

Space/time practices and the production of space and time: an introduction

Dorsch, Sebastian

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Dorsch, S. (2013). Space/time practices and the production of space and time: an introduction. *Historical Social Research*, 38(3), 7-21. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.38.2013.3.7-21>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Space/Time Practices and the Production of Space and Time. An Introduction

*Sebastian Dorsch**

Abstract: »Raum/Zeit-Praktiken und die Produktion von Raum und Zeit. Eine Einführung«. This introduction to the HSR Special Issue *Space/Time Practices* outlines some main aspects of the discussion of space and time in social and *cultural studies*. Three main epistemic problems are sketched: 1) Space and time have often acquired a transcendental character, which continues to be especially true of time. 2) To this day, a distinct field of research on temporality in *cultural studies* is still in nascent form. 3) Space and time are often set in "binary oppositions" to one another, thereby inhibiting their combined analysis. The present volume, which is the result of discussions by the SpaceTime research group at the University of Erfurt (Erfurter RaumZeit-Forschung, ERZ), takes this set of problems as its starting point. The contributions share the pre-supposition that spatiality and temporality are inseparable in their lived and everyday worlds. Discussing concepts of permanences (Whitehead), of Space/Time Practices and forms of production of time and space, the introduction proposes a constructivist, actor-and praxis-centered approach to space and time that enables an inter- and multidisciplinary platform for different questions about two central facets of human life.

Keywords: Time, space, production, practices, permanences.

The Thing, however, never quite becomes absolute, never quite emancipates itself from activity, from use, from need, from 'social being'. What are the implications of this for space? That is the key question.
(Lefebvre 1991 [1974], 83).

In this case as in others the substantial form of the concept of time undoubtedly contributes much to the illusion that time is a kind of thing existing 'in time and space'.
(Elias 1992 [1984], 46).

* Sebastian Dorsch, Universität Erfurt, Nordhäuser Str. 63, 99089 Erfurt, Germany; sebastian.dorsch@uni-erfurt.de.

1. Introduction¹

Time and space frequently appear as structuring coordinates of the everyday, as one of the few stable and framing factors of social life. In Europe in particular, this view belongs to a tradition based in Christianity that prominently found expression in the classical mechanics of Isaac Newton (1643-1727) strongly embedded in religious thinking: He understood absolute space and absolute time as predicates of God. The human being, in contrast, only has recourse to relative concepts of space and time. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) ordained in secularized form, in his *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781), both categories as *a priori* principles of all knowledge. According to him, they are transcendently prior to every cognition, and as forms of pure intuition irreducible. Yet as such, they are also separate entities.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, scientific explanations of the world formulated models of SpaceTime with claims to totality and objectivity. The world was increasingly treated as precisely measurable by mathematics and the natural sciences: “Time and space” seemed to be “facts of nature”, as David Harvey (1996, 211) critically phrased it. And according to Mike Crang’s (2005, 216) conclusion about the relation of time and space “the very commonsensical facticity of the two has often meant they are not examined.” With its propensities for singularization, the modern, enlightened idea of history developed the notion of coherent, clearly definable time-spaces. In his philosophy of history, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) established a model of development categorized according to world regions. In the course of imperial expansion, the Eurocentric model of progress and acceleration (time-space compression!) came increasingly to inform the spatio-temporalities of non-European, or rather non-North-Atlantic, societies and marginalized alternatives (cf. e.g. in the present HSR Special Issue Fischer 2013; Schulz-Forberg 2013, chapter 3; for the micro level: Lüdtke 2013).

These models of spatio-temporality, with their claims to totality and objectivity, were increasingly criticized, particularly in their expansive phases. For example, Hermann Minkowski (1864-1909), Albert Einstein (1879-1955), and Mikhail M. Bakhtin (1895-1975) postulated the relativity of space and time in, respectively, mathematics, physics, and literature; in the age of high imperialism, Henri-Louis Bergson (1859-1941) and Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) point to their inextricability (cf. e.g. Dorsch 2012, 2013). Émile Durkheim (1858-1917) set forth around 1900, in response to Friedrich Ratzel’s (1844-

¹ I would like to express many thanks to the co-editor of this Special Issue Susanne Rau for her very important suggestions concerning the topics discussed below. The discussions not just in the preparation of this article but also since our first meetings initiating the TimeSpace research group in Erfurt are fundamental for this article.

1904) environmental determinism, a “morphologie sociale” that takes societies rather than primarily space as its argumentative point of departure (Durkheim 1899). This idea was further developed a little later by Georg Simmel (1858-1918), who argued: “Not space, but the division and aggregation of its parts effected by the mind has social meaning” (Simmel 1908, 615; for an overview of theories of social space: Dünne 2006).

For the everyday social world, however, Newton’s assumptions seemed and continue to seem more influential (and feasible). In the non-everyday realm too, there is much resistance to abandoning the notion of an almost lawful progress of humanity: Official political and economic policies, for example, are based on the idea of progress. So does the UN still use the name United Nations *Development* Program; in Germany (and not only there) is there a Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and *Development*.

2. La production de l’espace – et du temps?

La production de l’espace (1974) by Henri Lefebvre, and its reassessment by Edward Soja (1989) along with the English translation by Donald Nicholson-Smith from 1991, triggered a fundamental reconceptualization in nearly all the disciplines of *cultural studies* and social sciences. This study became an emblem of the so-called *spatial turn*. Lefebvre not only harked back to a (Neo)Marxist body of thought but also refined a tradition of French thought which, in the works of Lucien Febvre and Fernand Braudel, had questioned notions of a given (container)space since the 1920s. “With Lefebvre (and his epigones) we have finally moved beyond the deterministic concepts of space which had emerged at the end of the nineteenth century” (Rau 2013a, 52).² His analysis shows how space is produced by human beings. In order to dynamize the static and dichotomous modes of thought which predominate, he designed a trialectic model of analysis: “The spatial practice [*pratique spatiale*] of a society secretes that society’s space; it propounds and presupposes it, in a dialectical interaction; it produces it slowly and surely as it masters and appropriates it” – and this “within perceived space [*espace perçu*]” (Lefebvre 1991, 38). According to him society produces its space within “relations of production, which subsume power relations” (ibid., 33). In this sense, the “representations of space” (*représentations de l’espace*) for example in the form of buildings, the “conceptualized space [*espace conçu*] [...] is the dominant space in any society (or mode of production)” (ibid., 38f.). And on the other side, “representational space” (*espace de représentations*) is “directly lived through its associated images and

² I would like to express many thanks to Charlton Payne for translating and proofreading many parts of this text, for example all the translated German quotations.

symbols, and hence the space of ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users’” (ibid., 39), and as such this *espace vécu* is “linked to the clandestine or underground side of social life” (ibid., 33). The model thrives on tensions and confrontations, and the production of space thus becomes an unending process.

Societies produce their spaces, according to Lefebvre, in a complex arrangement (of power) consisting of experiencing, conceptualizing/representing, and practicing: “Production in the Marxist sense transcends the opposition between ‘subject’ and ‘object’” (ibid., 71). In this process of production “(physical) natural space is disappearing. Granted, natural space was – and it remains – the common point of departure” (ibid., 30).

Susanne Rau (2013b) shows – similar to Robert Fischer (2013; see below) – in her contribution to this HSR Special Issue that theories of the production of space must be augmented in order to deal with complex spatio-temporalities, for example, in the urbanization of the suburbs of Lyon in the eighteenth century. The modifications and accompanying discussions in Lyon produced temporal modalities which influenced the constitution of space, insofar as visions, hopes, probabilities (with regard to land speculation), temporal retrospection and delays came to play a significant, indeed constitutive, role in this process.

The *Pratique spatiales* in Lefebvre’s model acquire a specific significance: They are not ‘only’ one of three sub-categories of the production process. Producing is itself treated far more as a (spatial) practice, but as a practice that is based on specific relations of experiencing and conceptualizing, on specific relations of production and power in society.

As Marian Füssel illustrates in his essay, Michel de Certeau took this as his starting point and developed, albeit in a theological Jesuit context, an even stronger understanding of space as performative: In the first volume of *L’Invention du Quotidien* from 1980, titled *Arts de Faire*, he emphasizes: “l’espace est un lieu pratiqué”; to dead place (*lieu*) he contrasts lived space (*espace*) filled with everyday practices. For de Certeau practices always have something resistant about them, something intransigent and subversive. In this respect, he worked out – so Füssel – the analytic presumptions about space of Michel Foucault, which for him disregarded the agent and its practices: As a corrective to the “universalism of panoptical discipline” and the “irreducibility of power structures in Foucault’s works” (Füssel 2013, 22), de Certeau proposed the everyday doing of space, spatial practices.³ He thus also distanced himself from the “presumably substantialist notion of a social space” (Füssel 2013, 23) in the work of Pierre Bourdieu, less in his assumptions as in his perspective: “The wanderer de Certeau followed his agents on their level, he did not hover over them, but followed their chaotic creativity on a micro level which fundamentally refused the perspective of the ‘voyeur-god.’” (Füssel 2013, 33)

³ For a reading of Foucault’s work on space that assesses this aspect somewhat differently, see the essay by Maier (2013) in this HSR Special Issue.

Different disciplines have grappled with these theoretical considerations, particularly the Critical Geography of David Harvey or Edward Soja, literary studies and history (see the respective essays in this Special Issue). For sociology and its related disciplines, Martina Löw has furnished a relational concept of space that treats space as a performative social phenomenon. The central practice which constitutes space for Löw (2001) is “to arrange” – in German “(An)Ordnen” – a praxis that is often concealed by quotidian repetitions and routinized appropriation.

Discussions about time initially followed structures of thought similar to that of space – absolute vs. relative time – but have up to this day found far from the same resonance in scholarly practice. The sociology of time had introduced the notion of “Social Time” in its seminal text from 1937 by Pitirim A. Sorokin and Robert K. Merton.

Social time, in contrast to the time of astronomy, is qualitative and not purely quantitative; that these qualities derive from the beliefs and customs common to the group and that they serve further to reveal the rhythms, pulsations, and beats of the societies in which they were found (Sorokin and Merton 1937, 623).

They primarily emphasize the ordering function of social time and thus, like Armin Nassehi (1993) or Harmut Rosa (2003) later, take social systems and structures as their point of departure and less the (individual) praxeological level.

Norbert Elias made the point in 1984 that time – as cited in the epigraph – is not an object ‘out there’. Only by individual acceptance and acquisition of “human-made time symbols” can they serve as “means of orientation” (Elias 1992, 22, 21), and only in this way does time display a socially formative effect: “This can perhaps be seen more clearly by replacing the substantival concept ‘time’ by the verbal ‘timing’ to denote the human activity of synchronization” (ibid., 73).⁴

Despite these approaches, a constructivist-oriented conceptual apparatus like the one developed for the space discussions has not emerged, or at least has hardly been seized upon. A pendant to Lefebvre in the sense of an approach to the “production of time” does not to this day exist; the concept of “time-practice” is to be sure deployed, but has not been more thoroughly conceptualized or discussed. An anthology of central texts of time theory comparable to that of space studies does not (yet?) exist.

Nor has to this day a separate field of time study formed within literary studies or history in the sense of constituting a conceptual and methodological discussion like the one regarding space. A ‘Geography of temporality’ is still in its nascent stage (Parkes and Thrift 1980; May and Thrift 2001). For the discipline of history this is significant in light of the fact that Reinhart Koselleck, mean-

⁴ On the other hand, Elias had an essentialized view of *historic* time while writing about the civilizing process and more or less developed societies.

while one of the most widely known German historians, had already delivered path-breaking contributions to such a field well before the so-called *spatial turn*. In his contribution to this volume, Hagen Schulz-Forberg elaborates how Koselleck was to a certain extent also interested in questions of space, but primarily on a metaphorical level that merely accompanied his research on time: for this reason, his work “remains on a rather general and imprecise understanding of space” (Schulz-Forberg 2013, 41). By supplementing Koselleck’s theory of temporal layers (*Zeitschichten*) with so called spatial layers (*Raumschichten*), Schulz-Forberg “proposes to foreground an actor-based, multi-lingual, global conceptual history to better understand spatio-temporal practices” (Schulz-Forberg 2013, 41). In so doing, he intends to resolve the matter of whether space or time has priority.

Only gradually has this scholarly lacuna been identified and pursued (Daniel 2006; Lorenz and Bevernage 2013).⁵ In the forefront of such research is still a rich and empirical concern with temporal phenomena such as history, progress, acceleration, stress, boredom, epochal limits, generation, and so on. Memory studies occupy an exceptional position here (cf. in this HSR Special Issue Hitzke 2013; Wolff 2013).

Research on temporality has hardly considered the consequences of the turn to space, and this holds for the more temporal orientation of traditional Religious Studies (Barth 2013; Maier 2013). Harry Maier conducts in his essay a corrective space-time investigation of emergent Christianity. Working especially with Edward Soja’s concept of Thirdspace, he argues that the previous concentration on time has to be expanded into a conceptually richer account of early Christian urban belief by focusing on time-space and practice. He thus shows that a new “model of space and time” introduced by Paul is crucial to understanding emergent Christianity. Even the “consideration of ‘Jewish spaces’ has a relatively short tradition.” (Wolff 2013, 199) Frank Wolff adapts in his essay the concept of spatio-temporal mythscapes by Duncan S.A. Bell for an analysis of the construction of the “old home” by Russian Jews who emigrated to Argentina and the USA in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The spatio-temporal construction of different types of an “old home” served as a crucial element for the emigrant’s situating of him or herself within the new societies, as “a space, constructed by visions of the past, settings and interest of the present and, up to a certain point in time, aspirations for the future” (Wolff 2013, 210).

While a distinct field of research on temporality within *cultural studies* begins to come into its own and set itself apart from research on space, the geographers Jon May and Nigel Thrift maintain that “in social theory and the so-

⁵ See e.g. the workshop in Erfurt in 2012 titled ‘Historical Research on Time and Global Historiography: Crises – Orders – (Non)Contemporaneities’; cf. <<http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=4681>> (accessed July 27, 2013).

cial sciences and humanities more broadly” one cannot deny “the increasing prominence of space and spatiality” (May and Thrift 2001, 1). Despite preliminary work on the geography of temporality, they identify an aversion to studies of temporality not only in the field of geography. For many theorists of space time often ‘only’ serves to explain the respective approach to space; it is implied in the doing or producing of space. “On the other hand, important theories and approaches to agency and its spaces [...] remain temporally flat” argues Schulz-Forberg (2013, 43) with reference to Bourdieu in particular. To be sure, in his late work *Éléments de rythmanalyse* (1992), Lefebvre attempted to supplement his theory of space by developing an analytic tool for “Time, Space, and Everyday Life,” as reads the somewhat unfortunately translated subtitle of the English publication. However, it never achieved the same degree of conceptual precision as his theory of space.⁶ It is thus not surprising that both of the studies in this volume which work in detail with Lefebvre (Fischer 2013; Rau 2013b) seek to further develop his theory for analysis of space-time (see below).

The same Lefebvre writes:

With the advent of modernity [which means for him especially capitalism, S.D.] time has vanished from social space [...]. Our time, then, this most essential part of lived experience, this greatest good of all goods, is no longer visible to us, no longer intelligible. It cannot be constructed. It is consumed, exhausted, and that is all. It leaves no traces. It is concealed in space (Lefebvre 1991, 95).

In this respect, time frequently acquired, or retained, an irreducible character: it could be experienced but not shaped. Foucault accounted for the increasing interest in space with the decreasing interest in time: “Those sacred characteristics” which “time certainly lost in the nineteenth century [...] space has not yet lost” (Foucault 1997 [1967], 331), and this he argues is why one should now give attention to space (similarly Lefebvre 1991, 412). Harry Haarotunian also identified in ethnology and parts of the *cultural, postcolonial, and area studies* “claims of untimeliness” (Haarotunian 2010).

One gets the impression that this is to a certain extent a struggle between space and time for attention, in which only one category can win (from a critical perspective cf. Bachmann-Medick 2006, 284-6). In research praxis as well, “both aspects are seldom combined in a skillful manner” (Rau 2013a, 67), for which theoretical difficulties – the “fausse symétrie” (Levy 1998) will be taken up below – as well as the pragmatics of research can be offered as explana-

⁶ For instance, Lefebvre develops here a strongly dichotomous analytic model (cf. Lefebvre 2004, 9), a form which in *La production de l'espace* he still strictly criticized. His concept of “energy” is just as hard to fathom as his definition of rhythm itself: “Everywhere where there is interaction between a place, a time and an expenditure of energy, there is a rhythm” (Lefebvre 2004, 15). Unlike the English subtitle suggests, Lefebvre is not primarily concerned here with space (*espace*) but much more with places (*lieux*) and placement.

tions. The dichotomous tradition of Newton/Kant is thereby to a certain degree perpetuated.⁷ Confirming this in discussion with Doreen Massey, May and Thrift (2001, 1) underline as the second development in the humanities the fact that many theorists have “the tendency [...] to draw a strict distinction between Time and Space.” Or as Mike Crang (2005, 216) formulates it: time and space “have often fed from each other in binary oppositions.”

3. Bringing Together Space and Time: Space/Time Practices

From what has been described thus far, in short three epistemic problems are discernible: 1) Space and time have often acquired a transcendental character, which continues to be especially true of time. 2) To this day, a distinct field of research on temporality in *cultural studies* is still in nascent form. 3) Space and Time are often set in “binary oppositions” to one another, thereby inhibiting their combined analysis.

The present volume, which is the result of discussions by the SpaceTime research group at the University of Erfurt (ERZ), takes this set of problems as its starting point.⁸ The contributions share the presupposition that spatiality and temporality are inseparable in their lived and everyday worlds (cf. Dorsch et al. 2012). In order to sublimate the “binary opposition,” a third term, a *tertium*, must be introduced on a methodological level that combines spatiality and temporality: This *tertium* is the agents and the practices by which it produces spatiality and temporality, or spatio-temporality. Bruno Latour puts it – and to a certain extent with Norbert Elias – like this:

Deeper than the question of time and space is the very act of shifting, delegating, sending away, translating. We should not speak of time, space, and actant but rather of temporalization, spatialization, actantialization (the words are horrible) or more elegantly, of timing, spacing, acting (Latour 2005 [1997], 178).⁹

This may also counter the above mentioned problem elaborated by Jacques Lévy of a “false symmetry” of space and time: agents decide in which relation both categories are set. In this way, we can also cope with the postulate to integrate the “multiple facets and definitions” (Crang 2005, 200) of space and

⁷ This is true in attenuated form for the French-‘Latin’ tradition, in which not only history and geography instruction is a more integral part of education and in which numerous *Sociétés de géographie et d’histoire* were established, for instance, in *Latin America*. In the Anglo-Saxon context, these societies were more strictly separated.

⁸ For further information about the research unit of the University of Erfurt (Germany) ERZ, and its work on TimeSpaces, see the homepage: <<http://www.uni-erfurt.de/philosophische-fakultaet/raumzeit-forschung/>> (accessed August 30, 2013).

⁹ See from a “chronogeographic perspective”: Parkes and Thrift 1980.

time. By virtue of this *tertium*, the scholar does not have to determine from the start whether she or he will analyze primarily temporality or spatiality.

But what do we mean by a “time practice” and the “production of time”? For a first definition one can fruitfully expand Lefebvre’s convincing model of space. Even if we express some objections and criticisms of this model, we adhere to the underlying idea that the production of time can be analyzed with the terms of practicing, conceptualizing/representing and living/experiencing. Theories of space cannot, of course, simply be transferred to theories of time, or vice versa, yet critical impulses can be adopted. So can studies of space and studies of time enrich and serve to concretize one another.

In this sense, a time practice is a practice that secretes a time. For grammatical reasons the term ‘time practice’ seems to mesh better than ‘temporal practice’ with our concepts – every practice has in a sense a temporal facet. But in this Special Issue both terms are used interchangeably. Time can be individual or – as we will see later – social.

Lefebvre operated with a Marxist worldview in which the social perspective was paramount. He was primarily concerned with “social space” in the sense of a society’s space. For us the individual level is most important, the individual time practices by which society is not assumed to be given *a priori*. It thus seems to make sense to follow, with Michel de Certeau, agents and their “chaotic creativity on the micro level” (Füssel 2013, 33). For society and social time (and space) are produced by the interaction of agents.

Christiane Barth further develops in her confrontation with Mircea Eliade, one of the founders of Religious Studies, his model of sacred and profane spaces and time along these lines. She criticizes how “for Eliade, the role of human practice and creativity, consequently, only lies in the correct imitation of these given models” (Barth 2013, 62). Fundamentally critiquing this conception, Barth constructs a model in which the individual is “not just passive spectator but an active part of the constitution of space” (Barth 2013, 70). Reiner Prass (2013) too foregrounds the appropriation of certain concepts of space and border by inhabitants of the newly founded Duchy of Sachsen-Gotha in the middle of the seventeenth century during the implementation of a planar concept of space. The analysis of this administrative praxis, in the figure of Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff (1626-1692) in particular, elucidates how this was not a linear, top-down process.

Of particular interest not only for time but also for space is the analysis of “permanences.” David Harvey has defined permanences, with reference to Alfred North Whitehead, as “relatively stable configurations of matter and things” (Harvey 1996, 55). A permanence is what appears to us as a fixed, (quasi) natural thing. As argued at the beginning of this introduction, time and space in particular have assumed “very commonsensical facticity” (Crang 2005, 216). They are frequently taken as given in the arrangement of the everyday and the (social) world:

Time, which on the preceding step was recognizable as a dimension of nature, becomes recognizable, now that society is included in the field of view as a subject of knowledge, as a human-made symbol, and, moreover, a symbol with high object-adequacy (Elias 1992, 36).

In this sense, the “apocalyptic chronotopes” that Matthias Rekow (2013) considers in his contribution can be regarded as attempts to implement such permanences. He analyzes two early-modern depictions of apocalypse on pamphlets with the aid of the chronotope model developed by the literary theorist Mikhail M. Bakhtin for the analysis of space-time relationships in the novel. Such “apocalyptic chronotopes” can be interpreted as representations of an essential space-time threat which was used on the one hand as a medium of political power to which on the other hand the beholder had to respond, whether actively or in a passively quietist manner (cf. Rekow 2013). Sabine Schmolinsky (2013) also applies the chronotope model for her essay on the production of the future in the Middle Ages and emphasizes the centrality of popular agency. The future qualified as a spatio-temporally determined evolution in times to come can be read as a chronotope in the Bakhtinian sense. She argues that the concept applies particularly well to the *adventus* pattern of future and that agency is inextricably bound to the relationship of space and time.

How have time and space acquired, again and again, this “high object-adequacy,” their quasi natural character as permanences? To answer this question, concrete social and individual practices and conflicts in building, maintaining, appropriating and questioning permanence become critical subjects of analysis. With these practices in mind we can analyze how a distinct time (or space) model attains the status of permanence. First, a permanence has to be built, to be constructed by concrete actors. And then it has to be accepted and in the best case be appropriated by actors (cf. Harvey 1996, 55f.). When this model has become commonplace in a society, when it is lived by its “users,” it can be called a social or a society’s time, or maybe even a global time. It must then be maintained, for instance by such representations of time as clocks, timetables, political and economic programs, or in narratives of progress or about developing societies. To adapt Lefebvre once again, moreover, such “dominant” time can also be challenged.

In his contribution, Alf Lüdtkke (2013) traces in this Special Issue not the chaotic but rather the ordering creativity of the Krupp worker Paul Maik (1891-1967). Lüdtkke underlines forms of appropriation, analyzing Maik’s “Aufschreibebuch” (notebook) and questioning the dominant temporal representation of acceleration in the so called ‘modernity’ which “is missing crucial practices (and experiences) of the historical actors” (Lüdtkke 2013, 216). The “Aufschreibebuch” can be read more adequately in terms of more or less intensified use of space and time. From a literary perspective, Diana Hitzke illustrates similar tensions: In her essay on two novels by David Albahari she investigates spatio-temporal practices of cartography with reference to approaches by Denis Cos-

grove, Franco Farinelli, Bruno Latour and Michel de Certeau on mapping and Sybille Krämer on maps. Mapping is understood as a practice that establishes a new spatio-temporal order in a world – in this case, disintegrated Yugoslavia – which is marked by “disorientation in relation to time and space” (Hitzke 2013, 246). With Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari and Rosi Braidotti she points to non-narratable and non-representable individual counter-memories, to the negotiation of minor and major memories. As in Lefebvre’s model, time production does not occur within a vacuum but within the perceived world in dialectical interaction and within power relations.

Heiner Stahl (2013) investigates divergent practices of mapping used in the measurement of airplane noise in Berlin of the 1960s and 1970s: He illustrates that different goals and positions of power with respect to the Berlin Senate and its affected population led to different practices of measuring and cartography by which spatial and temporal facets played the central role for not only the question: At what point is volume considered disturbing? But even more subtly (and concretely): Where and when is airplane noise measured? How is it represented on a map? Or: Are temporally distant average or (also) temporally limited peak values measured in decibels (dB), in Perceived Noise Decibels (PndB) or in phones?

Robert Fischer (2013) underscores in his article the aspect of power by analyzing actors in the construction and subversion of spatio-temporal borders of morality in the Mexican-US-American ‘twin city’ of Ciudad Juárez/El Paso at the beginning of the twentieth century. Combining and expanding the theories of Lefebvre, Foucault, and Bakhtin, he describes the production of “hetero-chronotopic places”¹⁰ and their impact on different parts of the population. “To say that time and space are social constructs does not deny their ultimate embeddedness in the materiality of the world” (Harvey 1996, 211) – in this sense, the production process was dominated by US-American actors.

4. Conclusion and Overview of the Special Issue

The contributions to this Special Issue are intended to trigger further discussion, not to be read as finished theoretical designs. Nor are they homogeneous; rather, they argue over and against their own disciplinary limits and traditional theoretical debates. Time can ultimately not be grasped spatially. Cultural studies of time can rather enrich its spatial pendant and vice versa (see above). At the same time, a common discussion of space and time can enable a more differenti-

¹⁰ See also the ideas of Schulz-Forberg (2013) about “*uchronotopias*”.

ated view of (nearly?) each object of analysis.¹¹ Practices and agents of spacing time or timing space constitute a fruitful field of investigation.

The model presented here should encourage and enable multi- and interdisciplinaryity, even beyond *cultural studies* and the social sciences.¹² The constructivist, actor-and practice-centered approach to space and time should enable a common platform for different questions about two central facets of human life. There is hardly a constellation which cannot be analyzed with the SpaceTime-framework elaborated here.

Altogether, the essays collected here constitute a treatment of concrete historical constellations from a spatio-temporal perspective guided by theory. In order to fortify the coherency of the volume, contributors were given a common set of questions to address:

- 1) What do the theorists referred to understand as spatial, temporal, and spatio-temporal practices? Very importantly: How do these practices relate to one another, and in which time and space? What significance do they hold for the theories? This was meant to enable the pursuit of each respective concept of praxis.
- 2) How can each respective theory or method be situated within international research on space and time in *cultural studies* and the social sciences?
- 3) What additional benefits can this research draw from the respective theories and the critique of these theories and methods?

Projects like this require the dedication of many people. Without the very thoughtful and comprehensive support of Florian Heintze and Monika Leetz in preparing the manuscript and of Charlton Payne in proofreading, this volume could not have been finished this way – thanks a lot! We would like to thank especially all the contributors of the present Special Issue for their very constructive cooperation. They are part of an increasing number of colleagues who have discussed with us in a very encouraging manner the topics presented in this volume – and hopefully will do so in the future with new themes in the field of *TimeSpaces*. Thanks a lot to all the participators of our workshops and other discussion platforms! We also would like to thank the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) which supported in form of various research projects indirectly this Special Issue. Last but not least, we would like to express our thanks to the editorial staff of *Historical Social Research (HSR)* for inviting us to publish some of the first results of our discussions and for the very professional and appreciative cooperation.

¹¹ In research on space, time often seems to be the subordinate category.

¹² In the workshops and discussions of the ERZ, additional disciplines such as philosophy, musicology, geography, medicine, and theology participate.

Special References

Contributions within this HSR Special Issue: Space/Time Practices and the Production of Space and Time

- Barth, Christiane. 2013. *In illo tempore, at the center of the world: Mircea Eliade and religious studies' concepts of sacred time and space. Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 59-75.
- Fischer, Robert. 2013. Mobility and morality at the border – A Lefebvrian spatio-temporal analysis in early twentieth-century Ciudad Juárez and El Paso. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 176-196.
- Füssel, Marian. 2013. Tote Orte und gelebte Räume. Zur Raumtheorie von Michel de Certeau S.J. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 22-39.
- Hitzke, Diana. 2013. Raumzeitliche Kartierungspraktiken. Karten und Mapping im theoretischen Diskurs und in den Texten von David Albahari. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 246-263.
- Lüdtke, Alf. 2013. Writing time – using space. The notebook of a worker at Krupp's Steel Mill and Manufacturing – an example from the 1920s. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 216-228.
- Maier, Harry O. 2013. Soja's thirdspace, Foucault's heterotopia and de Certeau's practice: time-space and social geography in emergent christianity. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 76-92.
- Prass, Reiner. 2013. Die Etablierung der Linie. Grenzbestimmungen und Definition eines Territoriums: Sachsen-Gotha 1640-1665. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 129-149.
- Rau, Susanne. 2013b. The urbanization of the periphery: A spatiotemporal history of Lyon since the eighteenth century. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 150-175.
- Rekow, Matthias. 2013. Gegenwart als ‚nahes Ende‘ – Apokalyptisches Denken in der Frühen Neuzeit. Der Entwurf eines apokalyptischen Chronotopos nach Bachtin. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 105-128.
- Schmolinsky, Sabine. 2013. The production of future. Chronotope and agency in the middle ages. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 93-104.
- Schulz-Forberg, Hagen. 2013. The spatial and temporal layers of global history: A reflection on global conceptual history through expanding Reinhart Koselleck's *Zeitschichten* into global spaces. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 40-58.
- Stahl, Heiner. 2013. Preparing for landing, ready for take-off. Zoning noise pollution as spatio-temporal practices at Berlin-Tegel and Berlin-Tempelhof airport (1965-1975). *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 229-245.
- Wolff, Frank. 2013. The home that never was: Rethinking space and memory in late nineteenth and twentieth-century Jewish history. *Historical Social Research* 38 (3): 197-215.

References

- Bachmann-Medick, Doris. 2006. Spatial turn. In *Cultural turns: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*, ed. idem, 284-328.

- Crag, Mike: Time:Space. In *Spaces of geographical thought: Deconstructing human geography's binaries*, ed. Paul J. Cloke, 199-220. London et al.: SAGE.
- Daniel, Ute. 2006. Reinhart Koselleck. In *Klassiker der Geschichtswissenschaft. Bd. 2: Von Fernand Braudel bis Natalie Z. Davis*, ed. Lutz Raphael, 166-94. Munich: Beck.
- Dorsch, Sebastian. 2012. Zeit. In *Lexikon der Raumphilosophie*, ed. Stephan Günzel, 161-2. Darmstadt: WBG.
- Dorsch, Sebastian. 2013. Die "Yankee City" São Paulo im verzeitlichten Atlantik: Die Nerven- und Modernerkrankheit Neurasthenie. In *Brasilien in der Welt: Region, Nation und Globalisierung 1870-1945*, ed. Georg Fischer et al., 296-319. Frankfurt/M., et al.: Campus.
- Dorsch, Sebastian et al. 2012. *Rahmenpapier: Erfurter RaumZeit-Forschung (21. Februar 2012)*, <<http://www.uni-erfurt.de/philosophische-fakultaet/raumzeitforschung/>> (accessed August 30, 2013).
- Dünne, Jörg. 2006. Soziale Räume: Einleitung. In *Raumtheorie: Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften*, ed. Jörg Dünne und Stephan Günzel, 289-303. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- Durkheim, Émile. 1899. Morphologie sociale. *L'Année sociologique* 2: 520-1.
- Elias, Norbert. 1992. *Time: An essay*, in part trans. Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Blackwell. Originally published as *Über die Zeit*. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp, 1984.
- Foucault, Michel. 1997. Of other spaces: Utopias and heterotopias. In *Rethinking architecture: A reader in cultural theory*, ed. Neil Leach, 330-6. New York: Routledge. Originally published as Des espaces autres. *Architecture/Mouvement/Continuité*, vol. 5 [1984]. The publication of this text written in 1967 was authorized by Foucault in 1984.
- Harootunian, Harry. 2010. "Modernity" and the claims of untimeliness. *Postcolonial Studies* 13 (4): 367-82.
- Harvey, David Justice. 1996. *Nature and the geography of difference*. Cambridge, MA, et al.: Blackwell.
- Latour, Bruno. 2005. Trains of thought: The fifth dimension and its fabrication. In *Thinking time*, ed. Anne-Nelly Perret-Clermont, 173-87. Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe. First published in 1997 in a slightly different version in *Common Knowledge* 6 (3): 170-91.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The production of space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Malden, MA: Blackwell. Originally published as *La production de l'espace*. Paris: Anthropos, 1974.
- Lefebvre, Henri, in collaboration with Catherine Regulier-Lefebvre. 1992. *Éléments de rythmanalyse*. Paris: Éditions Syllepse. English translation: *Rhythmanalysis: Space, time and everyday life*. London et al.: Continuum, 2004.
- Lévy, Jacques. 1998. L'espace et le temps: Une fausse symétrie. *EspaceTemps* 68-70: 16-30.
- Lorenz, Chris, und Bevernage Berber, eds. 2013. *Breaking up time: Negotiating the borders between present, past and future*. Göttingen et al.: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Löw, Martina. 2001. *Raumsoziologie*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- May, Jon, and Nigel Thrift. 2001. *TimeSpace: Geographies of temporality*. London, et al.: Routledge.

- Merton, Robert K., and Pitirim A. Sorokin. 1937. Social time: A methodological and functional analysis. *American Journal of Sociology* 42 (5): 615-29.
- Nassehi, Armin. 1993. *Die Zeit der Gesellschaft: Auf dem Weg zu einer soziologischen Theorie der Zeit*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Parkes, Don N., and Nigel Thrift. 1980. *Times, spaces and places: A chronogeographic perspective*. Chichester et al.: Wiley.
- Rau, Susanne. 2013a. *Räume: Konzepte, Wahrnehmungen, Nutzungen*. Frankfurt/M.: Campus.
- Rosa, Hartmut. 2003. *Soziale Beschleunigung: Die Veränderung der Zeitstrukturen in der Moderne*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- Simmel, Georg. 1908. *Soziologie: Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
- Soja, Edward. 1989. *Postmodern geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social theory*. London et al.: Verso.