

[Paul Stock](#)

Introduction: history and the uses of space

Book section

[Accepted version]

Original citation:

Originally published in Stock, Paul, (ed.) (2015) *The Uses of Space in Early Modern History*. Palgrave studies in cultural and intellectual history. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK. ISBN 9781137490032 (In Press)

© 2015 [Macmillan Publishers Ltd](#)

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/60218/>

Available in LSE Research Online: November 2014

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's accepted version of the book section. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

History and the Uses of Space

Paul Stock

Introduction

The Uses of Space in Early Modern History argues for the fundamental importance of space in historical study. Space – by which I mean the emplacement, distribution and connection of entities, actions and ideas – has become an increasingly important topic in the humanities and social sciences. This volume shows how spatial approaches can be used to understand the societies, cultures and mentalities of the past. The essays gathered here explore the uses of space in two respects: how spatial concepts can be employed by or applied to the study of history; and how particular spaces or spatial ideas were used for practical and ideological purposes in specific periods. All are grounded in specific case studies, but their procedures and focuses also suggest broader methodological and intellectual implications which resonate beyond those particular contexts. Some, for example, explore how domestic or religious ideologies structured, or were structured by, early modern social spaces and interactions. Others interrogate the political objectives and symbolic meanings integral to city design, or analyze the spatial strategies that define imperial space and practice.

Individually then, the contributions show how space can be integral to a number of disciplinary subfields: the histories of gender, everyday life, cities, borderlands, empires, political economy, science, and emotion. Collectively, however, they explore the imbrication of materiality and representation in the understanding and experience of space. They show how material spaces and other contextual circumstances give shape to ideas about, say, territory and religion, or

gender roles and imperial power. But they also show how those ideas help to structure the construction and experience of actual sites. In this respect, the volume allows us to see how spaces are built using physical materials, as well as in rhetorical and cultural terms. It explores the mentalities that inspire and structure conceptions of space; but it also investigates the consequences of those constructions, that is, their concrete effects and the realities that they influence. *The Uses of Space in Early Modern History* therefore directly engages with one of the central questions of historical research: the relationship between ideas and activity. It contends that a serious investigation of historical spaces can cast new light on the relationship between thought and practice in past societies.

This introductory essay serves several purposes. Firstly, it shows how space has long been an important part of disciplined historical study. Although there are important connections between the “spatial turn” and the “cultural turn,” the two are not identical, and this must be emphasized if the importance of space in history is to be fully exploited. Indeed, the study of space can help historians develop new perspectives on certain critical issues, most notably questions about agency and causation, and the relationship between material and intellectual life. Lastly, the essay introduces the articles which comprise this volume, showing how together and individually they represent an approach to space which encompasses both the material and the representational.

The History of Space

How important is space in history? The “spatial turn” is often presented and understood as a late twentieth- and twenty-first-century phenomenon.¹ In fact, however, the study of the past has long been saturated with spatialized concepts, both

as evidential historical categories and as historiographical frameworks: nation, empire, border, public, domestic, network. As Joanna Guldi's pioneering work on the "spatial turn" has shown, space has long played an important, even foundational, role in disciplined historical theory and practice.² Leopold von Ranke, for instance, took the "space of nations" as both the subject and the organizing principle of his enquiries. When he argues that "nations have evolved in unity and kindred movement" and laments the "division" afforded by the Reformation and political strife, Ranke proposes a historical trajectory driven by certain spatialized activities – migration, conquest, centralization – as well as a historiographical vocabulary for assessing that progress in terms of successful "union."³ In other words, Ranke is writing a kind of "spatial history"; a particular way of thinking about space – the idea of national consolidation – underpins his interpretation of historical events and change. Moreover – and this is an important point – Ranke's archival method is precisely located. His research involved travelling to specific archives and enduring various practical challenges: arduous journeys, poor accommodation, decaying documents, or closed collections. In this respect, he writes spatial history in another sense: his work is the product of interaction with specific material spaces. As Guldi notes, "to write history, as the historical discipline was invented, was very much a matter of interacting with the material landscape [...] The historian's route, traveling across diverse landscapes, was the single continuous thread that made possible the forging of an integrated story about the modern nation."⁴

Another prominent example of the importance of space in history comes from the *Annales* movement. The *Annales*, of course, employed different scalar perspectives in order to consider historical events within spatial frameworks larger or smaller than the nation state. Bloch's *La Société Féodale* (1939) and Braudel's *La*

Méditerranée (1949), for instance, combine interest in trans-state regions with attention to localized specifics. Braudel speaks of the “need to see on a grand scale,” but also notes that the Mediterranean is not a spatial totality: it is a “complex of seas [...] broken up by islands, interrupted by peninsulas, ringed by intricate coastlines,” each with their own interconnected contexts.⁵ By using different spatial frameworks to choose, focus and circumscribe certain topics, the *Annales* were able to offer new perspectives through which to interpret the events of the past. More fundamentally, however, the *Annales* also saw space as an active force in shaping history. They talk about geographical and environmental factors – mountains, plains, coastlines, climate – as having direct bearing on historical occurrences: as Braudel argues, “human life responds to the commands of the environment, but also seeks to evade and overcome them, only to be caught in other toils.”⁶ This was not, of course, a unique idea. Some scholars have detected the influence of early twentieth-century geographer Paul Vidal de la Blache who identified the supposed “personalities” of different geographical regions by arguing that people and landscape mutually imprint one another.⁷ And of course climactic theories – in which environmental circumstances are said to influence societal and individual development – have a very long provenance, reaching back through Jean Bodin and Montesquieu to Hippocrates and Strabo.⁸ The important point to emphasize here is the centrality of space for the *Annales* movement in both historiographical and historical terms: not only do they present a set of spatial perspectives through which to reconsider the past, but material space actively influences historical events.

I am arguing, then, that particular ideas about space are integral to several historiographical traditions. There are other examples. Guldi devotes especial attention to the radical landscape historians of the mid-twentieth century. Works such

as Henry Randall's *History in the Open Air* (1936) and W. G. Hoskins's *The Making of the English Landscape* (1955) show how the study of natural and built environments can offer evidential insights not accessible to solely documentary methodologies. By foregrounding questions about landholding, land use, everyday experiences and so on – in other words, by taking spatial contexts seriously – these works pioneered important developments in social history, material culture, and the history of everyday life.⁹ One might also mention how urban and architectural history explores the relationship between buildings and socio-cultural practice: for example, the development of different architectural styles, urbanization, city planning and so on.¹⁰

It is important to acknowledge this depth of historiographical interest in space. The “spatial turn” is often most associated with certain late twentieth-century thinkers: a range of founding theoretical texts such as Michel Foucault's “Of Other Spaces” (1967, published 1984) or Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* (1974); and several highly influential cultural geographers, including David Harvey, Edward Soja and Doreen Massey.¹¹ However, by acknowledging the significance of space in other, earlier, traditions we can see these figures as part of developing historical and historiographical interests in space, rather than as the creators of a “spatial turn” *ex nihilo*. Instead, Lefebvre, Harvey and their followers brought to the study of space a set of theoretical assumptions useful for historians. Firstly, that space is socially and culturally contingent: neither material spaces nor societal ideas about them are unchanging universal categories; rather, they are historically-specific cultural products – in Lefebvre's famous dictum, “(social) space is a (social) product.”¹² Secondly, Lefebvre and the rest propose that spaces are both instruments and evidence of uneven power dynamics and ideological agendas.¹³

One might say, then, these scholars have applied to the understanding of space some of the key insights of the 1970s “cultural turn” and the “new cultural history”: a suspicion of universal categories or positivist empiricism, and a focus on cultural processes, rhetorical language, sign systems and ideological meanings.¹⁴ Certainly, there are many subsequent works exploring the interaction of space, power and cultural meaning: from classic Foucauldian themes such as madness and sexuality, through to the strategies of power implicit in architecture and landscape.¹⁵ The effect of this cultural approach to space is perhaps most evident in the history of cartography. Formerly preoccupied with somewhat Whiggish narratives about the progress of scientific objectivity and ever-improving technology, J. B. Harley reframed the field around the idea that maps are reflections and agents of social ideologies: they “redescribe the world [...] in terms of relations of power and of cultural practices, preferences and priorities.”¹⁶

Clearly, it is important to acknowledge the influence of the cultural turn on ideas about space. But we must also recognize the breadth and significance of earlier historiographical interest in spatial topics. Otherwise, the danger is that we straightforwardly equate the emergence and possibilities of the “spatial turn” with the scholars, methods and achievements of cultural history after the “cultural turn.” Indeed, the term “spatial turn” may be problematic, not least because it unhelpfully suggests a parade of transient moments in scholarly fashion.¹⁷ Instead, I want to suggest, thinking about space is fundamental to the study of the past: it encompasses crucial questions about materiality, perception and agency. Cultural approaches have been, and remain, invaluable: for example, by promoting the notion that space is historically constructed and understood. But “spatial history” also has additional

strengths and prospects: it can combine interest in representation with greater attention to materiality and agency.

Representation, Materiality, Agency

A cultural approach to space offers one especially important insight: that space itself is a historical concept. In other words, space is not something outside history: a contextless, pre-existent “given,” or an “inert, frozen set of relations devoid of social origins and social implications.”¹⁸ Instead, space is historically contingent and constructed by specific circumstances and perspectives. Historians can therefore analyze the intellectual, cultural and social contexts which give rise to particular understandings of space, and explore how those understandings are reproduced, transformed and used.¹⁹ Some scholars have argued that the idea of “space as a naturally given, grid-like platform for human conduct” only became “an everyday premise” in seventeenth-century Europe. In other words, it is a particular perspective on the world, especially associated with ideas about the bureaucratic state and commodity exchange. Adopted by scientists, army officers, administrators and estate surveyors in the early modern period, this view of space has now become so commonplace that it is often taken for a neutral description of the world, when it is in fact a contextualized and historically-located interpretation of it.²⁰

If understandings of space are historically specific, they can therefore be disputed – something can be glimpsed when one examines the history of spatial thought. Isaac Newton understood space (and time) as “abstract, absolute entities that existed independently of their measurement.” But his contemporary Gottfried von Leibniz held that time and space are relational, that is, comprehensible only through “frames of interpretation.” Space and time have no “independent existence [...] but

[are] derivative of how we measure them.”²¹ These different interpretations encompass a significant philosophical problem: principally whether space is an intrinsic property of the universe, or whether it is an ordering mechanism devised by human observation. But these two views also remind us that understandings of space are not given or fixed. Instead, they are contested and historically constructed – that is, space has been understood in various ways at particular moments and is thus a contingent concept. This is even more evident when one examines non-European traditions. Barbara Mundy’s study of cartography in the New World shows how European and Aztec mapmakers comprehended and represented space in profoundly different ways. Spanish cartographers espoused “scientific rationalism”: they employed geometric techniques to describe “architecture and other man-made constructions” as “the defining and constituting features of space.” Conversely, the Aztecs offered “humanistic or social projections”: “their spatial reality was one defined and structured by social relationships,” rather than Euclidean geometries.²² Other scholars have identified critical cultural moments in which a society radically reassesses the way in which it understands space: such moments in Europe might include, for example, the discovery of the New World, the “dismantling of purgatory,” or the shift to heliocentrism.²³

The idea that space is contingent has thus been widely adopted; indeed, many contemporary theoretical paradigms in the humanities are underpinned by ideas about the cultural construction of space. To take two very well-known examples, Benedict Anderson’s notion of “imagined communities” and Edward Said’s analysis of the “Orient” are both premised upon the idea that “human beings plot their actions with reference to an imagined spatial projection of the world around them.”²⁴ Some historians have concentrated on how individual actors constructed their own “mental

maps” based on their “education, experience and personal values.”²⁵ Others, however, have focused on the social, economic, intellectual and political contexts through which different types of spatial imaginations are produced.²⁶ Charles Withers, for example, argues that the European Enlightenment was constituted, not only by particular geographical circumstances, but also by developing eighteenth-century ideas about space: the possibility of exact measurement, the utility of the natural world, and the borderless movement of knowledge.²⁷ For some historians, even landscape itself is a cultural construction. Influenced by John Berger’s art criticism, Denis Cosgrove argues that “the landscape idea represents a way of seeing – a way in which some Europeans have represented to themselves and to others the world about them and their relationships with it, and through which they have commented on social relations.”²⁸ In other words, landscape is, in part, an interpretative procedure – a kind of text which carries certain meanings and can be read by those who understand its metaphors.²⁹

This method, then, tends to see space predominantly as a set of metaphorical conceits, symbols pregnant with cultural meaning and situated within conceptual discourses.³⁰ But it also risks under-emphasizing the physicality of space: if spaces are merely texts to be read, one can lose sight of their materiality and the concrete experiences which take place in them. An approach to space largely concerned with representation risks presenting “spatial history” merely as a late-flowering branch of the cultural turn.³¹ Instead, therefore, historians also need to consider the physical elements and consequences of spaces. How do tangible spatial factors – proximity, resources, communication networks – affect the material and rhetorical construction of space: both at individual sites; and in spatialized ideas such as nation and empire? Can we identify the effects of spaces “without reducing them to clumsy, brute

determinants”?³² To what extent is all knowledge “situated”; that is, produced and organized by specific spatial contexts: the laboratory, the museum, or the coffeehouse?³³ How are ideological or societal concepts physically emplaced and enacted at specific locations, and how might they be changed by the material properties of those locations?

These are difficult questions. But they also suggest great opportunities for historical scholarship. The study of space can explore how materiality, social relations, epistemology and aesthetics interrelate. Talking about the spaces of empire, for example, Daniel Brewer argues that “the imaginary space of colonization intersects with aesthetic space; it is also an epistemological space, where forms of knowledge are set up, as well as a space of affect, where forms of desire are played out.”³⁴ By investigating space, historians can explore how the material and the representational are interrelated and mutually constitutive, not only in particular locations – churches, cities, and other sites – but also in the wider contexts of spatial thought and practice: for instance in the notions of “the border,” “territory,” or “the home.” Space concerns both “matter and meaning”: it is simultaneously “a set of social circumstances and physical landscapes, and as a constellation of discourses that reflect, constitute, and at times undermine, the [...] social order.”³⁵ The essays in this volume therefore discuss the practical uses of physical spaces, how past societies conceptualize space, and, importantly, explore the connections between activity and ideology. This last point is the crucial one. By considering both the physicality of material practices, as well as ideas about the world, the contributions can offer new perspectives on one of the most challenging issues in cultural and intellectual history: the relationship between ideas, matter and activity.

This, however, leads us to another important set of issues, relevant not only to space and history but also to historical study more broadly: questions about agency and causation. How do spatial factors – boundaries, proximity, distribution, connection and so on – affect past events? How, and from where, do particular concepts of space emerge and with what concrete consequences? How do people, cultures and societies shape spaces; and how do spaces affect those cultures and societies? On one level we might consider how social or intellectual elites construct physical and representational spaces which reflect their priorities. Many scholars have shown how elites manipulated urban and rural landscapes in order to articulate tangible and symbolic authority.³⁶ But this implies that space is simply acted upon by human actors – an assertion which, while persuasive in many respects, also contains some potential drawbacks. One problem is that it grants space anthropomorphic attributes: gendered space, sacred space, elite space, and so on. In these cases, an interpretation may be “read into or onto a space from a *knowledge generated elsewhere*, and then read back off the space as if it were the source of the knowledge, and then feted as a new evidential category.”³⁷ Another consequence is that it treats material space as a passive blank canvas; it turns physical sites into reified expressions of social or cultural ideas.³⁸

The bigger question, then, is how space might itself influence actions and shape events. Some historians have spoken of space’s “generative aspects”: it offers a way to think about agency and activity in material terms, outside the “shadowy world where such abstractions as “the market,” “political self-determination,” or “the state” reside.”³⁹ In this sense, space is not solely a contingent product of abstract historical forces; instead, it can also play a role in shaping historical practices, because it enables and constrains action.⁴⁰ Lief Jerram phrases this starkly: if

materiality “acts in its own right,” then the “material dispositions” of spaces may be able to “force, enable, delimit and prevent.”⁴¹ The point here is that space is not simply another expression of historical experience; rather, it replicates, enforces, or generates new categories of, say, gender or polity.⁴²

Clearly, this leads to difficult and controversial territory. To speak of space “acting in its own right” implies volition, or, at the very least, a set of essential qualities which can prescribe activity. Martina Löw, for example, talks about the “potentiality of spaces”: the way in which spatial and atmospheric qualities can influence societal responses. By way of illustration, she suggests that one might “enter a small shop in feverish haste,” but “restful music and pleasant aromas” might “retune” one’s responses and foster a sense of calm.⁴³ The problem with this example is that these atmospheric effects are not intrinsic qualities of the space; they are the products of human intervention. Any agency may therefore ultimately belong to those who acted on the space, rather than to the space itself. Furthermore, as Löw acknowledges, if spaces can “retune” or affect behavior, this may well be due to culturally-contingent responses to perceived conditions, rather than the intrinsic qualities of spaces themselves.⁴⁴ There are some longstanding philosophical problems here concerning perception: specifically, a debate about whether it is possible to perceive the world directly or whether perception is always filtered through human sense experience – an issue which Kant discusses explicitly with regard to space in the *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781).⁴⁵

As if this were not enough, any mention of space and agency also raises the specter of determinism: the idea that space is an “autonomous determinant” and that supposed spatial characteristics inevitably direct certain outcomes.⁴⁶ Clearly any causal explanation founded on a presumption of necessity is highly problematic,

though this is a potential difficulty for a range of historiographical traditions and fields – ranging from “Whiggish” political history to the history of technology – and as such is hardly unique to the study of space.⁴⁷ For this reason, the significance and possibilities of spatial history should not be disabled by wider dilemma at the heart of historical study. Space may well have “generative aspects,” but this does not mean that spaces *act* in themselves, or that essential spatial qualities necessarily structure activity – only that the material characteristics of spaces can influence beliefs and practices, just as beliefs and practices can shape concrete spaces. Taking examples from this book, to what extent did the spatial conditions of the St Petersburg site shape its physical construction and ideological messages?; how did the arrangement of early modern sites of worship help organize the enactment of societal roles.⁴⁸ Spatial history requires historians to confront and re-examine important questions about agency and contingency. It provides a way to explore how matter, lived experience and intellectual life interact in specific historical fields and contexts: the history of religious practice, city design, nationalism, science, or the emotions – topics all covered by the essays in this volume.

Spatial Questions; Spatial Answers

How, then, can historians analyze space? Firstly, we need to recognize that all historical events and practices are emplaced; that is, they are located in a physical and conceptual spatial context. We might then ask how these spatial circumstances may have shaped those events and practices. And we can also explore how physical spaces and spatial ideas are produced and constructed by changing and competing activities and ideologies.⁴⁹ These lines of enquiry lead to further questions encompassing both the material and representational elements of space. What are the

dominant paradigms for thinking about space in a given period? How, where and when do these emerge? How are spaces classified or divided – both literally and conceptually – and with what consequences? Who controls space, and how is this maintained or challenged? What is the relationship between space and socio-cultural identities? How are specific sites constructed in physical and ideological terms? How might material or conceptual spaces influence ideas and activities, and how might historians identify this influence? How do spaces help us understand the relationship between the material and the representational in particular contexts?⁵⁰

The essays in this volume represent a set of contextually specific answers to some of these questions. The book begins with Matthew Johnson's essay about early modern "living space." He argues that vernacular houses do not simply express existing symbolic concepts or mentalities, but instead "materialize a set of cultural practices and meanings at [a ...] quotidian level." In other words, "meanings and values do not have ontological existence prior to spaces and objects, but rather they emerge through [...] practice that takes place within and through spaces and objects." Johnson discusses the layouts and activities of particular sites alongside early modern conduct manuals, exposing how homes were fashioned in physical and representational terms. His discussion shows how "living space" was, in some respects, constructed at an idealized discursive level and disseminated to an "imagined community" of readers, but also, crucially, how home spaces were produced by the material practices and locally-interpreted activities of everyday life. Amanda Flather's contribution on gender and sacred space moves away from "the abstract historiographical metaphor" of separate spheres for men and women in order to "explore what people *did* in spaces and how gender influenced spatial meaning and patterns of use and control." She concentrates on parish churches, noting how

“questions of identity and social cohesion were bound up with issues of position and performance in particular places.” Her essay shows not only how church spaces and activities gave material expression to gendered ideas, but also how the local uses of space affected and modified understandings of social relations. That these mutual interactions occurred in churches – spaces which localize “the holy” – also suggests the imbrication of the spiritual, social and material in particular early modern locations.

Claire Norton focuses on the liminal spaces between the Ottoman and Habsburg empires. She warns historians against anachronistically imposing “nation-state spatial imaginaries with their concomitant emphasis on ethno-cultural, linguistic and religious homogeneity onto early modern conceptions of geographical space.” Early modern imperial authorities may well have employed propaganda to conceptualize space in terms of “loci of power.” However, literature, muster records, tax records, and correspondence suggest instead an imperial space which “permitted and encouraged both political cooperation and ethno-cultural and religious interaction.” In other words, we need to reassess how early modern communities conceptualized and experienced space in terms of connections, allegiances and synthesis, rather than centralized state power or bordered division. Crucially, Norton also argues for a corresponding fluidity in ethnic and religious identity in the borderlands, suggesting that intersecting economic and political alliances and networks helped constitute plural overlapping conceptions of space, society and identity alike.

Turning to early modern city spaces, Paul Keenan interrogates the material contexts and symbolic resonances central to the design and construction of St Petersburg. He explains how the city’s location served, and was intrinsic to, certain

military, commercial and political objectives. But he goes on to analyze the symbolisms literally built into the site: through its structure and details, the city displayed itself as an Orthodox Christian space, a sophisticated “European” space and as a “well-ordered,” rational space. In this way, St Petersburg employed a rhetorical language of the built environment in order to materialize particular interpretations of Russia and its rulers. Importantly, it also shaped that language, lending substance and physicality to representational rhetoric.

Mike Heffernan’s contribution discusses a significant development in early modern conceptions of space: the idea that space is “a fundamental physical parameter, measurable by techniques of survey and calculation that linked a knowable earth to the wider universe.” This was a critical moment in the “emergence of modernity” partly because it challenged traditional Aristotelian and Judeo-Christian understandings of the earth and the cosmos. Heffernan concentrates on the eighteenth-century Paris Academy of Sciences, suggesting that its debates about the relative merits and utility of terrestrial measurement and celestial calculation held substantive epistemological, disciplinary and institutional implications. He also locates these disputes within their specific sites and networks, showing that large-scale re-conceptualizations of space are themselves the products of particular spatial contexts.

The volume continues with two essays on imperial spaces. Lauren Benton and Jeppe Mulich use the concept of “microregions” to complicate historiographical understandings of early nineteenth-century empires. They show how the imperial and the local become entangled in small regions, and how “cross-polity movements and alliances” knit these zones together. These microregions – for example, the Leeward Islands, the Gold Coast, Mauritius – are defined equally by “thickening networks of

local exchange” and by the global imperial competitions and hegemonies which intersect there. Moreover, these regions are at the forefront of political experimentation: free ports, confederations, and other inter-polity jurisdictions. The key point is to understand these polities and spaces outside “narratives of a global politics dominated by either the continuities of empires or the proliferation of nation-states.” Microregions provide a spatial framework to explore the configurations of regionalism and global integration in empires. Andrew Rudd’s article explores the relationship between physical distance and imaginative sympathy in the spatial conception of empires. He discusses the practical problems occasioned “at the level of material space,” notably the “worryingly fragile networks of communication.” But he also demonstrates how eighteenth-century notions of sympathy were used to conceive of “empire as a community bound together by common laws, ideas and values, despite the remoteness between its constituent parts.” Focusing on Edmund Burke’s prosecution (1788-95) of Warren Hastings, Governor-General of India, Rudd suggests that ideas about universalism, cultural difference, morality and law are defined and given application by different perceptions and conceptions of space. He therefore explores the unexpected connections between imaginative and emotional spaces, and the theory and activity of imperial governance.

In the final essay, Robert Mayhew considers the significance of space and scale as historiographical tools. “Concepts of space,” he says, “can act upon the world, peoples’ spatial understandings driving their actions (which then affect the material world), just as assuredly as the socially-produced material world can affect mental space.” But space does not possess independent volition; it “cannot ‘do’ anything” in itself. Instead, space and scale are “logical devices for ordering our inquiries”; they structure our understandings of objects, events and experiences, and

in that sense are instruments of “worldmaking.” Mayhew demonstrates his approach by showing how different scalar perspectives – global, national and local – can facilitate diverse readings of Thomas Malthus’s *Essay on the Principle of Population*. Spatial categories, he concludes, are “one way of weaving the web of a historical narrative, of making a coherent historical worldview to contextualize an object, moment or person.” Beat Kümin closes the volume with a discussion of the essays’ wider implications. He argues that together they explore three themes of especial consequence: the negotiation of gendered spaces, the spatial limits of political control, and the formation of contextualized discourses about space and place. Moreover, he shows how the essays suggest important questions for future work on space and place, particularly concerning the relationship between materiality and immateriality and the definition of “early modernity” itself. Finally, Kümin uses the essays’ insights to propose a fresh terminological framework for analyzing historical spaces, a vocabulary which “helps us integrate the material, social and mental components of space constitution.” By “testing concepts, providing new insights and provoking further questions,” he says, “*The Uses of Space in Early Modern History* advances the field in significant ways.”

Acknowledgement: I am very grateful to Jo Guldi for her comments on an earlier version of this introduction.

¹ See the discussions in, for example, Diarmid A. Finnegan, “The Spatial Turn: Geographical Approaches in the History of Science,” *Journal of the History of Biology* 41 (2008); Angelo Torre, “Un ‘tournant spatial’ en histoire? Paysages, regards, ressources,” *Annales* 63, no. 5 (2008); Barney Warf and Santa Arias, eds., *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2009); Ralph Kingston, “Mind Over Matter: History and the Spatial Turn,” *Cultural and Social*

History 7, no. 1 (2010); Malte Rolf, "Importing the 'Spatial Turn' to Russia: Recent Studies on the Spatialisation of Russian History," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 11, no. 2 (n.s.) (2010); Kathryn Beebe, Angela Davis and Kathryn Gleadle. "Introduction: Space, Place and Gendered Identities: Feminist History and the Spatial Turn," *Women's History Review* 21, no. 4 (2012).

² See especially Joanna Guldi, *What is the Spatial Turn?* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Scholars Lab, 2010) <http://spatial.scholarslab.org/spatial-turn/what-is-the-spatial-turn/>; Guldi, "Landscape and Place," in *Research Methods for History*, ed. Simon Gunn and Lucy Faire (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012).

³ Leopold von Ranke, "Preface" to the first edition of *Histories of the Latin and Germanic Peoples* (1824), in Ranke, *The Theory and Practice of History*, ed. Georg G. Iggers, trans., Wilma A. Iggers (London: Routledge, 2011), 85-7. See also Ranke's "Introduction" to this work trans. Philip A. Ashworth (London: Bell, 1887), 1-17.

⁴ Guldi, "The Spatial Turn in History" (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Scholars Lab, 2010) <http://spatial.scholarslab.org/spatial-turn/the-spatial-turn-in-history/index.html>. See also Bonnie G. Smith, "Gender and the Practices of Scientific History: The Seminar and Archival Research in the Nineteenth Century," *American Historical Review* 100, no. 4 (1995): 1166-9.

⁵ Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, trans. Siân Reynolds, abridged Richard Ollard (London: HarperCollins, 1992), xiv, x.

⁶ Braudel, *The Mediterranean*, 199.

⁷ Kristin Ross, *The Emergence of Social Space* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988; reprinted London: Verso, 2008), 86-7. See also Kevin

Archer, "Regions as Social Organisms: The Lamarckian Characteristics of Vidal de la Blache's Regional Geography," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 83, no. 3 (1993): 498-514.

⁸ See David N. Livingstone, "Environmental Determinism," in *Handbook of Geographical Knowledge*, ed. John Agnew and David Livingstone (London: Sage, 2011), 368-80.

⁹ Guldi, "Landscape and Place," 68-70.

¹⁰ For a useful bibliography see Simon Gunn, "'The Spatial Turn: Changing Histories of Space and Place,'" in *Identities in Space: Contested territories in the Western City since 1850*, ed. Simon Gunn and Robert J. Morris (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 1-14.

See also Guldi, "Landscape and Place," 70-2.

¹¹ See Barney Warf and Santa Arias, "Introduction: The Reinsertion of Space into the Social Sciences and Humanities," in *The Spatial Turn*, ed. Warf and Arias, 3. Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," trans. Jay Miskowiec, *Diacritics* 16, no. 1 (1986): 22-27; Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991). See also David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990); Harvey, *Paris: Capital of Modernity* (London: Routledge, 2003); Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989); Doreen Massey, *Space, Place and Gender* (Cambridge: Polity, 1994).

¹² Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 26.

¹³ Guldi, "What is the Spatial Turn?"

¹⁴ Lynn Hunt "Introduction" to Lynn Hunt, ed., *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989), 7. See also Roger Chartier, "Intellectual History or Sociocultural History? The French Trajectories," in *Modern European*

Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives, ed. Dominick LaCapra and Steven L. Kaplan (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982).

¹⁴ Ralph Kingston, "Mind Over Matter," 112.

¹⁵ See, for example: Andrew Scull, *The Insanity of Place / The Place of Insanity: Essays on the History of Psychiatry* (London: Routledge, 2006); George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940* (New York: Basic, 1994); Robert Titler, *Architecture and Power: The Town Hall and the English Urban Community, c. 1500-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991); W. J. T. Mitchell, *Landscape and Power* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

¹⁶ J. B. Harley. "Text and Contexts in the Interpretation of Early Maps," in J. B. Harley, *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography*, ed. Paul Laxton, intro. J. H. Andrews (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 35.

¹⁷ See "AHR Forum: Historiographic 'Turns' in Critical Perspective," *American Historical Review* 117, no. 3 (2012): 698-813.

¹⁸ Santa Arias, "Rethinking Space: An Outsider's View of the Spatial Turn," *GeoJournal* 75 (2010), 31.

¹⁹ Arias, "Rethinking Space," 31; David Harvey, *Social Justice and the City* (1973) (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, revised edn. 2009).

²⁰ Richard Biernacki and Jennifer Jordan. "The Place of Space in the Study of the Social," in *The Social in Question: New Bearings in History and the Social Sciences*, ed. Patrick Joyce (London: Routledge, 2002), 133, 140.

²¹ Barney Warf, "From Surfaces to Networks," in *The Spatial Turn*, ed. Warf and Arias, 59.

²² Barbara Mundy, *The Mapping of New Spain: Indigenous Cartography and the Maps of the Relaciones Geográficas* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996), xiii-xvi.

²³ Beat Kümin and Cornelia Usborne, "At Home and in the Workplace: A Historical Introduction to the 'Spatial Turn,'" *History and Theory* 52 (2013): 317.

²⁴ Kingston, "Mind Over Matter," 113-14. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. edn. (London: Verso, 2006); Edward Said, *Orientalism*, rev. edn. (London: Penguin, 2003).

²⁵ Steven Casey and Jonathan Wright, "Introduction," to *Mental Maps in the Early Cold War Era, 1945-68*, ed. Steven Casey and Jonathan Wright (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 1.

²⁶ See, for example, Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory* (London: HarperCollins, 1995); Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Pamela K. Gilbert, ed., *Imagined Londons* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002); John Rennie Short, *Making Space: Revisioning the World 1495-1600* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2004)

²⁷ Charles Withers, *Placing the Enlightenment: Thinking Geographically About the Age of Reason* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2007), esp. 6-21.

²⁸ Denis Cosgrove, *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*, rev. edn. (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998), 1. See also John Berger, *Ways of Seeing* (London: Penguin, 1972).

²⁹ See Stephen Daniels and Denis Cosgrove, "Spectacle and Text": Landscape Metaphors in Cultural Geography," in *Place/Culture/Representation*, ed. James

Duncan and David Ley (London: Routledge, 1993), 57-77. For an overview see Susanne Seymour, "Historical Geographies of Landscape," in *Modern Historical Geographies*, ed. Brian Graham and Catherine Nash (Harlow: Pearson, 2000), 194.

³⁰ Philip Ethington, "Placing the Past: "Groundwork" for a Spatial Theory of History," *Rethinking History* 11:4 (2007), 475-6.

³¹ Kingston, "Mind Over Matter," 112-14; Lief Jerram, "Space: A Useless Category for Historical Analysis?," *History and Theory* 52 (2013), 417. See also David Matless, "An Occasion for Geography: Landscape, Representation, and Foucault's Corpus," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10 (1992), 41-56.

³² Patrick Joyce and Tony Bennett, "Introduction: Material Powers"; and Chris Otter, "Locating Matter: The Place of Materiality in Urban History," both in *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, History and the Material Turn*, ed. Tony Bennett and Patrick Joyce (London: Routledge, 2010), esp. 5-8, 43-6.

³³ David N. Livingstone, *Putting Science in its Place: Geographies of Scientific Knowledge* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2003).

³⁴ Daniel Brewer, "Lights in Space," *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 37, no 2 (2004), 184.

³⁵ Arias, "Rethinking Space," 29.

³⁶ Denis Cosgrove, *The Palladian Landscape: Geographical Change and its Cultural Representations in Sixteenth-Century Italy* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1993); Chandra Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Harvey, *Paris, Capital of Modernity*.

³⁷ Jerram, "Space," 404, 413.

³⁸ See Daniel Miller, "Materiality: An Introduction," in *Materiality*, ed. Daniel Miller (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 3

³⁹ Peter J. Arnade, Martha C. Howell and Walter Simons, "Fertile Spaces: The Productivity of Urban Space in Northern Europe," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32, no. 4 (2002), 516, 541. See also Otter, "Locating Matter," 54.

⁴⁰ Mike Crang, "Spaces in Theory, Spaces in History and Spatial Historiographies," in *Political Space in Pre-Industrial Europe*, ed. Beat Kümin (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 264. See also Crang, "Time: Space," in *Spaces of Geographical Thought*, ed. Paul Cloke and Ron Johnson (London: Sage, 2005), 199-217.

⁴¹ Jerram, "Space," 414. On materiality and causation in historical study see Frank Trentmann, "Materiality in the Future of History: Thing, Practice, and Politics," *The Journal of British Studies* 48, no. 2 (2009), 283-307.

⁴² I owe this observation and its phrasing to Jo Guldi.

⁴³ Martina Löw, "The Constitution of Space: The Structuration of Spaces Through the Simultaneity of Effect and Perception," trans. Rhodes Barrett, *European Journal of Social Theory* 11, no. 1 (2008), 43-4

⁴⁴ Löw, "Constitution of Space," 43, 45-6.

⁴⁵ See particularly the section "Transcendental Doctrine of the Elements. First Part: Transcendental Aesthetic."

⁴⁶ Ross, *Emergence of Social Space*, 9. For some problems surrounding spatial and environmental determinism see: Gabriel Judkins, Marissa Smith and Eric Keys, "Determinism within Human-Environment Research and the Rediscovery of Environmental Causation," *The Geographical Journal* 174, no. 1 (2008), 17-29; James M. Blaut, "Environmentalism and Eurocentrism," *The Geographical Review* 89, no. 3 (1999): 391-408.

⁴⁷ See Adrian Wilson and T. G. Ashplant, “Whig History and Present-Centred History,” *The Historical Journal* 31, no. 1 (1988), 1-16; Merritt Roe Smith and Leo Marx, *Does Technology Drive History? The Dilemma of Technological Determinism* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994).

⁴⁸ See the articles by Paul Keenan and Amanda Flather in this volume.

⁴⁹ Crang, “Spaces in Theory,” 249.

⁵⁰ These questions are influenced by Jerram, “Space,” 418; Simon Gunn and Robert J. Morris, “Preface,” in *Identities and Space*, ed. Gunn and Morris, x; Gerd Schwerhoff, “Spaces, Places and the Historians,” *History and Theory* 52 (2013), 430.