Šebek, Josef

Social space, physical space, representation of space: spatiality and Bourdieu's theory of the literary field

ÜBERLEGUNGEN ZU MEHRSPRACHIGEN LITERARISCHEN FELDERN

Social Space, Physical Space, Representation of Space: Spatiality and Bourdieu's Theory of the Literary Field

Josef Šebek

Abstract

In this paper the author analyses the forms of space in Pierre Bourdieu's field theory, looking in particular at the way they relate to one another and at the spatial aspects of the literary field in his book *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. The first of these forms is what Bourdieu calls the "social space" and "social field", each of these referring to a structure of positions that exists objectively yet does not exist (primarily) in physical space or real (physical) interactions between social agents. In order to make this structure intelligible, Bourdieu creates various spatial schemata that range from simple diagrams to sophisticated visualisations based on multiple correspondence analysis. The relationship between this structure and physical/geographical space is a complicated matter, since relations in the social space or social fields will not necessarily coincide with actual spatial distances or proximities. Nevertheless, Bourdieu demonstrates – especially in the last period of his career – that it is necessary to study the relations among agents and the objectified forms of capital as they play out *within* physical/geographical space. The last part of the paper deals with the complicated relations of the three spatial aspects of Bourdieu's field theory as they are applied to the literary field. In this respect, the most interesting part of *The Rules of Art* is the "Prologue". In the rest of the book, spaces that are characteristically physical, such as salons and cafés, give way to non-spatial aspects of the literary field, above all literary texts, which Bourdieu conceives of as a privileged form of "position-taking" on the part of social agents.

> [N]*othing is more difficult than to escape reified social space in order to think it*, especially in its relation to social space. And this is all the more true given that social space is, as such, predisposed to being visualized in the form of spatial schemata and that the language most commonly used to talk about it is loaded with metaphors borrowed from physical space.
>
> (Bourdieu 2018: 108)

The term "social field", one of the core concepts of Pierre Bourdieu's theory of practice, has distinct spatial implications: as a segment of social space, a social field is undoubtedly "located". Moreover, Bourdieu uses spatial schemata to represent social space as well as particular social fields. Yet a social field can be identified neither with the geographical location of its agents and objectified forms of capital nor with the spatial schemata that allow us to visualise them. Things get even more complex when we look to the mutual relations among different fields, their position vis-à-vis the field of power, and the way in which several social fields can "share" the same geographical habitat. However vast the theoretical terrain, my aim in this paper is relatively modest. First, I will try to elucidate the interrelations of the three basic spatial aspects of Bourdieu's field theory: the social space/field, visual representations of the social space/field, and physical or geographical space. Then, in a brief analysis, I will show how Bourdieu engages these spatial aspects in his theory of the literary field.

The relationship between Bourdieu's theory of social practice and physical or geographical space is a complicated matter. As commentators have shown, social practice is strongly associated with particular spaces and spatial patterns in Bourdieu's ethnological research during the 1960s on Kabylia and his native region of Béarn (Painter 2000: 253; Savage 2011: 512–513; Lebaron – Le Roux 2013: 108; Wacquant 2018: 92–97). For instance, according to Bourdieu, traditional Kabyle houses involve spatial patterns – in the way they are built and furnished as well as in the way they are used – that are homologous to the structure of social relations and the habitus of the Kabyle people (Bourdieu 1977: 90–91). Later, when Bourdieu was elaborating his theory of social fields, his attention shifted away from physical and geographical space towards the more abstract – yet objectively existing – social space (see section 1). The relations in the social space that matter are not immediately observable in the interactions among social agents, and do not necessarily translate into relations in physical space. Nevertheless, his seminal works from the 1970s and 1980s contain remarkable passages on the connection between social and physical space, as well as concrete analyses of their homologies (see section 3). In the 1990s Bourdieu turned once more to the power dynamics that plays out in physical space and its relationship to social space and social fields (cf. Savage 2011; Hanquinet – Savage – Callier 2012; see section 3).

1. Social Space and Social Field

Any attempt to understand spatial aspects of the social field must begin with the questions: Where does the social field exist? Is it an objectively existing entity? And if so, what

kind of entity it is? According to Bourdieu, a social field is a semi-autonomous segment of the social space. This immediately brings us to another set of intricate problems: What is the relation of the field to the social space? How are different social fields in the same social space – which Bourdieu typically defines along national lines – related to one another? How are social fields further divided into subfields? For the purposes of the present argument, however, we may simply observe that the mode of existence of the social field is the same as that of the social space, so that the most appropriate general answer to our initial questions is that social space and social fields exist objectively but cannot be directly identified with physical or geographical spaces, nor with the interactions of social agents or their specific points of view. They are spaces of positions defined by their mutual relations. As Bourdieu succinctly puts it in an early text on "some properties of fields":

> Fields present themselves synchronically as structured spaces of positions (or posts) whose properties depend on their position within these spaces and which can be analysed independently of the characteristics of their occupants (which are partly determined by them). (Bourdieu 1993: 72)

A more complex definition from the book *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* draws attention to the relationship between the social space, its representation, and physical/geographical space:

> The mere fact that the social space described here can be presented as a diagram indicates that it is an abstract representation, deliberately constructed, like a map, to give a bird's-eye view, a point of view on the whole set of points from which ordinary agents (including the sociologist and his reader, in their ordinary behaviour) see the social world. Bringing together in simultaneity, in the scope of a single glance – this is its heuristic value – positions which the agents can never apprehend in their totality and in their multiple relationships, social space is to the practical space of everyday life, with its distances which are kept or signalled, and neighbours who may be more remote than strangers, what geometrical space is to the "travelling space" [...] of ordinary experience, with its gaps and discontinuities. (Bourdieu 1984: 169)

According to Bourdieu, the space of positions exists objectively; it is a structure apprehended by social agents endowed with the appropriate habitus and *illusio* – the same motivation to "play the game". Positions in the field are "adopted" or "enacted" by agents, and the social field is structured by various forms of capital (principally economic, cultural, social, and symbolic; cf. Bourdieu 1997). These forms exist in an embodied as well as objectified state. In the objectified state, they entail an aspect of the physical space and geography (e.g. living in a neighbourhood; see section 3).

Having briefly addressed the ontological question, we must ask a question of a more epistemological nature: How can social spaces and social fields be known? As suggested by the passage quoted above, there are two basic kinds of knowledge: the practical knowledge of the social agent and theoretical knowledge of the scholar. The first tends

to treat the social field as a "field of struggles", where knowledge is a practical necessity in the context of maintaining one's position (whether this involves preserving a sum of capital already appropriated or increasing it). The scholar, by contrast, tends to see it rather as a "field of forces": a structure that can be studied and visualised (Bourdieu 2020: 211–213).

While social agents are certainly capable of meditating on their behaviour or the behaviour of others, or even on the structure of positions in the field, they are more likely simply to *act* in the field, adopting positions on the basis of their dispositions, their accumulation of capital, and the positions available to them. Their understanding of the social space and a particular social field can be profound, yet it is practical in its nature and limited in each case to an individual point of view. The agent approaches the social world not as a thing to be contemplated but as a world in which to live and act.

The field is never as transparent to an agent as it may be to a scholar, who strives to see it from the "bird eye's view", i.e., to identify actual positions available in a field, work out their relations, and eventually make it intelligible through a visual schema. This attitude, however, is also deeply problematic, since the scholar tends to impute to social agents his or her own distanced way of looking at the social world, a perspective firmly rooted in the peculiar conditions of the "scholastic point of view". We see this tendency most clearly, for instance, in the presupposition that practice is governed not by social agents' strategies and improvisations but by sets of rational rules (see Bourdieu 2000: 1–84). Analysis of the character of a particular field, its stakes, and the behaviour of its agents thus tends to be biased. In order to theoretically understand social practice, it is therefore necessary to keep in mind the difference between these two perspectives, practical and "scholastic", which requires in turn the introduction of scientific reflexivity. Bourdieu dedicates much of his theoretical effort to describing the mechanism of the "objectification" of the scholarly point of view along these lines (cf. Bourdieu 2000: 118–122; Bourdieu 2004: 85–114).

Moreover, the social field is not a mimetic concept but a heuristic tool created to help analyse and interpret the social world (cf. Thomson 2008: 74). We may find this distinction rather difficult to grasp, given that Bourdieu goes to some length to emphasise that the social field exists "objectively" – all the while warning that one must not mistake "the model of reality [for] the reality of the model" (Bourdieu 1990a: 39). The field exists "objectively" primarily in the perception of the agents since they experience the effects of the field; the "bird's eye view", however, is excluded from this experience. The scholar who reconstructs the field inevitably also constructs it, chooses the scale and granularity of analysis, and selects from a large number of possible aspects only those which will most adequately describe individual positions in the field. Julien Duval thus notes that social space and social fields are "constructed" by the scholar in the very act of analysis and that "fields or social space" are "theoretical spaces" (Duval 2013: 111; cf. ibid.: 113, 114).[1] The "bird's eye" then resides in the scholarly method itself, in the processing and

---

1   Frédéric Lebaron and Brigitte Le Roux similarly maintain: "To *construct* a field, from the point of view of empirical sociology, consists in geometrically modelling the 'social distances' between individuals, using Euclidean distance as a measure" (Lebaron – Le Roux 2013: 108; emphasis added).

visualisation of data and its results, always based on prior hypotheses about the nature of the social space.

2. Spatial Representations of Social Space and Social Fields

The field as well as the whole social space can be – or rather *must* be – visualised, schematically captured, but this visualisation depends entirely on the particular aspects selected for a given study. It is impossible to directly grasp the social field as an "objective structure" (Bourdieu 2020: 248); it can only be verbally described or visually represented. According to Frédéric Lebaron and Brigitte Le Roux, Bourdieu's concept of the social field is itself "closely related to the practice of empirical research and, more specifically, to a particularly original use of the statistical instruments at hand when Pierre Bourdieu made it the central aspect of his theoretical edifice" (Lebaron – Le Roux 2013: 107). In developing his field theory, Bourdieu was influenced by methods of statistical data analysis that had been greatly improved in the course of the 1960s (especially with regard to techniques developed by Jean-Paul Benzécri), not only on the plane of the graphic "interface" but also on the more theoretical level (ibid.). Lebaron and Le Roux aptly summarise the objectives of the methods adopted by Bourdieu:

> It must make possible, in the first phase, an operationalisation of the different fundamental dimensions of social space – that is, the different kinds of capital, economic, cultural, social, and symbolic; the phase that follows consists of combining them in order to obtain a geometrical modelling of the data, which is also a summary of the whole set of social regularities. The horizon of this application is the study of the global social space and the sub-spaces that constitute it (the fields, the most important of these being the field of power). (ibid.: 108)

Among Bourdieu's methods of visualisation we find various alternatives, from basic schemata of the social space and the social field to point clouds produced by multiple correspondence analysis (MCA). The basic diagram of social space and social fields as such presents a strong theoretical hypothesis. In the conventional visualisation, the diagram consists in a vertical axis representing the total amount of capital (the amount increases going upward), and a horizontal axis representing the opposition between economic capital (right) and cultural capital (left). The principal hypothesis is that it is the type and amount of capital that is decisive for a position in the social space or in a given field; the model must also take into account mutual conversions of individual forms of capital (cf. Bourdieu 1997: 53–55). The value of the axes can be modified to suit particular fields: in the literary field, for example, the vertical axis can represent the degree of consecration of social agents in the field as it relates to their "social age" (Bourdieu 1995: 122).

A further methodological step in the visual representation of the field is the MCA, which introduces a point cloud of positions into this general schema of the social space or of a particular social field. Bourdieu uses this method in *Distinction* and other works, developing its most advanced version – according to Lebaron and Le Roux (2013: 109)

– in his article on the field of French publishing houses (Bourdieu 1999b). Preparation of data for the MCA is critical, and to select particular factors is "to ask what characteristics are effective in the field" (Duval 2013: 114). Moreover, different scholars may select different factors for the same field (ibid.). This invariably leads to a situation in which the adoption of hypotheses, creation of models, and selection of data all tend to influence the results of the MCA and vice versa, suggesting a circular relationship between methods and results: "The structure of a field can emerge exclusively from the set of data constructed specifically for this purpose and already with reference to the notion of the field" (ibid.: 115).

Interestingly, Bourdieu compares the diagrams produced by the MCA to geographical maps (Bourdieu 1984: 169 – see the quotation is section 1; cf. Duval 2013: 118). In considering such a comparison we may observe that while a geographical map represents actual physical space, it also allows us to visualise various aspects that cannot be grasped in situ, and to this extent can be said to "construct" a place. The panoramic point of view presented by a geographical map significantly differs, for example, from that of a photo of the same physical space. There is also an important difference, however, between the map and Bourdieu's diagrams, insofar as neither social space nor social fields exist in any directly physical sense. Rather, these can only be grasped theoretically, by way of the kinds of sociological methods we have been discussing here (as opposed to the "practical" perception of an agent *as part* of the social space or field; see above).

The diagrams resulting from the MCA must always be brought back not only to the question of the selection and preparation of data, but also to the problem of what can and cannot be represented. As Julien Duval so aptly points out, individual agents will inevitably be reduced to just a couple of aspects, though this can be partially remedied by combining the MCA with qualitative methods, such as interviews (Duval 2013: 119). For the MCA it is also particularly difficult to grasp the temporal aspect of the development of the social space or the social field (ibid.: 122).

Both the basic diagrams and the MCA are scholarly tools: ways of representing and "mapping". It can be said that the field as a whole, seen from the "bird's eye view", is intelligible *exclusively* through visualisations, usually combined with verbal description and explication. It is a representation of something that does not exist in physical/geographical space, although it certainly has important *relations* to it. After all, agents are embodied, situated in real space and in a physical environment, just as certain kinds of capital exist in an objectified or "materialised" state.

3. Physical and Geographical Space as a "Reification" of Social Space and Fields

As is now evident, the field does not exist physically or geographically in any literal sense. We must add, however, that it could not exist *without* the interactions between social agents that take place in physical time and space, nor without the various forms of capital that are objectified in things and places. At the same time, not *all* forms of

capital are objectified, just as not *all* interactions take place in physical space and time. Moreover, even those interactions and forms of capital that have a physical or geographical aspect could not be said to exist in any meaningful way if they did not coincide with a relevant habitus or perceptions on the part of social agents.

The concept of the social space and field was elaborated in part as an alternative to the "too obvious" spatial relations of real agents, relations which often serve only to *conceal* or make invisible structural relations that cannot be directly observed in the real situation, but which govern practice and are "taken into the game" by social agents. Two quotes will help to clarify the scope Bourdieu gives to physical space in his theory of fields:

> One can [...] compare the social space to a geographical space within which regions are divided up. But this space [i.e. the social space] is constructed in such a way that the agents, groups or institutions that find themselves situated in it have more properties in common the closer they are to each other in this space; and fewer common properties, the further they are away from each other. Spatial distances – on paper – coincide with social distances. The same is not true in real space: it is true that one can observe almost everywhere a tendency to segregation in space; people close to each other in the social space tend to be close together – by choice or necessity – in the geographical space; however, people who are very distant from each other in the social space can encounter one another, enter into interaction, at least briefly and intermittently, in physical space. The interactions, which are accepted at their face value by people of an empiricist disposition – one can observe them, film them, record them, in short they are tangible – conceal the structures that are realized in them. It's one of those cases in which the visible, that which is immediately given, conceals the invisible which determines it. One thus forgets that the truth of the interaction is never entirely to be found in interaction as it is available to observation. (Bourdieu 1990b: 127)

It is precisely this tendency on the part of physical and geographical relations to conceal the (more meaningful) interactions in social space – to shift our attention to what is problematically "evident" in the spatial context – that abstract representations of social space and fields and their schemata are meant to overcome. On the other hand, it is apparent that real spatial relations of proximity and distance, as well as "co-occurrence" and interactions between agents in the same geographical space can sometimes express the structures of the social space or field. This raises the question: Does physical space constitute a relevant factor that can help to understand social space, or is it just a secondary "reification"? In the following passage from *Distinction*, actual spatial relations add an important layer to our understanding of social space and fields:

> To account more fully for the differences in life-style between the different fractions [of society] – especially as regards culture – one would have to take account of their distribution in *socially ranked geographical space*. A group's chances of appropriating any given class of rare assets [...] depend partly on its capacity for the specific appropriation, defined by the economic, cultural and social capital it can deploy in order to appropriate materially or symbolically the assets in

question, that is, its position in social space, and partly on the relationship between its distribution in geographical space and the distribution of the scarce assets in that space. [...] In other words, a group's real social distance from certain assets must integrate the geographical distance, which itself depends on the group's spatial distribution and, more precisely, its distribution with respect to the "focal point" of economic and cultural values [...]. (Bourdieu 1984: 124)

To better understand the structures of social space we need to *map them onto* geographical space, allowing us to visualise how such factors as social distance and the relative positions of individuals and groups translate into a certain spatial distribution. We may then see how this distribution reflects variations in economic and cultural capital objectified in "scarce" things and places.

As we turn our attention to Bourdieu's late thinking on the relationship between social space and physical space, it will be helpful to consider the reception of his work in the field of spatial studies, especially in the context of social geography and urban studies. While in the past Bourdieu's work never elicited more than modest interest among geographers (Painter 2000: 246–252), there has recently been more widespread effort to understand his theory of space. Mike Savage, for example, points to Bourdieu's "shift from a more structural to a more spatialized mode of analysis in his later work" (Savage 2011: 512), and to the fact that field theory has become for him "a means of recognizing the complex interplay between social and physical space" (ibid.). That results in "a reorientation of the concept of the field, in which the properties of social space are partly inferred from the analysis of physical space, and in which [...] the relationship between the social and spatial is of greater analytical interest" (ibid.: 514). In their Bourdieusian analysis of the distribution of cultural capital in social and physical space throughout the Brussels metropolitan area, Savage and his colleagues even maintain that in *Pascalian Meditations* Bourdieu goes so far as to note "how certain properties of social space are *derived* from physical space" (Hanquinet – Savage – Callier 2012: 513; emphasis added). Although Savage contrasts Bourdieu's renewed interest in space with the spirit of his older writings, the longer passage above regarding lifestyle as a function of geographical space (from *Distinction*) is itself an indication that such considerations are not completely absent from his works of the 1970s. It should also be noted that while Bourdieu gave more attention to the relationship between social space and physical space in his writings of the 1990s, he left the role of physical space in the field theory as something of an open question and a topic for further elaboration.

Recent studies dealing with Bourdieu's understanding of the relationship between social space and physical space largely focus on his text "Site Effects", which appears as a chapter in *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society* (cf. Painter 2000; Savage 2011; Hanquinet – Savage – Callier 2012). I will now proceed to give a brief analysis of that text, including material from an earlier draft of "Site Effects" that was recently published in the English translation by Loïc Wacquant.[2] Bourdieu's point of departure is largely consistent with his older views on physical space as they are briefly

---

2   It was presented by Bourdieu in Paris in May 1991 (Bourdieu 2018: 106; cf. Wacquant 2018: 97). The original publication of the book *The Weight of the World* dates to 1993.

sketched above. It is misleading, he argues, to focus only on the appearance of physical space (the ghetto, for example, as a place of social suffering). What we need rather is a "rigorous analysis of the relations between the structures of social space and those of physical space" (Bourdieu 1999a: 123). As bodies, social agents are not ubiquitous – not "in several places at once" –, but are necessarily "situated in a site", which is to say a specific physical and geographical place (ibid.). At the same time, they exist in the more abstract but equally objective social space. According to Bourdieu, "[a]n agent's position in social space is *expressed* in the site of physical space where the agent is situated" and the "social space translates into physical space, but the translation is always more or less *blurred*" (ibid.: 124; the first emphasis added). The possession of capital in the social space translates into physical space, understood as "appropriated physical space", by way of matching agents owning high amounts of capital with "scarce" goods and services (and vice versa). The social space is thus "objectified" or "reified" in physical space (ibid.). However, the relation between the social space and the appropriated physical space is *blurred*, the *expression* is not a one-to-one relationship – a work of displacement is always possible since, for example, proximity in the physical space does not necessarily express proximity in the social space. However, in circular motion, the appropriated physical space tends to be "gradually converted into mental structures" (ibid.: 126), so that "the habitat shapes the habitus [just as] the habitus [...] shapes the habitat" (ibid.: 128).

In the lecture version of the text Bourdieu is even more explicit: "[s]ocial space tends to *retranslate* itself, in a more or less direct manner, into physical space in the form of a definite distributional arrangement of agents and properties" (Bourdieu 2018: 107; emphasis added), "the locus and the place occupied by an agent in appropriated social space are *excellent indicators* of his or her position in social space" (ibid.; emphasis added) and "[t]hough *social space* is not a physical space, it *tends to realize itself in a more or less complete and accurate fashion* in that space" (ibid.: 108; the second emphasis added). Thus the

> [p]hysically realized (or objectified) social space presents itself as the distribution in physical space of the various kinds of goods and services but also of individual agents and groups physically localized (as bodies linked to a more or less permanent site) and endowed with higher or lower chances of appropriating these goods and services (depending on their capital and on physical distance to these goods, which itself depends upon their capital). It is this twofold distribution in space of agents as biological individuals and of goods that defines the differential value of the various regions of realized social space. (ibid.: 109)

In one instance (in the final version of the text as it appears in *The Weight of the World*), Bourdieu even seems to suggest an equivalence between the two "forms" of space, as a sort of "redefinition" of the concept of field: "different fields, or, if you like, the different, physically objectified social spaces" (Bourdieu 1999a: 125). As we have seen, these "physically objectified social spaces" are "appropriated social spaces", that is, geographical spaces conceived as "reifications" of social space and fields. Bourdieu points out that they "tend to be at least roughly superimposed" (ibid.), implying that objectified capital

generated in different social fields may accumulate in specific geographical locations. These locations tend to be perceived by social agents as *pars pro toto* of the dominant sectors of the respective field as well as the social space. The physically objectified capital shapes and informs the perceptions of agents, since "the imperceptible incorporation of structures of the social order undoubtedly happens, in large part, through a prolonged and indefinitely repeated experience of the spatial distance that affirms social distance" (ibid.: 126). Therefore

> [b]ecause social space is inscribed at once in spatial structures and in the mental structures that are partly produced by the incorporation of these structures, space is one of the sites where power is asserted and exercised, and, no doubt in its subtlest form, as symbolic violence that goes unperceived as violence. Architectural spaces address mute injunctions directly to the body and, just as surely as court etiquette, obtain from it the reverence and respect born of distance, or better yet, from being far away, at a respectful distance. (ibid.)

To conclude this analysis, we might approach the issue from the opposite perspective, asking: May we effectively use the concept of the social space and field theory to analyse a particular physical and geographical space – we are thinking primarily of urban spaces –, without it "vanishing" in the analysis of the more theoretically relevant social space? It is precisely this approach that is proposed by Michel Pinçon and Monique Pinçon-Charlot. At the same time, they redirect the topic to Bourdieu's model of the literary field (to which I turn my attention in the last section of this paper):

> To approach the city as a structured whole, as a space of relations, Pierre Bourdieu's theoretical system is of great use. [...] [T]he social agents and groups are distributed spatially, albeit in a conceptually constructed theoretical space, yet one is quickly inclined to apply them in geographical fashion. This is something Pierre Bourdieu himself does not deny. [...] In his analysis of "Paris of the *Sentimental Education*", Bourdieu demonstrates that [...] the structures of the social space or of the specific fields inside this space [...] can be read in the geographical space, one that is itself hierarchised and structured homologically to the system of positions of social agents. The urban space is thus also a space of relations where places, neighbourhoods, and amenities are in dialogue, responding to and confronting each other. (Pinçon – Pinçon-Charlot 1994: 52)

4. Spatial Aspects of the Literary Field

So far I have been concerned mainly with the social space, its visualisation, and its relation to physical space, and not with particular fields. It is clear that the spatial aspects of social space are pertinent to social fields as well, including the literary field with its specificities as a field of cultural production. Yet – as the last quotation indicates – Bourdieu's approach to spatial aspects of the literary field is interestingly layered; in fact the quotation does not deal with the relation of the literary field (as a segment of

the social space) to the physical space, but with the relation of social and geographical space as represented in a work of fiction – Flaubert's *Sentimental Education* (1869) – to the real social and geographical space as it exists outside the novel. Since this is perhaps the most interesting aspect of the relationship between social space/field and physical space in Bourdieu's book *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, I will now discuss it in some detail.

Flaubert's *Sentimental Education* is the pivotal literary work in Bourdieu's book on the literary field. In Bourdieu's view, the novel presents a story which gradually reveals the structure, positions, and oppositions of the fictional social space represented in the text. In this sense, the novel is also a "sociological experiment" (Bourdieu 1995: 9–10), studying how characters endowed with a certain habitus and capital will behave in the social field, how their trajectories will evolve: "[...] the structure [of the social space] which organizes the fiction, and which grounds the illusion of reality it produces, is hidden, as in reality, beneath the interactions of people, which are structured by it" (ibid.: 14). Fiction has the "capacity [...] to concentrate and condense in the concrete singularity of a sensitive figure and an individual adventure [...] all the complexity of a structure and a history which scientific analysis must laboriously unfold and deploy" (ibid.: 24). In the first chapter of *The Rules of Art*, Bourdieu offers a visual schema for the positions and character trajectories of *Sentimental Education* in the social space ("field of power"), plotting characters' names according to their groupings, which are based in turn on their affiliation with certain segments of the social field as it changes throughout the novel (ibid.: 6).

However, the structure that is revealed "in the concrete singularity of a sensitive figure" not only serves as a general example of the way the social world may be represented and clarified but, according to Bourdieu, also has a particular relation to the real social space and time that Flaubert drew on for the setting of his novel. It is the result of Flaubert's extraordinary *objectification of the self*, his "autoanalysis" or "socioanalysis" (ibid.: 25), whereby he makes manifest the structure of the social field he is part of: "[...] the author is led to uncover the most deeply buried structure – the most obscure because it is the most directly linked to his primary investments – which is at the foundation of his mental structures and his literary strategies" (ibid.: 25). Therefore "[...] *Sentimental Education* reconstitutes in an extraordinarily exact manner the structure of the social world in which it was produced and even the mental structures which, fashioned by these social structures, form the generative principle of the work in which these structures are revealed" (ibid.: 31–32). *Sentimental Education* thus reveals – in a specifically literary manner – the structure of the literary field and other fields of cultural production (including the field of power) in which Flaubert, as a writer, was a social agent.

The schematisation of the novel's "field of power" mentioned above (ibid.: 6) represents one of the forms in which we may visualise the social space and/or fields, yet it does not give much importance to physical space (that is, the physical setting of the novel). However, there is one more schema in the introductory chapter of *The Rules of Art*: the map of Paris referred to by Michel Pinçon and Monique Pinçon-Charlot in the passage quoted above (ibid.: 41). On this map of the central area of Paris, Bourdieu

plots the three main districts of social *and* geographical space represented in the novel, as well as the locations and spatial trajectories of the principal characters. Geographical localisations in this context express the objectified, reified social space; to reside in a certain borough of the city not only expresses a position in the social space but also, through the recognition of other agents, helps to strengthen and solidify this position. Position in the geographical space is a form of capital in itself. Bourdieu writes about a "*structured and hierarchised space*" (ibid.: 43) – in this case, it is an example of the way geographical space quite literally *expresses* crucial structural relations within the social space ("field of power").

Here we find all three types of space with which we have been preoccupied in this paper – the social space/field, spatial representation of social space/field, and physical/geographical space – interacting in a complex interplay of representations. According to Bourdieu, the novel represents – is a synecdoche of – real social space at a particular historical moment. We may thus think of it as arising directly from Flaubert's excellent socioanalysis. The schema of the "field of power" (ibid.: 6) is a visualisation of social space as it is represented in the novel. Given Bourdieu's understanding of the relationship between fictional and real social space, we may further consider how it points beyond the fiction. The map (ibid.: 41) represents Paris as a real geographical and historical space, with the social space of the novel mapped onto it – a move that is consistent with Bourdieu's interpretation of *Sentimental Education* as a non-trivial representation of historical social space. In other words, this map represents Flaubert's representation of the fictional social space of the novel which, according to Bourdieu, is a representation both of a real historical social space, and of the interactions of agents and objectifications of capital in a real geographical space.

We have so far been discussing the introductory chapter of *The Rules of Art* – which, in relation to the role of space in Bourdieu's theory of the literary field, is arguably the most interesting part of the book. But how is the relation of the literary field to physical space played out in the rest of this work? The differentiation of social space/field, physical space, and their relation to Bourdieu's visual schemata, which I have dealt with in previous sections of this paper, applies to the analysis of the literary field as well. The literary field can be identified neither with the physical space nor with its visualisation in a schema. The role of physical space seems to diminish in the book, giving way to the complex elaboration of the theory and history of the literary field as part of the social space.

However, spatial aspects remain present throughout the text, and while the literary field does not, properly speaking, exist in physical space, it does tend to "aggregate" or "reify" at certain places, especially insofar as these places express positions and oppositions within the literary field. Some places articulate both social space *and* geographical space (cf. the map on p. 41); in addition to those already mentioned above, Bourdieu lists salons, cafés, *brasseries*, and editorial offices. Salons are "places where writers and artists can gather together as kindred spirits and meet the powerful – thereby making real, through direct interactions, the continuity from one end of the field of power to the other"; and "through the exchanges that take place there [the salons are] genuine artic-

ulations between the fields" (ibid.: 51). Not only do salons express positions simultaneously in the literary field, artistic field, and field of power (since they are meeting places for agents from a variety of fields), they also allow for exchange and articulation of these different, yet – at least partially – homologous fields. Similarly, diverse writers make provisional meeting places "[i]n the small circles of bohemia, in cafés like the Voltaire and the Momus, or at the editorial offices of small literary journals like the *Corsaire-Satan*" – writers that are "destined for divergent fates" (ibid.: 73). The *brasseries* Divan Le Peletier and the Paris, and *La Revue de Paris* serve as meeting places for "writers who are already more or less consecrated and dedicated to art for art's sake"; by contrast, the *brasseries* Andler and Martyrs are meeting places for the literary realists. Yet, Bourdieu argues, "the two groups are not rigorously separated and there are frequent movements from one to another", and some authors may be found at any of the four *brasseries* (ibid.: 76; cf. 90). When two or more social agents who occupy a similar position in the field find themselves in the same geographical space, their interactions contribute to expressing and negotiating these positions. Yet Bourdieu's relatively marginal observations on "places" in the book would lead us to believe that such considerations serve only a secondary role in his theory, and the fact that an agent frequents this or that physical geographical place is not in itself of great importance for his argument. These passages also reveal a certain bias: two or more authors who may meet at a *brasserie* may in fact adopt contrasting aesthetic positions, and the groups may be provisional or intrinsically diverse (cf. the principle discussed in the previous section by which co-occurrence in physical space does not necessarily imply proximity in social space, and may even hinder our ability to make sense of the social space).

Furthermore, although the literary field certainly can and does "materialise" in the kinds of places mentioned in the preceding paragraph, as a structure defined predominantly by the mutual position of genres, styles, and other aesthetic choices adopted by its social agents (cf. schemata of the field, ibid.: 122, 124), it cannot be adequately conceptualised in terms of geographical space. The dominant form in which a position is adopted or in which it "materialises" is the literary work. Yet the literary work as such does not exist in physical space in any ordinary way. Even the material object of a book is a "carrier" of – and not fully identifiable with – the work. We can say therefore that in the literary field there is a dialectic between, on the one hand, the need for agents to exist and interact in certain significant physical places, and, on the other, the non-physical character of the work through which the positions are primarily adopted. Moreover, physical interactions between agents in the literary field combine with other interactions that are mediated not only by literary texts but also by institutions and practices as diverse as literary criticism, programs and polemics, literary prizes, etc. Also the mediated image of the author becomes increasingly important not only in relation to the general public but also to the literary field and its agents.

Conclusion

In this paper I have dealt almost exclusively with the social space or field, defined implicitly by its national borders. This line of inquiry could be extended to relations among different fields, between field and non-field, as well as to transnational fields. Furthermore, following the path suggested by Michel Pinçon and Monique Pinçon-Charlot, the problem could be reversed: How are the many places of social interaction in an urban environment related to a particular literary field and/or other fields? This direction had already been indicated by Bourdieu in his chapter "Site Effects" in *The Weight of the World*, and in the lecture by Bourdieu that is discussed above. However, I am convinced that the awareness of the non-identity between the social space/field, the representation of social space/field, and the physical and geographical space, and the complicated relations between them as I have dealt with it in the preceding argument need to be the starting point for any discussion of spatial aspects in Bourdieu's field theory, including his theory of the literary field.

Literature

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977): Outline of a Theory of Practice. Transl. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [1972].

Bourdieu, Pierre (1984): Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste. Transl. Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press [1979].

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990a): The Logic of Practice. Transl. Richard Nice. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press [1980].

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990b): Social Space and Symbolic Power. In: Bourdieu, Pierre: In Other Words: Essays Toward a Reflexive Sociology. Transl. Matthew Adamson. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 123–139 [1986].

Bourdieu, Pierre (1993): Some Properties of Fields. In: Bourdieu, Pierre: Sociology in Question. Transl. Richard Nice. London: Sage, pp. 72–77 [1987/1976].

Bourdieu, Pierre (1995): The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field. Transl. Susan Emanuel. Stanford, CA: University of California Press [1992].

Bourdieu, Pierre (1997): The Forms of Capital. Transl. Richard Nice. In: Halsey, A. H. [et al.] (eds.): Education: Culture, Economy, and Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 46–58 [1986].

Bourdieu, Pierre (1999a): Site Effects. In: Bourdieu, Pierre [et al.]: The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society. Transl. Priscilla Parkhurst Fergusson et al. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 123–129 [1993].

Bourdieu, Pierre (1999b): Une révolution conservatrice dans l'édition. In: Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales, no. 126–127, pp. 3–28.

Bourdieu, Pierre (2000): Pascalian Meditations. Transl. Richard Nice. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press [1997].

Bourdieu, Pierre (2004): Science of Science and Reflexivity. Transl. Richard Nice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [2001].

Bourdieu, Pierre (2018): Social Space and the Genesis of the Appropriated Physical Space. Transl.

Loïc Wacquant. In: International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 42, no. 1, pp. 106–114 [1991].

Bourdieu, Pierre (2020): Habitus and Field. General Sociology, vol. 2. Lectures at the Collège de France (1982–1983). Transl. Peter Collier. Cambridge: Polity.

Duval, Julien (2013): L'analyse des correspondances et la construction des champs. In: Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales, no. 200, pp. 110–123.

Hanquinet, Laurie – Savage, Mike – Callier, Louise (2012): Elaborating Bourdieu's Field Analysis in Urban Studies: Cultural Dynamics in Brussels. In: Urban Geography 33, no. 4. pp. 508–529.

Lebaron, Frédéric – Le Roux, Brigitte (2013): Géométrie du champ. In: Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales, no. 200, pp. 107–109.

Painter, Joe (2000): Pierre Bourdieu. In: Crang, Mike – Thrift, Nigel (eds.): Thinking Space. London – New York: Routledge, pp. 239–259.

Pinçon, Michel – Pinçon-Charlot, Monique (1994): De l'espace social à l'espace urbain. Utilité d'une métaphore. In: Les Annales de la recherche urbaine, no. 64, pp. 51–53.

Savage, Mike (2011): The Lost Urban Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu. In: Bridge, Gary – Watson, Sophie (eds.): The New Blackwell Companion to the City. Malden, MA – Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 511–520.

Thomson, Patricia (2008): Field. In: Grenfell, Michael (ed.): Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts. Durham: Acumen, pp. 67–81.

Wacquant, Loïc (2018): Bourdieu Comes to Town: Pertinence, Principles, Applications. In: International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 42, no. 1, pp. 90–105.

Mgr. Josef Šebek, Ph.D. / josef.sebek@ff.cuni.cz

Charles University, Faculty of Arts, Department of Czech and Comparative Literature, nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1, CZ