taking in respect to these schools attempted to overcome this seemingly insurmountable impasse within the social sciences (Swartz).

Decades later, in 1992, when Bourdieu was to expand his sociological theory into the artistic sphere with *Les règles de l'art* [*The Rules of Art*], post-structuralism, synonymous with the French thinker Jacques Derrida, had gained momentum in the scholarly world of literary analysis during the 1980s and 1990s, especially in the United States academy. This new wave of analysis related to a philosophy of literature was a reaction against structuralism and the natural sciences and claimed that science was one discourse among many whose “texts” had no truth-value claims which could grant it epistemological supremacy over any other discipline¹. Once applied to literary analysis scholars attempted to read a text against itself or deconstruct it (using a hermeneutics of suspicion), relegating any discussions on social context, authorial biography, or authorial intent as increasingly irrelevant. As another so-called “deconstructionist” Roland Barthes explained in his seminal essay “The Death of the Author”,

[t]hus literature (it would be better, henceforth, to say writing), by refusing to assign to the text (and to the world as text) a “secret”: that is, an ultimate meaning, liberates an activity which we might call counter-theological, properly revolutionary for to refuse to arrest meaning is finally to refuse God and his hypostases, reason, science, the law (521).

The philosophical and literary implications for scholars who embraced post-structuralist analysis were that the meaning of the text was not analysed through the external elements of the text, instead, the text was to be analysed internally, in isolation from all these other elements, in effect denying the validity of these former approaches.

With his theory of fields, Bourdieu establishes his own position on the side of the scientific community and in opposition to these post-structuralist or post-modernist stances (Bourdieu, *Homo academicus*)². In “Structuralism and Theory of Sociological Knowledge”, Bourdieu defines theory (scientific and literary)

not as a literal translation based upon a term-by-term correspondence with the “real”, merely reproducing the apparent elements and properties of the object after the fashion of the mechanical models of ancient physics. The structure of symbols symbolizes the structure of relations established by experience in such a way that the relation between theory and facts, between reason and experience, is still a structural homology (688-9).

1 An enormously influential text in this early post-structuralist research was undoubtedly *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts* by Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar.

2 In Bourdieu's ethnography of the academy *Homo academicus* he has this to say regarding the recent waves of the postmodern study of science and his position in respect to them: “Far from leading to a nihilist attack on science, like certain so-called ‘postmodern’ analyses, which do no more than add the flavour of the month dressed with a soupçon of ‘French radical chic’ to the age-old irrationalist rejection of science, and more especially social science, under the aegis of a denunciation of ‘positivism’ and ‘scientism’, this sort of sociological experimentation applied to sociological study itself aims to demonstrate that sociology *can* escape from the vicious circle of historicism or sociologism” (xii-xiii).

Bourdieu, as such, applies the same relational principles used in advanced sciences to his sociology and in turn to his study of art and literature in *The Rules of Art* (39), in which theory is a translation or a symbol of what it attempts to capture in the real world via analogy (“Structuralism and Theory” 689). In this way Bourdieu sets himself the task of constructing an evolving theoretical model which could be fine-tuned over time through “a procedure of verification” and the “testing against reality” and which could explain the invisible laws and structures of not only the social world but also the artistic (“Structuralism and Theory” 699-700).

However, there is an important difference, in that contrary to the positivist tradition in science which maintains that scientific knowledge is based on observable and verifiable phenomena, Bourdieu maintained that the real world is understood and reinterpreted through the constructed model, and not observed necessarily in a pure and objective sense³. As such, Bourdieu’s model, much less positivistic in its make-up, is more traditionally formalistic, in the sense that it is a growing model which can be tested and corrected, with an explanatory ability to reveal the world to us, as interpreted through the developing model. As was to be expected in this context of suspicion and scepticism on the part of post-structural and post-modern literary critics, Bourdieu’s particular approach to social science and literary criticism was criticised particularly in Western academia for its foundational contradiction of these various theories in vogue.

However, in the contemporary university setting, when we are once again at a time when literary studies must continue to struggle to remain a relevant discipline amidst an increasingly instrumentalised research sector, literary analysis is experiencing shifts towards empirical methods of research with digital humanities and computational approaches gaining significant institutional backing and the emergence of big data collection projects such as those by Franco Moretti’s distant reading. It is not surprising, then, that along with these shifts in humanities methodologies Bourdieu’s (and by extension Casanova’s) claim to connect external and internal levels of analysis through an exploration of the text and the world is being revisited by scholars.

3. Bourdieu’s field theory, *illusio*, and *habitus*

Bourdieu’s theory of fields can be explained simply through the metaphor of Russian dolls, where each represents a concentric level of power relations, their relational char-

3 Yet tempering his commitment to the sciences, Bourdieu criticised the “false philosophy of objectivity” and what Nietzsche had called “the dogma of the immaculate perception” (“Structuralism and Theory” 695) in respect to the positivistic tendencies of certain branches of sociology.

acter, and the various distinct levels of analysis. Bourdieu's starting point and largest Russian doll is that of the field of power, a national structure defined by unequal internal power relations. Within this space, the social structure of the fields or competing groups is hierarchically ordered according to the varying levels of economic and cultural capital within the field of power. Bourdieu situates the literary field within this broader social structure, as "a universe obeying its own laws of functioning and transformation, meaning the structure of objective relations between positions occupied by individuals and groups placed in situations of competition for legitimacy" (*Rules of Art* 214) which encloses writers and their competing struggles. As Speller recognises, Bourdieu in effect attempts to provide a more detailed analysis of the well-worn term "Republic of Letters,"⁴ to show that it is a social category with its own struggle for a specifically literary capital (or power, prestige, influence, etc.) rather than political or economic capital (56)⁵. In reference to the symbolic capital or value of a work, however, Bourdieu claims that what we perceive to be the inherent quality, value or significance of a work are in fact products of the literary game founded on collective belief, or the *illusio*.

For Bourdieu, *illusios* are apparent in a variety of fields, be it the literary, the political, the religious, or the scientific. It is the collective belief in "the game" held by players—writers, readers, and critics in this case, in other cases believers, scientists, etc.—and which simultaneously contributes to the existence of the game through their participation in it, and by extension also perpetuates the *illusio* itself (*Rules of Art* 335). It is from this standpoint that Bourdieu describes the literary field as a separately functioning *illusio* to that of the ordinary common-sense world:

[t]o take the literary illusion seriously is in fact to play one *illusio* off against another: [...] the literary *illusio*, the belief of learned people, a privilege of those who live literature and who can, by writing, live life as a literary adventure, is played off against the most common and most universally shared *illusio*, the *illusio* of common sense. Sancho is to Don Quixote what the Thracian servant is to Thales, a permanent reminder of the reality of the world of common sense, of the common world, almost universally shared, unlike special worlds which are microcosms founded, like the universe of literature or of science, on a rupture with common sense and with the doxic adherence to the ordinary world (*Rules of Art* 335).

4 This is a critique which has also been leveled against Pascale Casanova, even though throughout her work she favors the term "world literary space" throughout, over the catchy "world republic of letters" which she uses to title her main work.

5 Bourdieu states in his essay "The Field of Cultural Production" that "[t]he *space of literary or artistic position-takings*, i.e. the structured set of the manifestations of the social agents involved in the field—literary or artistic works, of course, but also political acts or pronouncements, manifestos or polemics, etc.—is inseparable from the *space of literary or artistic positions* defined by possession of a determinate quantity of specific capital (recognition) and, at the same time, by occupation of a determinate position in the structure of the distribution of this specific capital" (30).

Here Bourdieu compares the real or common-sense world with the literary world, in a sense describing a worlding of literature which in Casanova's model would take a more ambitious proportion and a topographic resemblance to (yet relative independence from) the international political world.

The Russian dolls continue, as within this literary field Bourdieu creates two sub-fields which categorise authors according to their cultural production. Firstly, heteronomous writers, who belong to the subfield of mass production (popular with the public and the media) and secondly, autonomous writers, who belong to the subfield of restricted production and, despite being less successful commercially, accumulate greater symbolic capital due to their greater ability to innovate and transform the cultural field. It is this group within the literary field who though its specifically literary form of capital exerts dominance over other writers: the dominated writers such as popular writers (heteronomous writers); the new or nascent—and as yet unrecognised—avant-garde (autonomous writers); and, failed writers who fall between these two poles for their use of out-dated forms which do not bring them great commercial success nor innovate literary forms, leaving them without economic nor symbolic capital. This symbolic capital however is not something which Bourdieu considers inherent to the work or measurable according to universal norms or aesthetics, but rather relating back to the *illusio*, “[t]he producer of the *value of the work of art* is not the artist but the field of production as a universe of belief which produces the value of the work of art as a *fetish* by producing the belief in the creative power of the artist” (*Rules of Art* 229). That is, the actors within this artistic and literary field of production, the critics, publishers, academies, juries, which mediate quite overtly in the production of the value of works and their authors.

In addition to this broader level of analysis of the field of power and the literary space, Bourdieu undertakes an analysis of the writer's trajectory and position-taking (or “space of positions”) within this literary space, as well as the comparatively more micro-scaled analysis of their literary position-takings through their fiction, within the “space of possibilities” (*Rules of Art* 231-39). Bourdieu's methodology analyses an author's trajectory by expanding the work of a traditional literary biography, which might predominantly focus on just the subject, to also analysing the writer's social position-takings and overall social trajectory within the structure, such as their choice of publishers, groups with which they are affiliated, manifestos, or even their choice of writing style or genre, all which are understood as “*placements/investments* and *displacements/disinvestments*” into specific types of symbolic or economic capital⁶ (*Rules of Art* 258-59).

6 Bourdieu constructs his own biographical analysis of position-takings and social trajectory in contradistinction to a simple and traditional kind of biography which he critiques for its undervaluing of the significance of those

These decisions, however, are ultimately mediated by a person's *habitus*, which is formed throughout their life, from their family to broader levels of interaction which culminate in a personal conviction about one's social identity and one's place in the world. The *habitus*, for Bourdieu, holds a determinate sway in the kinds of position-takings, risks, genres, and groups in which writers might participate. Bourdieu, for example, describes how affluence can provide the preconditions to literary advantage by being born and cultivated in a social position of high cultural capital, as well as provide the artists with the economic stability to be audacious in their pursuit of artistic prestige, while conversely, working class, provincial and foreigner artists may experience disadvantage in these areas due to their social and geographic distance from the ordaining centres (*Rules of Art* 261-62).

One final level of inquiry in Bourdieu's method requires an analysis of the author's written text within the broader space of works and within the space of possibilities. Bourdieu sees each work of art as belonging to a space of works in which it is situated in a relational position to other artworks by way of refusal, approbation, parody, denial, emulation, etc. In this sense, the author's position-takings make possible an added scope of analysis, not solely their choice of publishers or groups but also their work as responding to other works in a struggle to set themselves apart within this competitive structure of the literary field.

Additionally, for Bourdieu, what a particular writer has produced is only part of the space of possibilities, or in other words, potential other works, or literary courses of action. Whilst heavily invested in constructing and detailing the *structure* of the field of power; the literary field; and the socio-cultural formation of writer's *habitus*, Bourdieu also emphasises the agency of the writers by acknowledging their career position-takings and their interventions into the space of works within their personal "space of possibilities". In short then, according to Speller's summary of Bourdieu's method,

[m]icro-textual analysis and macro-social analysis are thereby linked in a sort of hermeneutic circle (not a term Bourdieu uses), in which our understanding of the "part" (here, a singular text), defined within a web of intertextual relationships, (the "space of works") is informed by our understandings of the "whole" (the author's position, again defined relationally in the literary field and in the field of power), which in turn increases with our understanding of the "part", and so on (64).

Bourdieu's analysis, then, is an attempt to account holistically for the existence and form of a particular literary text (and also in-turn how this informs the other levels of analysis)

structural interactions: "Trying to understand a career or a life as a unique and self-sufficient series of successive events without any other link than association with a 'subject' (whose consistency is perhaps only that of a socially recognized proper name) is almost as absurd as trying to make sense of a trip on the metro without taking the structure of the network into account" (*Rules of Art* 258-59).

as it is explicated by its multiple simultaneous positions as an intertextual interlocutor in the space of works; as one product among many potentials in the space of possibilities; and informed by an author's *habitus*, trajectory, position-takings in their respective division (heteronomous or autonomous) within the local literary field.

By way of parenthesis, in terms of language, it is significant to make a note on the English translation of Casanova's work and the ways in which the connections to Bourdieu have been both highlighted and hidden. The translator, Malcolm B. DeBevoise, who despite providing a skilful translation of Casanova's unique style and flair, errs by obscuring some significant concepts imported from Bourdieu. I am referring specifically to the preference by the translator for terms with wider usage in English such as commitment and career over the very specific Bourdieusian terms of position-taking and trajectory. While position-taking is obviously clunky and not particularly concise as a compound word besides having little currency in common parlance, it captures both the very act of taking an authorial stance, through an exercise of personal agency, as well as an understanding that this stance occurs within a determinate context and structure. Commitment, on the other hand, is defined according to the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* as a dedication to a cause, ideology, etc. ("commitment" 7a.) or "[i]n the existential philosophy of Sartre: the action of engaging with the world or committing oneself to a social or political cause" ("commitment" 7b.). The issue with using the term commitment over position-taking, then, is that it erroneously emphasizes a Sartrean existentialism which Bourdieu intentionally disavowed and removes the rich meaning embedded in the original term which incarnated the way in which his theory was developed as a synthesis of the aforementioned agency/structure debate, and which a more direct translation would have highlighted more clearly.

Equally, career has been defined by the *OED* as "[a] person's course or progress through life" ("career" 5a.), a definition which can be shown once again to conflict with Bourdieu's preferred term: trajectory. From Latin, the etymology indicates its origin in the natural sciences and later applied figuratively, to express "[t]he path of any body moving under the action of given forces" (*OED*, "trajectory" B1a. and B1b.). While career highlights the individual's course through life, in some senses disregarding external factors or forces at play, trajectory on the other hand once again captures and emphasizes these structural factors while acknowledging the individual subject, here the author. This is apparent in a number of passages in which trajectory would have been a superior translation more consistent with the deeper structural emphasis Casanova was making, for example:

Generally speaking, one can point to some feature of every writer's *career*—important, to be sure, but nonetheless secondary—that conceals the structural pattern of literary domination (*World Republic* 42).

They are not clear-cut choices, but rather a series of possibilities that are dependent on political and literary constraints and on the development of a writer's *career* (which is to say the degree of national and international recognition his work enjoys) (*World Republic* 267).

Each of their *careers* poses, in an exemplary way, the question of how literary universality is manufactured (*World Republic* 354).

DeBevoise, nevertheless, did acknowledge this potential misreading in a translator's note in which he explains his avoidance of a literal rendering of *trajectoire* and expresses his hope it will be interpreted "in keeping with the root sense of the English word and with the author's (Casanova's) own conceptions, [as] the path and passage of a writer through literary space and literary time" (*World Republic* 402). Nevertheless, in perhaps opting for a more readable approach, the English translation of the Bourdieusian concepts⁷ in *The World Republic of Letters* inadvertently obscures Casanova's Bourdieusian terminology and, to a certain extent, exposes the text to interpretations in conflict with both Casanova and Bourdieu's thought.

4. Casanova's position-taking in the field of world literature

In his seminal work *The Rules of Art*, Bourdieu had proposed that literature did not require a separate form of analysis (as it was then in the French scholarly space) and therein applied his sociological theory of fields to art and literature. In the same way Casanova also developed her own international literary criticism by building on Bourdieu's sociological theory of fields and Fernand Braudel's *économie-monde* economic model. In fact, in the author study *Kafka, Angry Poet*, we gain further insights into how Casanova sees her own literary criticism as striving toward becoming a "fully fledged social science" which functions at the "intersection of history, sociology (as developed by Pierre Bourdieu) and textual criticism" (7), similar to Bourdieu's vision. It is with these theoretical foundations that Casanova sets the parameters of her own approach responding to and positioning her work in respect to the *nouvelle critique* (and by extension, the American New Critics), historicism, postcolonial criticism, as well as national literary criticism. As will be seen—or as any reader familiar with Casanova's rather negative academic reception—this unique position-taking would not be without its problems, perhaps due in part to the direct critiques it advanced against widely established schools and methodologies.

7 It is worth noting that position-taking and trajectory are the preferred terms both in Susan Emanuel's English translation of Bourdieu's *The Rules of Art* with Polity Press, as well as used widely in scholarship on Bourdieu.

In *The World Republic of Letters* Pascale Casanova reads Henry James' short story "The Figure in the Carpet" as a veiled criticism of the enduring critical assumption that every work of literary fiction is a sudden and inexplicable expression of artistic creativity (2). In the story, the character of the critic holds the view that texts are somehow autonomous from the world (and in extreme cases from each other and even the author themselves) and any attempt at tracing dependence, influence or connection with these external factors is an impossible task. Later in her book, Casanova critiques Roland Barthes for holding this exact view in his 1960 essay "Histoire et littérature" ["History and Literature"], when he claims the irreconcilability of the two: "[o]n the one hand the world, with its profusion of facts, political, social, economic, ideological; and on the other the work, apparently solitary, always ambiguous, since it lends itself to several meanings at the same time" (524)⁸. Barthes here is in clear unison with earlier sceptics of the American New Criticism, namely Wimsatt and Beardsley, in their critique of historicist's reliance on "external evidence", and their view that it held little bearing on the close reading of texts (477). In their criticism of what they called the "intentional fallacy", Wimsatt and Beardsley had claimed "that the design or intention of the author is neither available nor desirable as a standard for judging the success of a work of literary art" (468).

Conversely, and alongside Bourdieu in radically opposing this view, Casanova posits that to understand an author's work one must consider the whole of the figure in the carpet or, that is, the complex and apparently disordered pattern and structure of, for instance, a Persian rug, her analogy for world literary space. It is from this standpoint that Casanova lays out a "new tool for reading" the texts themselves ("Literature as a World" 73), or a "new hermeneutic logic" (*World Republic* 352) to literary analysis which is both literary *and* historical, and which constantly passes "back and forth between the microscopic and the macroscopic, between the individual writer and the vast literary world" (*World Republic* 352). In a sense then, Casanova attempts to achieve, similarly to Bourdieu's passing between micro-textual analysis and macro-social analysis, a mutually informing harmony between external and internal levels of analysis in response to Barthes' apparent antinomy and the New Critics' claims against historicism.

Equally, Casanova critiques and positions her approach in respect to the excesses and limitations of more historically and politically grounded approaches to literature such as historicism and postcolonial criticism. She warns of the excess of certain historicists who fall into the trap of "the illusion of immediate understanding" in approaching

8 «[D]'une part le monde, son foisonnement de faits, politiques, sociaux, économiques, idéologiques ; d'autre part l'œuvre, d'apparence solitaire, toujours ambiguë puisqu'elle se prête à *la fois* à plusieurs significations» (Barthes 524). In the text I have cited the English translation from *The World Republic of Letters* (349).

texts through external material or an author's biography (*Kafka* 9), or that "external criticism, which describes the historical conditions under which texts are produced, without, however, accounting for their literary quality and singularity" (*World Republic* 4-5). Yet, while acknowledging that some efforts in this task of establishing links between these seemingly irreconcilable worlds has been made by postcolonial criticism, Casanova critiques the postcolonialist's primarily political basis and tendency to emphasise external criticism as failures to account for the very literary elements (aesthetic, formal, and stylistic) that also connect the two worlds. Again, like Bourdieu, Casanova's model rather than reifying political, historical, and economic explanations in literary criticism, posits the relative autonomy of the literature-world from the politico-economic world and argues for a complex understanding of the former without reducing it to the latter.

Lastly, Casanova explicitly critiques the "nationalization" of literatures and literary histories, distancing these approaches to her own "international literary criticism" (*World Republic* xi, 5). This is where the development from Bourdieu's analysis of the French cultural field in *Les règles* is most apparent. If for Bourdieu this "Persian rug" would have required a detailed explication of the field of power and the field of cultural production at a strictly national level, Casanova's development was to establish an international literary criticism, a "*mondialisation* of Bourdieu's cultural maps" as James F. English put it (364). To continue with her metaphor, then, the Persian rug for Casanova is world literary space, and the critic's task is to approach works, authors, and contexts through "a non-national history of strictly literary events, of the rivalries and competitions, the subversions and conservative reactions, the revolts and revolutions that have taken place in this invisible world" (*World Republic* xii). Unsurprisingly, then, in the period when scholars were worlding and globalising their approaches in the 1990s and when "renewed interest in world literature took off", "Casanova was somewhat involuntarily dragged into this field" alongside Franco Moretti and David Damrosch as the proponents of a new turn in world literature theories and methodologies (Thomsen 212).

While ambivalent towards a criticism restricted exclusively to the national field, Casanova does not do away with the national space in her model. Instead, Casanova acknowledges that

contrary to what economistic views of globalization would have us believe— international struggles take place and have their effects principally within national spaces; battles over the definition of literature, over technical or formal transformations and innovations, on the whole have national literary spaces as their arena ("Literature as a World" 81).

The national literary space is an essential level of analysis for Casanova's model—to deny it would be counterfactual—however, the separate and divided analysis of nation-

al literatures which arose out of the historical emergence of world literary space, represents to Casanova a form of critical astigmatism (“Literature as a World” 78). Necessary then is an understanding of the whole, the structure and dynamics of world literary space, which allows for a more complete understanding of the international or transnational trajectories, interventions, and the recognition of literatures and what norms and prejudices inform that recognition (“Literature as a World” 78-79). It requires not only an awareness of the author’s position within their space, but also the positioning of that space within the fabric of the literature-world. Hence it is unsurprising that her two major author studies would focus on authors who lived transnational lives, between nations, languages, and literature: *Samuel Beckett: Anatomy of a Literary Revolution* and *Kafka, Angry Poet*.

5. *Illusio à la Casanova*

For Casanova, the literature-world is not solely spatial, but also has a “‘tempo’ peculiar to literature” (*World Republic* 4), something she called the literary Greenwich meridian (*World Literature* 87). Similar to Greenwich Mean Time, the arbitrary line in relation to which all time zones are measured and which organises the “real” world, the Greenwich meridian of literature determines literary modernity and orders world literary space according to this standard (*World Republic* 88). This concept was strongly critiqued, (mis)understood as Casanova’s imposition of the centre’s self-aggrandisement and devaluation of all literatures which fell beyond its sphere of influence, allowing such “hierarchies to determine the qualitative worth of whole swathes of literary fields” (Ganguly 257). However, when understood as part of a global *illusio* described rather than necessarily inscribed by Casanova, then the literary Greenwich meridian can be considered as part and parcel of the literature-world’s structural hierarchy and inequality. This literary Greenwich meridian exists both in thought, through the *illusio* regarding what represents the global modern or the “world” which writers embody and project, and in things, as it constitutes and transforms literary production through structural relations to the rest of world literary space.

This plays itself out in various ways. Firstly, the very structure of world literary space is theorised by Casanova as an *illusio*, that is, as both real and imagined:

[I]terary space in all its forms—texts, juries, editors, critics, writers, theorists, scholars—exist twice over: once in things and once in thought; that is, in the set of beliefs produced by these material relations and internalized by the players in literature’s Great Game (“Literature as a World” 82).

That is to say that the literary world is not solely made up of texts and stories, but of people, their opinions, discourses, valorisations, and beliefs also. Literary value is not an inherent quality nor can it be measured according to the standards of other *illusios*, be it the scientific, the economic, or even the common sense. For Bourdieu, as for Casanova, what is perceived as the “inherent” symbolic capital, prestige, or value of an artwork—oftentimes in respect to the canon described as the universal or timeless quality, as André Malraux might put it—, are in fact the *products* of the literary game grounded in its very own collective belief or *illusio*. At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century Paris was without doubt an epicentre of artistic innovation and experimentation, something which was both a reality and an *illusio*, and like a self-fulfilling prophesy drew so many writers to Paris further confirming and contributing to its prestige and authority to define the literary Greenwich meridian, and in turn further fuelling the *illusio*. Much the same has occurred in other literary capitals such as Barcelona, especially for Latin American authors during the second half of the twentieth century, and increasingly now in New York.

Despite literary capital being associated with nations, it is also associated with language, and consequently *illusios* also pervade conceptions of linguistic hierarchies. When measuring the dominance of a language Casanova draws on political sociologist Abram de Swaan, who posited that the more polyglots who spoke the language the more central the language was on a global scale. Adapting this analysis to the literary world, Casanova insists the literary dominance of a language is not best measured by the number of writers or readers it has, but based on the number of “cosmopolitan intermediaries” such as publishers, editors, critics, translators, who circulate texts into languages and out of them (*World Republic* 21) and is dependent on a “professional milieu” of cultivated publics and press, a competitive publishing industry, and an interested and literate bourgeoisie (*World Republic* 15). As Casanova stressed in her article “What is a Dominant Language?”, the inequality between languages is not absolute but practical and can be explained, in part, due to the *illusio* generated around prestigious languages:

“Prestige” comes from the Latin praestigium, meaning, according to Larousse, “imposture, illusio,” or “illusio produced by magic or a spell,” thus “ascendancy, enticement, attraction, charm. It is a sort of power based on illusion”. It becomes clear that all world languages have been affected by this difference [...] There is a dominant language if (and only if) speakers believe in the difference (379-80)⁹.

9 Italics in the original.

The literariness of a language and the value of translation into certain languages over others is also, thus for Casanova, also regulated and realised by the literary *illusio*.

Despite these complex assessments, Casanova's attempt to provide a totalising or universalised theory of world literature received ample criticism for the unwittingly European and French purview of her theorisations (Guerrero; Ette). For the new French edition of *La République mondiale des lettres* in 2008, Casanova offered a *mea culpa*, acknowledging her own critical ethnocentrism:

I now take account of the fact that I was—and how could I have hoped to escape being?—a pure product of the very structure I had described. I would say that I was spontaneously and decisively inclined, by the mere fact of my French identity, to mix myself up in matters of literary universals (“Preface” 172).

The truth is, the extent to which a critic is capable of distancing themselves from their socio-cultural origins, and the culturally specific *illusios* conditioned therein, is obviously questionable, putting into doubt any proposal which seeks to offer a perspective from the world or so-called “objective” analysis. What *is* within the power of the critic, however, are methods of self-reflexivity, peer evaluation and critique, and developed theories and methodologies capable of development, adaptation, and growth, all concepts apparent in Casanova's theory and methodology as they are in Pierre Bourdieu's.

These critiques nevertheless provide a useful corrective to Casanova's theorisations, part of what Bourdieu emphasised as the necessary processes of critical self-reflexivity and “epistemological vigilance” (*Homo academicus* 15): “I think that we only have a chance of achieving real communication when we objectify and master the various kinds of historical unconscious separating us, meaning the specific histories of intellectual universes which have produced our categories of perception and thought” (*Rules of Art* 344). Casanova had at least acknowledged this more broadly in her emphasis that the authority and prestige of a language, a national literature, an author, work, or the pronouncements of a critic rested upon the collective belief, or *illusio*, in its authority (*World Republic* 164-65). She did so more explicitly when she even openly critiqued Eurocentric critics who, without realising it, impose arbitrary and ethnocentric standards across the literary world:

[t]he authority of the great literary capitals is not unambiguous, however. The power to evaluate and transmute a text into literature is also, and almost inevitably, exerted according to the norms of those who judge it. It involves two things that are inseparably linked: celebration and annexation. Together they form a perfect example of what might be called Parisianization or universalization through denial of difference. The great consecrating nations reduce foreign works of literature to their own categories of perception, which they mistake for universal norms, while neglecting all the elements of historical,

cultural, political, and especially literary context that make it possible to properly and fully appreciate such works (*World Republic* 154).

While the irony is lost on Casanova at the time of making these pronouncements, and the hypocrisy acknowledged and absolved to a certain extent through her *mea culpa*, it ought to be recognized, nevertheless, that while the term *illusio* is almost completely absent from Casanova's critical *oeuvre*, there are evident traces that it has underpinned core elements of her theorisation, not least her critical methodology which is underpinned by critical self-assessment, even when this evidently a very difficult task. Uncovering both the way in which *illusio* as a theoretical concept and the practice of scholarly reflexivity as a methodology not only further highlights the Bourdieusian underpinnings to Casanova's *oeuvre*, but should cause us to question the rather Manichean characterisation of Casanova fixed by her mostly negative reception.

6. *Habitus à la Casanova*

Habitus is another term which does not appear throughout Casanova's *The World Republic of Letters* and which nevertheless can be uncovered in aspects of her analysis in this book as well as elsewhere (such as in *Kafka, Angry Poet*) where this Bourdieusian concept emerges as a significant part of her own theorisation.

According to Casanova's model writers are agents within the competitive and antagonistic world literary structure and can be varyingly classified according to the kind of national space they inhabit and their responses to their unique contexts. For Casanova there is a structural homology that underpins this antagonism and competition from the macro to the micro level, from the vast literary world, down to the national field, and even embodied in authors' *habitus*:

The internal configuration of each national space precisely mirrors the structure of the international literary world as a whole. Just as the global space is organized with reference to a literary and cosmopolitan pole, on the one side, and a political and national pole on the other, each of its constituent spaces is structured by the rivalry between what I shall call "national" writers (who embody a national or popular definition of literature) and "international" writers (who uphold an autonomous conception of literature) (*World Republic* 108).

That is to say, the structure of the literary field, the *illusios* reigning and emerging, as well as authors' *habitus*—"embodied" responses to these approaches as James English has noted (367)—all contribute to cultural production as well as the literary game itself. For example, national writers valorise a national conception of literature (local aesthetics

and norms or out-dated forms) which contributes to the closing-in of their national literary space. This national pole is conceived by Casanova as at once a global centrifugal force directed towards the division of literatures along essentialised national(istic) differences, as well as a force internal to a national field by which a self-enclosed national literary space can be conceived, demarcated, and sustained (*World Republic* 108-9).

This antagonistic relation described by Casanova arises rather directly from Bourdieu's own argument that "[t]he literary or artistic field is a *field of forces*, but it is also a *field of struggles* tending to transform or conserve this field of forces" (*Field of Cultural Production* 30). This governing quasi-Darwinian outlook, not to mention her appropriation of Bourdieu's conceptualisation of autonomous and heteronomous writers for her division between international and national writers, once again continue to emphasise the Bourdieusian reading.

Yet, despite this apparently simple and bipolar introduction, Casanova nuances and bifurcates her definition of these authorial *habitus*. In continuing the example above, the situation is altogether different in dominated literary spaces of the global periphery where the "national" writer is paradoxically—according to Casanova—working for the independence of their national space by carving out its own distinctive literary and cultural identity (*World Republic* 279). In this sense the national writers of a dominated space can represent the first generation of a "new" independent literary space, the "fomenters of the first literary revolts" who, by defining a unique literary space, create the possibilities of conformity with this tradition, *à la* national writers, or revolt, as is the case with international writers (*World Republic* 327).

More broadly, and opposed to this national pole, are those who Casanova denotes as "international" writers who valorise an autonomous conception of literature unencumbered by national concerns, are open to foreign dialogue, and are the seekers of artistic modernity (*World Republic* 108, 280). It is within this division that Casanova details three distinct authorial typologies or, as I argue, *habitus*: assimilation, differentiation, and revolution.

Assimilation is an option for writers from predominantly literarily impoverished regions who instead of contributing to the creation of their own national space choose to assimilate themselves into a more dominant space by writing in another language or self-translating (*World Republic* 207)¹⁰.

10 In this category of assimilationists Casanova's case studies include: V.S. Naipaul (Trinidad to England), Henri Michaux (Belgium to France), E. M. Cioran (Romania to France) and later in her specific discussion of the Irish case, George Bernard Shaw (Ireland to England).

Differentiation is the route chosen by writers who manufacture a distinctive national literary identity as a form of independence from a more dominant field, such as a past coloniser or linguistic power, and gather literary credit to enter into global literary competition on their own footing, so to speak. These writers deploy a variety of strategies including auto-ethnology (*World Republic* 223); the importing of literary metrics, expertise and techniques from closer to the Greenwich meridian of literature (*World Republic* 232); or the creation of linguistic difference through a distortion of the language (*World Republic* 284)¹¹.

The final category of writers are the *revolutionaries* who transform, renew, or destroy the literary order undermining the forms and codes accepted at the Greenwich meridian of literature and what is considered modern and defining new parameters and hierarchies in the process (*World Republic* 326). This process transforms the governing *illusio* of the literary world, in effect “altering the relations between players, the laws or rules of their game, and the nature of the stakes to be fought for” (English 366). The 20th century exemplars of this *habitus* according to Casanova were James Joyce and William Faulkner, who set new parameters and measures of literary prestige, and whose modes and styles were seized for local literary purposes across the globe. These and other international writers through their global outlook and literature strengthen the international pole, a force which Casanova considers the centripetal force that works at a global scale for the unification of world literary spatially and temporally (*World Republic* 109).

Some critics have claimed that *The World Republic of Letters* circumscribes authorial motivations to nothing more than a search for visibility, global fame, or the desire to enter the pantheon of universal literature, “as if their vision of the world would not also be deeply affected and motivated by a protest before the lived and observed injustices of his/her nations”¹² (Vidal 251), as though literariness were the only purpose of strategy of literature (Montaldo 119). It is true that Casanova focalises the majority of her study on international authors and, in particular, the literary revolutionaries for whom these criticisms may apply. It is also true that Casanova dedicates herself less to analysing the role of politics in literature or those authors who would fit into her national typology, despite it being a rather prominent if not the most common literary *habitus*. Yet, to purport

11 In this differentiationist category Casanova’s case studies include Latin American (Rubén Darío, Arturo Uslar Pietri, Alejo Carpentier, Octavio Paz, Mário de Andrade), Spanish (Juan Benet), African (Mouloud Mammeri, Mouloud Feraoun, Kateb Yacine, Daniel Olorunfemi, Ngugi wa Thiong’o), American (Gertrude Stein), Canadian (Michel Tremblay in the Québécois community) and Irish (John Millington Synge) authors.

12 “[C]omo si su visión de mundo no estuviera también profundamente marcada y motivada por la protesta ante las injusticias vividas y observadas en sus naciones y en Latinoamérica en general” (Vidal 251).

that Casanova's model reduces *all* literary interventions to strategic literary innovation and modernity is to misinterpret the fundamental Bourdieusian categorisation between heteronomous and autonomous writers which Casanova clearly develops, and unfairly assuming that her focus on international authors is a reductive conclusion rather than one aspect of her scholarly focus among many.

As such, Casanova not only draws on Pierre Bourdieu's broad categories of autonomous and heteronomous authors, but further develops this taxonomy of authorial *habitus* within her own theorisations of world literary space. The obvious limiting factor in this aspect of theorisation in *The World Republic of Letters*, however, is the vast and consequently superficial treatment of the *habitus* of the various authors which Casanova draws on to define her rough taxonomy. Casanova herself acknowledged the limited nature of her work in discussing all the literary geographies she has mapped in her world structure (*World Republic* 304). While she goes some way in remedying this vacuum with her chapter of the Irish "paradigm" (*World Republic* 304), Casanova's book-length study of Franz Kafka, *Kafka, Angry Poet*, provides a better indication of what Casanova's critical methodology, including an analysis of *habitus*, might look like. In it, Casanova explores in great depth Kafka's intellectual marginality (100), his clash with paternal authority (102), his bureaucratic career and political *habitus* (108-9), and his complicated identity as a germanised-Jew in Prague favourable to Eastern Judaism but ambivalent toward Western Zionism (112-22). These various intersecting features which make up Kafka's familial, relational, social, political, and religious identity are germane to Casanova's analysis of Kafka's literary position-taking as well as his *habitus*. As such—and in response to the above charge—given that *The World Republic of Letters* is a theoretical work intended to develop the analogy of the literature-world through the ubiquitous inductive evidence from its historical development, unification of literary spaces, its laws, *illusios*, and inequalities, and support for these through the testimony of writers from across the globe, it might be considered unreasonable for critics to expect highly detailed and deep analyses of specific authors of all schools.

7. Conclusion

While not pretending to be an exhaustive analysis, this paper has shown how and the extent to which Casanova has both based and developed her theorisation and literary methodology on Bourdieu's. While to date connections back to Bourdieu have been identified mostly in relation to Casanova's expansion of Bourdieu's field theory to a global scale, this paper has shown there are many more deep and implied

connections to be drawn and which are indeed necessary to fully grasp Casanova's theoretical proposal.

This is evident in an explicit sense through Casanova's borrowing of a considerable number of Bourdieu's most seminal concepts—such as field, symbolic and literary capital, as well as the concepts of autonomy and heteronomy in the cultural field—even when at times they have been obscured in translation. But this paper also sheds light on Bourdieusian terms left mostly unnamed yet fundamental throughout Casanova's critical *oeuvre*, namely *illusio* and *habitus*.

Illusio permeates Casanova's entire conceptualisation of world literary space: governing the notion of literariness; determining the power and prestige and symbolic capital of certain texts, authors, languages, and nations over others; and establishing and perpetuating the Greenwich meridian of literature. In a self-reflexive gesture, Casanova also acknowledged the influence of the *illusio* in the predisposition of scholars of the most dominant spaces to ethnocentric critique. Her underscoring of epistemological vigilance in this respect is enough to revise the charge laid against her by critics who invariably misread her account in *The World Republic of Letters* as privileged naïveté or Gallocentric ideology and to stress the importance of a Bourdieusian reading to fully grasp Casanova's theoretical proposal.

Habitus was yet another unnamed Bourdieusian term which Casanova draws on in a number of her studies, from her broad authorial typologies expounded in *The World Republic of Letters*, to her more complex and detailed analysis of the various dimensions to Franz Kafka's *habitus* in her sole author study. This concept was also shown to be at work in her back and forth micro-/macroanalysis of the competition, antagonism, and struggle evident at all levels of her structural homology: from the vast literary world to the national field and in the author's mind as well as in their literature.

And lastly, there are those deeper and perhaps more fundamental epistemological similarities, such as Bourdieu and Casanova's joint disputation with other competing schools of thought (such as the post-structuralists and New Critics). Yet here it can be said that Casanova has also broken new ground in differentiating her approach from national literary scholarship (including Bourdieu's) and postcolonial criticism. In a less overt sense what is also clear is that in terms of methodology the apple really hasn't fallen far from the tree, so to speak, in that Casanova similarly creates a generative model emulating Bourdieu's own hermeneutic circle. There is, thus, a unity of approach both in their work as "amphibious" critics working at the nexus of history, sociology, and literature, as well as in their development of theoretical models designed to grow and develop through concrete praxis and through indispensable processes of critical reflexivity.

Bibliography

- Barthes, Roland. "Histoire et littérature : à propos de Racine". *Annales, Economies, sociétés, civilisations*, vol. 15, no. 3, 1960, pp. 524-37.
- _____. "Death of the Author". Translated by Richard Howard. *Literary Theory. An Anthology*, 3rd edition, Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan (eds.), Hoboken, John Wiley and Sons Limited, 1986, pp. 518-21.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Structuralism and Theory of Sociological Knowledge". Translated by Angela Zanotti-Karp. *Social Research*, vol. 35, no. 4, 1968, pp. 681-706.
- _____. *Homo academicus*. Translated by Peter Collier. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1988.
- _____. *Les règles de l'art*. Paris, Seuil, 1992.
- _____. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Edited by Randal Johnson. Cambridge, Polity Press, 1993.
- _____. *The Rules of Art. Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Translated by Susan Emanuel. Cambridge, Polity Press, 2017.
- Casanova, Pascale. *La République mondiale des lettres*. Paris, Seuil, 1999.
- _____. "Literature as a World". *New Left Review*, vol. 3, no. January/February, 2005, pp. 71-90.
- _____. *Samuel Beckett. Anatomy of a Literary Revolution*. Translated by Gregory Elliott. London, Verso, 2006.
- _____. *The World Republic of Letters*. Translated by M.B. DeBevoise. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2007.
- _____. "What Is a Dominant Language? Giacomo Leopardi: Theoretician of Linguistic Inequality". Translated by Marlon Jones. *New Literary History*, vol. 44, 2013, pp. 379-99.
- _____. *Kafka, Angry Poet*. Translated by Chris Turner. London, Seagull Books, 2015.
- _____. "Preface to the 2008 Edition of *La République mondiale des lettres*". *Journal of World Literature*, vol. 5, 2020, pp. 169-173.
- Damrosch, David. "World Literature in Theory and Practice". *World Literature in Theory*, David Damrosch (ed.), London, John Wiley & Sons, 2013, pp. 1-11.
- Eagleton, Terry. "The empire writes back. Should the literary realm be seen as its own republic, complete with frontiers, legislators and rivalries? Yes, according to a bold new theory. Terry Eagleton applauds a milestone in the history of modern thought". *New Statesman*, 11 April 2005, vol. 134, no. 4735, pp. 50-51.

- English, James F. "Cultural Capital and the Revolutions of Literary Modernity, from Bourdieu to Casanova". *A Handbook of Modernism Studies*, Jean-Michel Rabaté (ed.), London, John Wiley & Sons, 2013, pp. 363-77.
- Ette, Ottmar. "Desde la filología de la literatura mundial hacia una polilógica filología de las literaturas del mundo". *América Latina y la literatura mundial; mercado editorial, redes globales y la invención de un continente*, Gesine Müller and Dunia Gras Miravet (eds.), Madrid, Iberoamericana Vervuert, 2015, pp. 323-367.
- Franco, Jean. "Nunca son pesadas/las cosas que por agua están pasadas". *América Latina en la "literatura mundial"*, Ignacio Sánchez Prado (ed.), Pittsburgh, Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana, 2006, pp. 183-95.
- Ganguly, Debjani. "Global literary refractions: Reading Pascale Casanova's *The World Republic of Letters* in the post-Cold War era". *English Academy Review*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2012, pp. 249-64.
- Guerrero, Gustavo. "The French Connection: Pascale Casanova, la literatura latinoamericana y la República mundial de las Letras". *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana*, vol. 39, no. 78, 2013, pp. 109-21.
- Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar. *Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts*. Beverly Hills, Sage, 1979.
- Montaldo, Graciela. *Zonas Ciegas. Populismo y experimentos culturales en Argentina*. Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2010.
- Oxford English Dictionary*, "career, n." 5a, Oxford University Press, 2019. www.oed.com/view/Entry/27911, accessed 6 November 2021.
- _____. "commitment, n." 7a and 7b, Oxford University Press, 2019. www.oed.com/view/Entry/37161, accessed 6 November 2021.
- _____. "trajectory, n." B1a and B1b, Oxford University Press, March 2019. www.oed.com/view/Entry/204477, accessed 6 November 2020.
- Perus, Françoise. "La literatura latinoamericana ante *La República mundial de las Letras*". *América Latina en la "literatura mundial"*, Ignacio Sánchez Prado (ed.), Pittsburgh, Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana, 2006, pp. 147-81.
- Poblete, Juan. "Globalización, mediación cultural y literatura nacional". *América Latina en la "literatura mundial"*, Ignacio Sánchez Prado (ed.), Pittsburgh, Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana, 2006, pp. 271-305.
- Prendergast, Christopher. "The World Republic of Letters". *Debating World Literature*, Christopher Prendergast (ed.), London, Verso, 2004, pp. 1-25.

Sánchez Prado, Ignacio M. “‘Hijos de Metapa’: un recorrido conceptual de la literatura mundial (a manera de introducción)”. *América Latina en la “literatura mundial”*, Ignacio Sánchez Prado (ed.), Pittsburgh, Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana, 2006, pp. 7-46.

Speller, John R.W. *Bourdieu and Literature*. Cambridge, Open Book Publishers, 2011.

Swartz, David. *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Thomsen, Mads Rosendahl. “Heralded Heroes”. *Journal of World Literature*, vol. 5, 2020, pp. 211-21.

Vidal, Hernán. “Derechos humanos y estudios literarios/culturales latinoamericanistas: perfil gnóstico para una hermenéutica posible (en torno a la propuesta de Pascale Casanova)”. *América Latina en la “literature mundial”*, Ignacio Sánchez Prado (ed.), Pittsburgh, Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana, 2006, pp. 213-54.

Wimsatt, W. K. and M. C. Beardsley. “The Intentional Fallacy”. *The Sewanee Review*, Vol. 54, No. 3, 1946, pp. 468-88.