

Space, Narration, and the Everyday

WLADIMIR FISCHER-NEBMAIER

Spaces can become full of time when they permit certain properties of narrative to operate in everyday life.

Richard Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*¹

What comes to mind first when reading a book title like *Narrating the City* are probably city novels like Dickens's *A Tale of Two Cities* or his other London stories, or perhaps Émile Zola's *Le Ventre de Paris*, Alexander Belyj's *Peterburg*, or Alfred Döblin's *Berlin Alexanderplatz*, and of course Baudelaire's Paris poems. This linkage of the city and narration is not limited to the classical period of urban modernity, as is evident from more-recent titles like Paul Auster's *New York Trilogy* or Orhan Pamuk's *Istanbul*. The city has been the topic of so many central literary texts that it seems that modern literature is somehow inextricably linked with urbanity; as Richard Sennet has argued, literature sometimes captures urban phenomena better than academic writing.² Sometimes novels set in the city have influenced how scholars in very different academic disciplines have thought about the city. Indeed, the writing of urban fiction has always been influenced by other discourses on urbanity—perhaps most prominently, as James Donald pointed out, the discourses on crime, disease, citizenship, and class struggle (consider Victor Hugo's Paris, Jack London's San Francisco, or Upton Sinclair's Chicago).³

However, it is not only fictional writing that interlocks cities and stories, but it is also narration in a more general sense. This volume explores the interplay between the concepts of narration, space, and the everyday in the city through a variety of disciplinary and interdisciplinary lenses. As this introduction will demonstrate, there have been currents in international scholarship over the past one hundred years that

have successfully connected the everyday, space, and narration that have influenced our contributors. Important interdisciplinary authors have engaged with two or all of these concepts—for example, Michel de Certeau, Henri Lefèbvre, Erving Goffman, or Mikhail Bakhtin, the latter of whom coined the term “chronotopos” or “chronotope.” Whole subdisciplines have been dedicated to linking at least two of the phenomena, as oral historians did with storytelling and everyday history, or urban ethnographers with storytelling and space.

The background to the development traced in this introduction involves a democratization of theories across disciplinary boundaries that took place during the second half of the twentieth century, informed by innovations in literary theory before the Second World War. The following introductory chapters on narration, the everyday, and space celebrate these developments, particularly those catalyzed by the work of thinkers who facilitated connections across entrenched disciplinary positions (ethnologists, symbolical interactionists, semiologists, narratologists, perhaps also critical Marxists). Given the democratizing thrust of many of these scholarly enterprises, it comes as no surprise that in many cases critiques of power and hegemony have linked the concepts of space, narration, and the everyday. Likewise, the replacement of vertical concepts with horizontal ones in many post-Cartesian moves in the 1970s and 1980s are part of debates linking narration, space, and the everyday. Arguably, the heyday of the theoretical developments traced here was the 1980s; nonetheless the actual interlinkage of all three concepts is an ongoing process.⁴ This is what the seven chapters in this volume demonstrate, each after its own fashion.

The Everyday

The everyday offers itself up as a problem, a contradiction, a paradox: both ordinary and extraordinary, self-evident and opaque, known and unknown, obvious and enigmatic.

Ben Highmore, 2002⁵

In one way or another, the everyday has preoccupied intellectuals since the late eighteenth century, at the latest. Under the influence first of Enlightenment thinkers and later through research inspired by the Romanticism movement, the everyday has entered spaces in the world of academic research and teaching that had previously been reserved for so-called higher values. For instance, where theology had once dominated, the study of popular religion and religions of “primitive peoples”

became legitimate subjects of inquiry. Scholars of language, who had formerly engaged in prescribing *le bon usage* of grammar, now grew interested in describing words that “the people” used for everyday objects and concepts, including even obscene language. With the introduction of ethnological approaches, the people became the subject of a particular academic discipline.⁶

An Elusive Concept

From the moment of its introduction, the everyday has been an elusive concept. First, it is ambiguous: Is the everyday merely the sum total of what people do each day and from day to day, or is it something more meaningful? If the former, no human being can ever grasp the everyday. If the everyday is all about temporality, how, then, can we actually show what the everyday is if not in real time? But if we employ the concept in this way, our concept of the everyday would stop being a concept and rather become the thing itself. This utopian intellectual claim has rendered the everyday an object of desire: it seems like the key to reality.⁷ Perhaps it also seems so precious because understanding the everyday might be the key to power—in other words, the power to liberate the oppressed, to gain control over entire populations, or the recipe for economically exploiting their (everyday) needs. What is the everyday and what does it have to do with space, narration, and the city?

The first academic approaches to the everyday were those inspired by romanticist ideology in the early nineteenth century, in some cases even earlier. Romanticists were interested in the ways the people lived, at a time when the people came to be understood in a specifically national context.⁸ As the foundation of Enlightenment bourgeois political philosophy just a few short decades earlier, the people had become the ultimate authority and fundamental source of value in an evolving nationalist discourse. Classic examples are France and the United States, where revolutionaries declared the people sovereign. Even in the nominal monarchies, the people have replaced the country not only in philosophical discourse, but also in political practice and law.⁹ For public communication, the following question arose: what language would be fitting for a society of and for the people? This question was especially acute in regions without one, uncontested language standard. Consequently, philologists in Central, Southern, and Eastern Europe ventured out and meticulously noted the terms people employed to designate objects in their everyday worlds. They also recorded stories recounted by older village women.¹⁰ Ethnologists would later employ a similar tactic,

albeit for different heuristic ends, when they encountered the customs, costumes, narratives, and objects of everyday life.¹¹

But is folk culture necessarily identical with the everyday—and vice versa? Ethnological investigation has always focused on special cultural practices that are arguably not part of the everyday. For example, sacred rituals take place on specific days at special times. People dress up especially for rituals; they do not wear their costumes used for rituals on an ordinary workday. Rituals are performed to structure the course of life, they are not the course of life itself, as we will explore further below.¹²

Some ethnographers and ethnolinguists have managed to spare themselves such criticism. There has always been a section of those disciplines that not only engaged with epic poetry and rituals of passage, but also looked closely at cultural routines—a perspective, it should be noted, that was in accordance with the romanticist aspiration to “compass the whole of life.”¹³ Originally, ethnographers typically looked to rural villages for documentation on popular practices such as food preparation. After the First World War certain ethnographers also turned to the city, investigating the everyday culture of rural migrants as they transformed themselves into urban workers, yet left the legacy of their rural experiences on subsequent generations. Scholars in subdisciplinary fields such as sociolinguistics and urban ethnography have richly documented such practices.¹⁴ The research presented here by Tihana Rubić and Carolin Leutloff-Grandits in their chapter on Zagreb mass housing tenants is a contemporary example of such an urban ethnography. The turn to the city was in many instances connected to the abandoning of primitivism—that is, of the focus on folkloric and presumed primordial practices.¹⁵

Even as these new approaches evolved, scholars who were engaged in them still implicitly defined the everyday in a socially selective way, insofar as they gave preference to the routines of the poor or so-called ordinary people over the rich and prominent. A thorough appreciation of the everyday would have to include examination of the latter’s realm of experience, too, even if elites are not representative of the broader population. Indeed, a range of elite attitudes toward popular everyday practices are as essential to gaining a fuller appreciation of social dynamics in specific contexts as are popular perceptions of elite everyday practices.

For the purpose of this volume, we employ a circumscribed working definition of the everyday, but one that we suggest is no less rich for its simplicity. The everyday is what we do on a daily basis under specific circumstances or as part of the longer arch of life, and that is structured by rituals both mundane and loaded with larger meaning.

The Everyday, Authenticity, and Ritual

The idea that investigation into the everyday also brings investigation into reality rests on the argument that it is not the glorious battles, not the genius' moments of inspiration, not the creation of exceptional works of art that represent daily experience for most people. Consistent with the fundamental move to translate the idea of majority democracy into academic research, the concept of "real" is not what the most important people experience, but rather what most people experience as (the most important) reality. This broad focus can raise the larger question of authenticity, however. Postmodern critics have argued that leftist scholars of the everyday criticized the nationalist agenda of traditional ethnographers and their approach to customs and material culture, only to replace national essentialism with class essentialism.¹⁶

Since the 1960s two contradictory yet connected trends have evolved. It appears that at the same time as postmodernists were developing a critique of authenticity, authority, and the *auteur* (see part 3 of this introduction, "Narration"), an authenticist and ever-more radical claim for the everyday was thriving. Prominent examples come from scholars working in the area of early modern history interested in the other and in sociocultural change. For example, Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie's early microhistory *Montaillou* (1975) described phenomena of early modern peasants' everyday life, but he was actually more interested in them as articulations of *longue durée* phenomena such as the climate than as peasant sociocultural practices.¹⁷ Carlo Ginzburg's account (originally published in 1976) of one villager's thinking may have done justice to a particular person's ideas, but it aimed fundamentally at assumed roots in preexisting, essentially anti-authoritarian, folk traditions.¹⁸ Both works are examples for microstudies guided by an interest in larger patterns and underlying structures that had certain authenticist features—that is, that the phenomena were not taken for what they were, but as emanations of something supposed to be more real.¹⁹

Today, authenticism is a compromised concept. Other scholars, including later ones such as Michel de Certeau, reconciled the everyday with postmodern critiques. Moreover, when historians began to embrace new ethnographical methodologies, such as Clifford Geertz's concept of thick description, they too turned away from speculating about what was thought to lie behind or beneath their objects of study. In the long run the everyday was saved as a useful concept, even taking the influence of postmodernism into account.

How justified is the other move, then—to prioritize the everyday over ritual? A critical stance toward a history or sociology of exceptional

events is justified, of course—and not only because of democratic considerations. Yet such a critical stance should not forgo consideration of ritual. As mentioned above, there are rituals that are recurrent, that are quite different than once-in-a-lifetime *rites de passage* like enthronement rituals. Everyday rituals, from sacred (e.g., praying) to profane (e.g., selecting one's clothes for the day ahead), structure the day and are there to give meaning and order to people's lives. Thus, everyday life can be scripted in key ways—structured by rituals, conceived in terms of narrations concerning the self and the other. As Louis Althusser has noted, rituals incorporate ideology into everyday life.²⁰ So, is ritual, in fact, an everyday phenomenon? A way out of these dilemmas might be inspired by the suggestion offered by Deleuze and Guattari to abandon vertical thinking in favor of “keeping it flat,” as Bruno Latour has put it.²¹ This allows us to acknowledge the importance of both exceptional narrations and rituals like those Andriy Zayarnyuk explores in his chapter on history and the everyday in L'viv alongside daily routines that Rubić and Leutloff-Grandits describe in their chapter on strategies of child care and neighborhood help in Zagreb. Such approaches suggest that the researcher's task becomes a search for connections between that which might be considered extraordinary and that which is mundane. Stories about the exceptional provide inspiration for the everyday. They are ubiquitous and transmitted via a variety of media, such as news reports, popular literature, comics, television, or popular songs. In this respect there is no elevated sphere of ritual with the rich and famous hovering over the abyss of the populace's everyday life routines. Instead, they are interconnected—not randomly but along the lines of politics and power. This brings us to the question of hegemony.

Hegemony

The everyday is not an innocent concept. Thinking about masses of people and about how they occupy themselves cannot be separated from issues of power and profit. If it were possible to know what most people do, it might be possible to influence them on a consistent basis. Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937) recognized this in his treatment of cultural hegemony—a concept that has become an integral part of the field of cultural studies that, since the 1960s, draws directly both from Gramsci and from contributions of scholars such as Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe.²² Cultural hegemony is a concept designed to explain how domination works and how it is maintained through consent, in contrast to extremely violent forms of domination associated with colonial or fascist regimes.²³ Elites find ways to persuade the subordinated social classes to

accept and adopt ruling-class values.²⁴ Crucial in this persuasion is reliance on the suggestion that the norms of the ruling classes are normal, natural, and perhaps even eternal. Everyday practices are the site where hegemony is actually exercised, for it is the everyday that convincingly appears ever-present and natural.²⁵ Technologies like inexpensive printing allowed for the distribution of images—for example, those depicting righteous conduct as defined by the middle classes, or national identity and community solidarity as defined by fascist regimes. The use of images, in this case filmic ones, are investigated in Anna Schober's study of how institutions incorporated cinema "into their strategies in order to expand their sphere of action" in the introduction to her contribution. One might identify the exercise of cultural hegemony far earlier than the twentieth-century context Gramsci observed, however. For example, in the late eighteenth century, Enlightenment-influenced intellectuals and public officials attempted to modify cultural forms such as folk songs and proverbs to propagate what they considered useful and appropriate content for the populace, such as purging sexual content and replacing it with references to industriousness.

The heightened interest in the popular and in the concept of the everyday expressed by the post-Marxist Left during the 1970s and 1980s, influenced by the concept of hegemony, was not necessarily an authenticist one. Cultural studies scholars developed concepts (since the 1970s, anti-essentialist concepts) in order to explain the failure of the radical Left to seize power in the twentieth-century industrialized world, and later to account for how Thatcherism and Reaganomics could find wide resonance despite their negative effects on the majority of the population.²⁶ Herbert Marcuse, Max Horkheimer, and Theodor Adorno had developed similar ideas about the role of popular culture in achieving power in their writings on culture, especially during Nazism but also within the "Hollywood" media system.²⁷ In contrast to this negative qualification of mass culture, in the 1970s and 1980s cultural studies scholars and others, either emphasized the possibility to appropriate popular and consumer culture, or focused on the agency of "the oppressed" who used such cultural practices for their own purposes.²⁸ Schober's work on cinematic spaces in this volume takes a new departure on this topic; she explores the strategies of cinema activists in several European cities who countered hegemonic use of cinema by producing difference. Some observers, themselves not disinclined to its aims, criticized cultural studies scholars for their initial focus on heroic gestures of working-class resistance, their indifference to gender, their lack of irony or—especially later on—for a blind belief in the power of the consumer that others derided as populism.²⁹

The North American variant of this intellectual current has focused especially on the media.³⁰ Researchers had earlier come to similar conclusions concerning the importance of creating consent via the everyday in their examination of the media and advertising industries. For example, they observed the tendency for marketing strategies to make products an integral part of their customers' lives. Some items could be consumed on a daily basis like soda pop, newspapers, or TV shows; others, such as the brands of car manufacturers, could manifest themselves every day.³¹ Consumer surveys developed by marketing strategists would apply methods similar to those of anthropologists and sociologists, and firms recruited staff members who had studied these disciplines.³²

Operationalizing the Everyday

When taken seriously, the study of everyday life can help us understand how things work—for example, how processes in a hospital function, how scientific inventions come about, or which decoding processes are involved in watching television. These are the questions that methodologies subsumed under the labels qualitative sociology, actor-network theory, cultural studies, ethnomethodology, and interactionism were designed to address. Some of the most acute questions raised in this volume speak to these sorts of topics. For example, Ronald Johnston and Arthur McIvor explore the way laborers dealt with health hazards in the workplace, Rubić and Leutloff-Grandits discern strategies mothers in mass-settlements developed to organize family and work, and Matt Berg explores how Viennese tenants acted to retain or gain access to scarce housing space in the years immediately following the Second World War. It is worth reflecting for a moment on how the fields in which most of our volume's authors were trained approach the everyday.

Historians have long been more interested in the political achievements of kings and queens than in the lives of their subjects. In the 1920s the founders of the *Annales* school, Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre, initiated the gradual turn of several generations of French and eventually other historians not only toward long-term structural history, but also to a history of the common people, developed with methods adopted from sociology and geography. The *Annalistes* used large quantities, or series, of documents, such as wills and marriage certificates, to create long-term accounts of the lives of the masses. In the 1970s some *Annales* historians of the second and third generation became particularly interested in the everyday experiences of rural people in the medieval and early modern period. Georges Duby and Philippe Ariès engaged with the history of private life from the Roman Empire until today.³³ Other historians went

to the village level and concentrated, as mentioned above, on clearly defined subjects in specific locations—for example, Le Roy Ladurie used the rich sources of one village in Southern France to show an unprecedented array of aspects of life in that village from agriculture to sexual deviance. The new trend came to be known as microhistory, a term introduced by Carlo Ginzburg.³⁴

As important as these microstudies have been for historiography, a significant new development emerged during the late 1970s and 1980s as the history workshop and dig-where-you-stand movements in Britain and Scandinavia, respectively, began to concentrate more intentionally on the actual actors in microsettings. This was a clear challenge to the preceding generation of social historians associated with *Annales*. In West Germany *Alltagsgeschichte* (history of the everyday) touched a particularly sensitive spot as it highlighted the everyday involvement of non-elite Germans in genocide and war of annihilation (*Vernichtungskrieg*).³⁵ Readers of Berg's chapter on housing requisition and reactions to it in post-Second World War Vienna in this volume will note that his work is informed by and speaks to this historiographic current.

At approximately the same time, fostered by the development of portable sound recording technology (audio tape), oral history developed as a movement to capture the history of the working classes particularly, as noted earlier in this introduction. Important branches developed in Europe and in the Americas. The narratives of ordinary people entered into scholarly historical works, historical exhibitions, museums, and interpretive centers; oral history was thus integrated into a new memorial culture that was developing parallel to the decline of traditional industrial working classes in an era of Western deindustrialization.³⁶ The Johnston and McIvor chapter in this volume on strategies developed to inform people of the asbestos hazard in a Scottish harbor town stands in this tradition.

As noted above, early-twentieth-century ethnologists and anthropologists were not so much interested in the everyday as they were in rituals and the symbols associated with them. Nevertheless, questions about the social organization of culture have accompanied these disciplinary discourses. In the 1960s a growing number of scholars turned their attention toward the everyday. They saw it as the site where collective meanings are created through interactions between individuals. The theory of symbolical interaction (Blumer) was actually developed among the ranks of sociologists,³⁷ but it also entered the field of anthropology, particularly through the influential work of Victor Turner and Howard Garfinkel.³⁸ This has created yet another space where anthropology has served as a communicating vessel across several disciplinary formations.

For instance, qualitative sociology and symbolic anthropology employ techniques of self-reflected conversation with actors and self-reflective observation. Both make use of regular reports that the researcher writes to herself not merely to record findings, but also to control developments and adjustments within the research process (such as the method that lies at the basis of the chapter on Zagreb mass housing tenants in our book). The notebook of the ethnographer has much in common with the memos of grounded theory.³⁹

Similar to the historians interested in the everyday, symbolic interactionists and anthropologists have been interested in the actual processes that continually comprise society, our perceived reality, or any other collective sociocultural projection. The emphasis on symbolism and interpersonal contact offers connections to various psychological theories—for instance in Erving Goffman’s work on identity management and the “presentation of self in everyday life.”⁴⁰ This does not mean that their work was detached from concrete reality; interactionists focus explicitly on how humans act towards things while anthropologists had a line of tradition to deal with what has been called material culture.⁴¹

Finally, the ideas described here have also found followers among historians. Historical anthropologists have embraced the idea of self-reflectiveness (or going into the field), and employed it in their journeys into the archives. Notable standard bearers include Peter Burke, who offered cultural analysis of the self-styling of the sun king Louis XIV or in the enthroning rituals of early modern English kings; and Robert Darnton, who adopted ideas from symbolic interactionism in his analysis of underground rumors and gossip surrounding the prerevolutionary royal court in Paris.⁴² Significantly, all these approaches have heavily depended on narration, whether in qualitative interviewing, field research, or the study of historical sources. This need for narration created openings for postmodern thinking among anthropologists and other social and cultural theorists.⁴³ Zayarnyuk’s chapter on L’viv, with its emphasis on difference in the history of the everyday, is a fine example of critical post-Soviet historiography informed by the discussions described above, which he presents in an interpretive survey.

Realism? How Fiction Writers Have Approached the Everyday

Literary scholars began to engage with the everyday much earlier than their colleagues in most of the other academic disciplines. This seems only natural, as we will see, given that narration is, to a great extent about “what it was like.” Debates in literary studies about whether to describe the everyday—and, if so, how to go about doing it—revolved around the

term “realism.” The discussion has been ongoing since at least the 1850s. The semiotic literary theorist Roman Jakobson once argued that every generation of *litterati* has its own realism debate and its own definition of realism.⁴⁴ This point notwithstanding, literary scholars in the West refer to a specific epoch as realism, modeled on the French realism movement of the 1850s identified with Honoré de Balzac and Gustave Flaubert who stood in opposition to romanticism. There have been many arguments about the historical connection between modernity and literary realism, as well as modernity on the one hand and capitalism and democracy on the other.⁴⁵ All three formations have been connected to (or interested in) the everyday, the ordinary, the repetitive. Moreover, the engagement of literary scholars like Walter Benjamin with the everyday has often been in response to phenomena of modernity, like the new access of the masses to resources once reserved for the privileged, the colonization of private life by commerce, or the impressions of a flâneur in the city.⁴⁶ Almandoz’s contribution on authors and their main characters moving through the city quarters of Caracas in time and space is a contemporary contribution to a debate that has always been linked to urbanity and modernity.

Not unlike later generations of anthropologists and sociologists, fiction writers who wrote realistically found it logical to describe not only the events and dialogues necessary to the plot (save any allegorical or symbolic descriptions), but also the detailed ways in which the actors speak, behave, look, and feel vis-à-vis the environments in which they find themselves. Russian realists of the progressive Gogolian school went so far as to fill page after page with irrelevant detail and dialogue in order to capture how conversations really flowed—and also in order to depict the social classes to which the fictional characters belonged.⁴⁷ Realism began simultaneously to exercise influence on the new disciplines of both ethnography and ethnolinguistics. This was not a coincidence, but a phenomenon of the expansion of positivistic claims on the entire world during the nineteenth century. In a way, authors of realist (later also of the naturalist) fiction pioneered what would become the methodologies of twentieth-century anthropology, sociology, and historiography.

The technique of creating a realistic account for fiction authors has caused the same paradox as in academic research, of course; an author can control narrative time which, apart from certain experimental texts, unfolds more rapidly than does real time. A realistic account would probably develop at a slower pace. Still, even a faster pace can be realistic—for example, the account of a crisis might be more realistic if it captures how the pace of events is perceived subjectively.⁴⁸ These are literary tech-

niques of narration that have proven to be a good resource for treatment of the everyday, perhaps equally or even better equipped than the academic account of the researcher to capture lived life.⁴⁹ When we touch upon narration in the third and last part of this introduction, we will note that methodologies that engage with the everyday rely heavily on narratives, insofar as they conduct interviews, analyze texts, interpret nonlinguistic narrative sign systems, and so on. Narration's unique potential to relate the quality of what happened is perhaps the only way to capture what otherwise appears elusive in the concept of the everyday. It is also the reason why in this volume we feature studies about narrating the urban everyday.

Space

The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space.

Michel Foucault, *Of Other Spaces*⁵⁰

Space is a practiced place.

Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*⁵¹

Space is where it all comes together, including narration and the everyday. Given that space is one of the key dimensions in which human activity takes place, this volume examines it in the form of family dwellings, city streets, and harbor docks. The book also makes a contribution on discussions about spatiality in public and private contexts, specifically discussions about claims for particular urban spaces like city quarters of Caracas; apartments and cinemas in Vienna, Cologne, Berlin, Ljubljana, and Belgrade; wharves and homes of Clydeside; mass dwellings in Nieuwland and Novi Zagreb; or the city of L'viv in its entirety. Indeed, the everyday frequently—but certainly not exclusively—takes place in those spaces that are used by masses of people, by everyone. For narration, space matters in a double sense: there must be places where people tell and hear stories, as when the urban anthropologist interviews a respondent in her modest Zagreb living room. But there also need to be spaces and places in narration itself, especially in fictional narration, like the dark forest in fairy tales. Narrated spaces are at the center of chapter 2 in this book, in which Almandoz tackles the fictionalization of city quarters. In factual narration, as most of the narrative texts under scrutiny in this book are, the plot may take place in the very same Zagreb living room just mentioned—yet here we are concerned with the space that underlies the rules of narration.

Perhaps the experience of cyberspace has made us more perceptive of imagined spaces, as the plethora of recent studies on spatial constructs and mental maps, especially the connection of space and power, testify.⁵² Spatial discourse can create powerful concepts and represent powerful images that help organize our thinking about the world in a hegemonic fashion, for example in such concepts as the East and the West in European modernity.⁵³ But such geostrategic symbolic usage is not the only power issue in space. The studies in this book subscribe to more localized concepts of space, like in the post–Second World War settlement Nieuwland near Rotterdam described by Reinders. In his chapter the routine practices of everyday life for Nieuwland’s inhabitants living in what they experience as disrupted social space are analyzed through narrative maps drawn by his interview partners themselves. Power also manifests itself in urban cinema space through cinema’s socializing force, which results in an empowering experience of nightly freedom as explored in Schober’s chapter, but which also caters to overpowering education and advertising strategies.

This collection primarily looks at space as something contested, especially cases where urban space has been claimed with narrative means. Such claims have been negotiated in spatial conceptions like in the Nieuwland study, when inhabitants explain the maps they draw of their neighborhood. In a related vein, in discourse on the redefinition of historical city life in L’viv, Ukraine, Zayarnyuk confronts narratives about everyday life in the past that are designed to create an urban imaginary in the present. By concentrating on specific objects in such narratives, certain categories of people are left out, thus silencing the memory of social and ethnic conflict. In Berg’s chapter on post–1945 expropriations of Viennese apartments, narratives of need and suffering are a means by which citizens submitted petitions to the city authorities in order to secure housing space.

Theories of space have had other, sometimes very abstract approaches to space, too. Some of the more general philosophical theories on space will come together with narration and everyday practices in this book, especially in chapter 4 on cinematic spaces in Berlin, Cologne, Vienna, Ljubljana, and Belgrade that reflects on cinema as a potential space for encountering the other, and cinemas as places of ambivalent identification and nonunivocal attribution of identity in a context where modern institutions worked to break down differences.

Theories of Space

In a most general sense, space is one of the three fundamental categories in thinking about our physical reality: space, time, and energy are the

basic and also most abstract components in theorizing this reality. Although it is one of the most abstract categories in physics, mathematics, and philosophy, space can simultaneously be a most concrete concept; as we have noted, it describes the specific place where things are or, in temporal terms, where things happen. In geometry, space can be described with coordinates; in other disciplines, descriptions are more contingent.

Earlier geographers, partly relying on physical and mathematical methodology, concerned themselves mostly with the description of concrete physical space, in significant measure fueled by the interest to demarcate territory and to explore travel routes.⁵⁴ Although cultural notions have always been in play in geographical description, cultural geography developed as a systematic, theorized field of knowledge in the early twentieth century. It had long been a deterministic theory—the basic idea being that people and practices are determined by the space they inhabit—that is, geomorphology (landscape) and climate. Culture was thought of as bound to geography, bound to space, and not bound to social or political phenomena.⁵⁵ A famous example is the idea that the Dinaric type or “race” of people—a construct advanced most vociferously by physical anthropologist Hans F.K. Günther—is allegedly shaped in its culture, economy, and bodily appearance by the climatic preconditions of the maritime Adriatic coastal regions and hinterlands of the Western Balkans.⁵⁶ Earlier works in this vein had infamously included racist, Eurocentrist, and imperialist examples, such as the idea of innate tropical laziness contrasted with an assumed industriousness allegedly characteristic of inhabitants of cooler climates. Ultimately Carl O. Sauer, who developed the notion of cultural geography, raised important criticism of the determinist perspective.⁵⁷ In the 1930s other more-sober positivist researchers began to emphasize the interaction of cultural practices and landscapes.⁵⁸ Furthermore, Marxist influenced writings of the Annales school’s first generation subscribed heavily to the idea of a long-term geomorphological/climatic/economic determination of peoples’ lives, albeit in a dialectic way—as in Fernand Braudel’s monumental *The Mediterranean*.⁵⁹

To be sure, it was not the geographers who invented determinism: it had already been closely connected to influential ideas in the social sciences such as societal determinism. Determinist sociologists and modernist architects maintained that not only society, class, and family, but also the physical environment shaped people’s behavior.⁶⁰ Also, environmental influences, particularly the notion of sanitation and healthy or unhealthy environments, based on the miasma theory (i.e., bad air, not germs, caused disease), especially in urban settings, played a role in the deterministic thinking of scholars and policymakers alike. One

manifestation of this can be seen in Paris, first in the Hausmannian city restructuring of the late nineteenth century, but also as late as the 1960s when whole city quarters were demolished in order to purge so-called unhealthy structures from the urban setting.⁶¹

Of course, this volume's focus on narration and everyday experience in an urban setting owes much to our understanding of the significance of actors' agency. Much of the book builds on the criticism of the 1970s that countered the then-dominant determinism with an emphasis on notions of agency, fluidity, and diversity in social geography. In the latter discipline some otherwise influential concepts, such as Edward Soja's socio-spatial dialectics (see below), remained rather isolated, while others—such as studying space as experienced by its inhabitants—have become widely accepted.⁶² Here, again, methodologies such as interviewing the users of spaces were negotiated by ethnographers and anthropologists, and influenced by intellectual movements such as symbolic interactionism. The fact that our contributions primarily examine the contestation of space is very much in line with the aforementioned postdeterminist literature, which has questioned the often tacit assumption that spatial determinants were (quasi) natural. However, given that earlier, cultural geographers and historians of *longue durée* did not concern themselves much with agency, they tended to understand the spatial environment with either a natural status beyond the influence of actors (especially in climate history), or—if they conceded any greater human influence at all—they looked at one or more human generations. In any event, in their approaches the environment seemed not to be subject to discrete moments of direct human intervention. What introduced a major shift of perspective, then, was an insistence that processes produce and maintain space. When authors critical of spatial determinism began to focus on conflict and resistance, the critique of determinist space-essentialism intensified.

Not surprisingly, then, Henri Lefèbvre's *The Production of Space*, first published in 1974 in French, changed the terms of debate in important new ways. Although his terminology has not become standard, his basic anti-essentialist position has. A critical Marxist, Lefèbvre argued that as modes of production change, so too do the spaces produced under those modes. This would not be a dialectical idea if the spaces would not, in turn, have an impact on the modes of production—thus, we can speak of a reciprocal determinism. Lefèbvre distinguished physical space from the spatial practice in which a given society produces space as it “slowly masters and appropriates it,” as well as from representations of space by “scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers, and social engineers” and finally from representational space “as directly

lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users.’⁶³ Notably, although physical space is an important part of this theory, it only comes into social existence through conceiving, appropriating, and using it. As noted in the previous section, Lefebvre especially engaged in the relationship between space and those who use it in his *Critique of Everyday Life*.⁶⁴

A new take on the topic came from Michel de Certeau, a Jesuit historian with strong philosophical interests but who was also influenced by psychoanalysis and structuralism. His *The Practice of Everyday Life* examines space alongside the everyday; in a metaphor that has become commonplace, he made a point of communicating to the reader that one must explore urban space at “street level” instead of from a city planner’s perspective atop “the 110th floor of the World Trade Center” in Manhattan (Reinders draws on this in chapter 3).⁶⁵ *The Practice of Everyday Life* is an inspiration to the present volume as well, as street level is of course also a metaphor for the everyday and de Certeau offered a narrative analysis concentrating on the way that “stories ... carry out the labor that constantly transforms places into *spaces* and spaces into places.”⁶⁶

Neither going street level nor studying space as something produced were innocuous moves, of course. Although they drew on different political influences, both academic projects were designed (at least in part) to relocate power from top to bottom, to change the researcher’s perspective from the one of a planner to that of a user. While for these authors power was only one among several issues, for others power is the most central concern—such as in Edward Soja’s socio-spatial dialectics and theories of public space or spheres. Declaring his theory both Marxist and postmodern in his 1989 book, Soja shares Lefebvre’s basic idea about space and production modes.⁶⁷ What he added was a toolkit to analyze actual struggles for socio-spatial dominance, such as in the example of the restructuring of Los Angeles in the 1960s and 1970s, and inequalities in the distribution of urban resources, including public transport.⁶⁸ On the other hand, Jürgen Habermas’s reflections on *Öffentlichkeit* or the public sphere is essentially a musing on power and social control, yet in a rather idealized way and with less emphasis on actual urban places.⁶⁹ To Habermas the public sphere is not just a space accessible to all, but also an attitude characteristic of civil society, a space and a sense for open public debate brought about in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century debating clubs, cafés, and salons before the mass press subjected it to capitalist interests. It is in a sense an ideal type of democratic debate.⁷⁰

In the 1970s there was also an increasing interest in spaces that may be called nondominant or alternative, and in spaces that might be nei-

ther public nor private. Michel Foucault described “heterotopia” as a specific space that exists in any society in varied forms. With respect to premodernity, the concept can be applied to sacred or forbidden places, whereas in modernity heterotopias can be associated with spaces “in which individuals whose behavior is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed”—for example, rest homes, psychiatric hospitals, prisons, retirement homes, and army barracks, but also places as diverse as cemeteries and theaters. Foucault noted that the heterotopia “is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible,” as for instance in the cinema space Schober thematizes in chapter 4.⁷¹ In the space of the movie theater, spectators can see how many different spaces are usually staged in relatively rapid succession. For instance, events in an action movie can unfold in places as far apart and diverse as London, New York, and Kingston, Jamaica, in a matter of minutes. Moreover, time can deviate in the heterotopia, such as in the museum. Museums are places where time is arrested when dinosaur skeletons are displayed right next to space rockets.⁷² A series of studies on deviant spaces has appeared in the past two decades, such as alternatives and challenges to the hetero-normativity of modern city spaces in George Chauncey’s study on gay New York or Judith Walkowitz’s description of the gendering and classing of Victorian London’s city spaces.⁷³ A more recent example is Anne-Marie Fortier’s work on migrant spaces in London or recent work on disability studies, as presented by Brendan Gleeson and Rob Imrie.⁷⁴ One of the important contributions of such studies was a kind of reverse strategic intervention in order to make visible the presence of those in public spaces who have been written out of historical memory. For example, Mica Nava has reinscribed women in Victorian public space, thereby defining women as central to the making of modernity.⁷⁵

Several concepts have since been discussed that are using the basic idea of space as a mental, imaginary process, as in mapping and power, imagined communities, and spaces of identity.⁷⁶ James Donald and Richard Sennett have discussed issues of contesting urban space in this theoretical context. Donald shows how in the imagination (he argues that “the boundaries between reality and imagination are fuzzy”) several mediations of the modern city have been fabricated—that is, the planned technological City of Light, the flâneur’s city of experience, and the republican city—with methods such as the flâneur narrations of Charles Baudelaire or the social body metaphors of the early urban critics.⁷⁷ The way that such cultural processes of space function will be discussed below.

Historians around the world embraced poststructuralist ideas relatively recently. It is no surprise, then, that those in Britain who had been

dealing with spatial histories as early as the late 1970s did this in the then-traditional sense of space as a neutral container or setting. These were detailed empirical studies on socio-spatial segregation in nineteenth-century British cities with a focus on the modernization of class and social relations. By the mid 1980s this research was challenged by historians who had begun viewing the city as a readable text and who interpreted space in the sense of a social construct, but still the interest in urban space remained. David Harvey's *Consciousness and the Urban Experience* on the Hausmannian interventions in the Paris cityscape and struggles over the meaning of urban places represents a transition, while Judith Walkowitz's above-mentioned *City of Dreadful Delight* described the uses and representations of London city spaces as gendered and their connections to the Victorian concept of respectability. Urban historians have had questions of culture, power, and gender clearly in focus ever since.⁷⁸

Space and Cultural Practice

Spatial categories are a staple metaphor in human languages ... and what would be more cultural than language? The fundamental descriptive linguistic and logical categories of up, down, forward, or backward are spatial. In cultural description, such spatial terms traditionally have cultural value connotations, of course: for example, higher and lower value, rank, and prestige that are closely connected to ideas of class, gender, or other identity markers.⁷⁹ Forwardness and backwardness were categories that either reinforced or counteracted such qualifications. Revolutionary discourses of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries temporarily exchanged high and low, and the classes that had been labeled low now became the bearers of forwardness (progress). This implies a switch in spatial symbolism from a horizontally stratified class logic to a vertical logic of progress, connected to contemporary evolutionism and historicism. Of course, the importance of the vertical distinctions was not exclusive to the 1800s—what seems special is rather that modernization came with an especially intense conflict over vertical and horizontal categories, either starkly contrasting them or conflating them.⁸⁰

More specifically, in the 1970s a new predilection for spatial terms was noted for postmodern language usage, as opposed to the modernist variant that, according to the seminal text by Michel Foucault on heterotopia, had preferred temporality. What the new spatial thinking did was precisely to engage with nineteenth-century categories of class and backwardness, in the process offering a critique of such spatialization—but also offering critiques of the spatial language of description and of

spaces/places as objects of investigation. This had a significant impact on all fields of inquiry, including (but not limited to) cultural investigation, also known as the spatial turn.⁸¹ This development cannot be considered as divorced from intense debate about space and culture among European structuralists thirty or even fifty years earlier.

The examples offered in this introduction, particularly those from literary theory, highlight how the production of space can be understood as a cultural process, as practices of cultural representation that constantly re-create space. For instance, with the metaphor of the London fog, Charles Dickens created narratives of mid-nineteenth-century London that cannot be entirely separated from the city as experienced today.⁸² In lyrical poetry, Charles Baudelaire defined Paris as the capital of modernity with his figure of the flâneur, an alienated middle-class urban protagonist who “seeks refuge in the crowd,” which is “the veil through which the familiar city beckons to the flâneur as phantasmagoria”—in other words, the “virtual reality” of capitalist commodities.⁸³ Fyodor Dostoyevsky created images of Saint Petersburg “that were more legible than they were to the urbanite using his own unaided sight on the street” as the author “singled out the relevant details that gave a scene its character.” This was useful to the reader because “ordinary experience never presents itself this sharply, but the cities of the nineteenth century were particularly unclear.”⁸⁴ Such cultural representation processes can be highly sustainable but also transformable. City places and spaces, as created by novels and films, have become part of the imagination of the twenty-first-century city. They are a motivation and a manual for how to use a city, for instance by tourists who are following the footsteps of Graham Greene’s *The Third Man* in contemporary Vienna’s sewerage system, or by people attending a festival celebrating Saint Petersburg’s white nights.

Images of (city) space as durable have been produced (and are being reproduced) through key cultural texts—and, in Foucault’s terminology, in the appropriate discursive formation. But city space is culturally reproduced every day, for example by the inhabitants of Nieuwland. The maps that Reinders asked them to draw (chapter 3) demonstrate a way to retrieve such everyday practice for academic research. And, as Katherine Brickell and Ayona Datta demonstrated in their volume on translocal geographies, the use of locality need not be bound to one city or even to one nation state.⁸⁵ Space is thus produced not only by architects and planners, but also by writers and painters; moreover, it is also constantly re-produced by quotidian users of space, or by tourists who are involved in the constant re-production of space.

The symbolic production of space has often also been discussed as cultural appropriation of space. Narrated and publicized memory is a

fine example of cultural techniques to lay claim to a city, as Zayarnyuk shows in this volume with the example of nationalist aspirations vis-à-vis contemporary L'viv by way of history of the everyday. Yet even rather mundane texts can be instrumental in claiming and appropriating city space as Berg's work on the letters of complaint concerning confiscated apartments in post-Second World War Vienna demonstrates in chapter 5. Not only discursive, but also more performative practices have been discussed in the recent past, as they seem to signify appropriation in a much more direct, immediate manner. Ritualistic practices, in particular, have been at the center of attention in studies on the appropriation of space and city space, for instance the street manifestations of middle-class societies in middle English cities in the late nineteenth century,⁸⁶ or the aspirations of German nationalists for the southeastern provinces of Austria during the same period, when nationalist tourists hiked on paths designed by corresponding organizations making an explicit claim on German territory against Slavic aspirations in the Habsburg monarchy.⁸⁷ Chapter 4 discusses spaces that were occupied by squatters and where alternative cinema was enacted—a related kind of ritualistic space appropriation in its own right.

Finally, we can refer to what could be called spaces of culture: districts of culture, where opera houses are found; districts of worship; or closed spaces of cultural practice. These are places in the city dedicated to special cultural practices, but that can simultaneously have several other functions, including economic or political ones. Mica Nava has described how in the early twentieth-century city the department store and the cinema were spaces where, for the first time, middle-class women could present themselves in the public unaccompanied.⁸⁸ In this book, for example, Schober treats cinema as cultural and political space in which politically relevant nonconformist movements constituted themselves in democratic and totalitarian political systems.

Traditional conceptions of urban cultural spaces have been narrower, however. They would not include department stores but rather target spaces where works of art are presented—for example, museums, concert halls, perhaps also public libraries, venues for open air events, and houses of worship. Cultural spaces and places in the city are usually conceived of as organized mass spaces for tourists and visitors, of commodified culture—or as public cultural affairs, often, with an orientation toward elite culture. Such modern concepts of cultural spaces derive from the functionalist city theory (e.g., Le Corbusier), according to which city spaces should be separated along their functions. In an elitist tradition of thinking, cultural functions were frequently influenced by premodern sacred spaces, located in the city center. Peripheral areas

were designated for purely residential purposes, which were then by definition cultural voids. Although cities were rarely entirely remodeled in accordance with this theory, and although it soon became clear that dwellers of satellite cities and suburbia needed cultural amenities on site, a strong current of literature inspired by Lefèbvre and de Certeau has since emerged that treats suburbia and other pure residential areas as spaces of cultural practice, as our Nieuwland case examines in detail.

Space and the Everyday

In the traditional definitions we have examined above, cultural places are zones that, by definition, are separate from the everyday. However, literature critical of such ritualistic separations has especially engaged with everyday cultural practices in spaces of the temples of culture.

The metaphor derived from Michel de Certeau's street-level view, in contrast to the city planner's perspective, treats walking in the city (following the structuralist tradition) as analogous to the linguistic concept of the speech act: "The act of walking ... has a triple 'enunciative' function: it is a process of *appropriation* of the topographical system on the part of the pedestrian ... ; it is a spatial acting-out of the place ... ; and it suggests *relations* among differentiated positions, that is among pragmatic 'contracts' in the form of movements."⁸⁹

Obviously influenced by Walter Benjamin's theorization of Baudelaire's flâneur, Certeau focused on the pedestrian's way of experiencing a city as a theoretical model for city recognition in general—without actually engaging with concrete urban space, however. In 1958 the early cultural studies author Richard Hoggart had already been interested in the actual spaces the British working class inhabited in the mid twentieth century, and in 1978 Paul Willis described such profane spaces as rockers' gathering places and hippies' apartments.⁹⁰

In the 1980s scholars began to focus more on theory, even when profane spaces formed the focus of their work. For example, Meaghan Morris approached a specific shopping center as a space of everyday culture in a now classic essay, that was rather based on discourse analysis.⁹¹ Shopping centers have become a staple object of investigation in cultural studies, in addition to the beach and the street, youth clubs, and private apartments as spaces where youth styles are staged. Nonetheless, some of the most prominent cultural studies texts about such spaces still tend to dwell more on theory than on the actual spaces.⁹² In short, everyday spaces seem to be often the object of cultural theory musings (maybe even a site of theoretical desire), while actual studies like the one on the Nieuwland suburb in this volume are less common.

Beginning in the 1970s, urban anthropologists increasingly became interested in actual everyday urban spaces, and their work has been engaged with the uses to which urban spaces have been put by their inhabitants. A drawback of their approach has been, for the most part, that space has been conceived of in a traditional way, as background. While initially there had been a strong interest in poverty and slums,⁹³ urban anthropologists have come to deal with the interrelatedness of life in specific neighborhoods or communities within a broader urban context. Despite an emphasis on classical anthropological topics like kinship and community, urban anthropologists have contributed studies on neighborhoods, like New York's Greenwich Village or Washington's Soul Side,⁹⁴ which were based on field work and participant observation that opened up a dialogue with work done in fields ranging from cultural studies, to history, to urban sociology, that remains ongoing. This approach is also manifested in our volume's chapter on the Novi Zagreb suburb of Croatia's capital city.

The work of our contributors engages specifically and intentionally with actual spaces. Their scholarship represents the next generation of the pioneering work begun by those researchers at the intersection of the academic fields, discussed above, who engaged in description of everyday spaces and places on a pedestrian level. Our contributors represent space in the course of fieldwork, archival investigation, or reading fictional texts as it is conceptualized by actors.

Narration

Narrative is present in every age, in every place, in every society. ... Narrative is international, transhistorical, transcultural: it is simply there, like life itself.

Roland Barthes [1966] 1977⁹⁵

In 1981 W.J.T. Mitchell proclaimed a narrative turn in the humanities in general. In 1994 David Maines pledged to develop a narrative sociology. By 2000, narration was already an entry in a social psychology handbook, and in 2004 Berger and Quinney published a comprehensive study of the topic. Some observers speak of a narrative turn during the 1990s in sociology, too, while in 2005 Goodsell still found it necessary to defend narrative in sociology.⁹⁶ Our book demonstrates that, over the past two decades, practitioners in nonliterary fields have become aware of the importance of narration. Many have found out that narration has long been a part of their discipline's methodology, albeit under a dif-

ferent name and not as developed theoretically, as in literary studies. Indeed, there has been considerable resistance to the idea that theories derived from so fictive a discipline as literature should matter in fact-driven fields such as physics or sociology. This battle of ideas was especially fierce in the 1970s and 1980s. Poststructuralist proponents of the use of narrative maintained that the move to narration was a politicization of cultural and social analysis. Marxists ignored that claim and condemned narrative approaches as culturalist and apolitical.

New Marxists, like Louis Althusser (1918–1990), who were under the influence of structuralism were highly interested in the political aspect of narrative theory when developing theories of ideology and hegemony in the 1960s. This prepared the postmodern move from the “analysis of rhetoric to the analysis of ideology” and the “transition from poetics to politics,” as represented by poststructuralist and deconstructivist theories in the later 1960s.⁹⁷ While one might assume today that these had been predestined as leftist theories, they were branded as conservative in the 1960s by classical Marxists, for their political quietism. Deconstruction was castigated as removed from reality, producing boundless doubt, for adhering to an anti-historicist formalism, and for containing no program for social change.⁹⁸ However, in the end deconstructivism influenced even a traditional Marxist like Eric Hobsbawm; his *Nations and Nationalism* widely popularized the idea of the “constructedness” of nations in the 1980s.⁹⁹ Another related and politically motivated adaptation of narrative theory emerged at the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies; in fact, one of the initial and most important pieces of cultural studies scholarship in this vein was concerned with literature: Raymond Williams’s *Marxism and Literature*.¹⁰⁰

Theories of Narration

Postmodernists, deconstructivists, New Marxists, and cultural studies scholars had only borrowed the idea from structuralists, formalists, and narratologists—scholars of literature who were not content with the traditional, positivist ways of analyzing stories—that narration and how it works are essential to understand a wide range of human activity. However, their writings found a deep and long-running reception across disciplinary boundaries, known as the narrative turn. Narrative theory is closely related to structuralism. It developed in the 1920s, especially in Russia and Czechoslovakia. The structuralists’ discontent with the mere description of literary texts and its elements resulted in the search for underlying constitutive structures—that which holds the elements together. Put another way, they were concerned with the ways in which

narrative elements are related, not inconsistent with the Aristotelian notion that the whole is more than the sum of its parts. In their search for basic structures, early narrative theorists engaged with so-called simple narrative forms—that is, relatively short and repetitive narrations, such as those typical of fairy tales. Most importantly, the work of Vladimir Propp (1895–1970) is still regularly cited, particularly his *Morfologiya skazki* (1928), a systematic description of basic structures in Russian folk tales.¹⁰¹ Later, Tzvetan Todorov developed a systematic narratology based on structuralist principles and proposed the name.¹⁰² Although structural theory, perhaps given its abstractness, has not become the sole standard in literary analysis, the structuralist legacy is still present in the work of most authors who engage with narrative texts on a theoretical level. For example, Gérard Genette was able to present a systematic narratology of literary texts that is much in use with practitioners, arguably drawing on the strengths of structuralist theory and while simultaneously employing classical concepts of fiction.¹⁰³

The reasons why narratologists' concepts could spread to other disciplines are manifold. At root, this theory had the potential for general application, and it offered possibilities to work with narration that other concepts had not. Narrative theory can apply not only to fictional, but also to factual narration (i.e., narration about events that are supposed to actually have happened). It thus goes far beyond literary texts or fiction, and can be applied whenever something is being narrated. Narrative theory describes what is being narrated on the one hand, and how it is being narrated on the other. The how is what offered new possibilities: it included, for example, whether that which is narrated is presented more or less directly, from which perspective or point of view it is narrated, on what level the narration takes place, the extent to which the narrator is part of the story, and who is narrating to whom. In narratological terms, this would be called distance, focalization, intradiegesis versus extradiegesis, homodiegesis versus heterodiegesis, and subject/addressee.¹⁰⁴

This sophisticated descriptive arsenal has made it possible to ask new questions. For instance, when I am describing a scholarly topic, to whom am I speaking? How am I presenting it, and what does this mean for the authors whom I cite? When I employ source material, interviews, or any kind of text, how do I narrate them, and which meanings are advanced that were not previously conceived? Such questions are, of course, highly political in the sense that they challenge the authority of whole disciplines and their methodologies. The dust on the methodological and theoretical battlefields has settled in more recent years, to be certain; maybe, as Terry Eagleton stated in 2003, we are even “after theory” right now.¹⁰⁵ Narration has become widely used as a concept. However, it is

still worthwhile to think about how exactly narration can be understood and what narrative theory can offer to practitioners of nonliterary and nonphilological disciplines.

How To

Narrative theory offers three advantages for scholars in disciplines other than literature. First, it can help the reader to reflect on who is speaking to whom in a text and make the writer aware of her role in the production of text. Second, it allows the reader to distinguish narrative texts from nonnarrative ones and to think about the character, the potential, and the limits of narration.¹⁰⁶ Third, and perhaps most importantly, narration offers something that other forms cannot: personal experiences, the power to communicate what something was like. Narrative theory is able to describe how these qualia work. This is also the most important function of narrative for the contributions collected in this volume.

The ability to analyze narratives opens up the option of self-reflection. It makes one aware of the stories one tells about oneself. This characteristic trait of narrative theory made it so interesting to postmodern authors, insofar as it made it possible to highlight the academy's own politics and the power issues at stake when stories are being told. Thus, for instance, the account of narrative theory provided above is basically a heroic story (note also with exclusively male actors). It is, read as a simple form, a myth of origin, a specific narrative used to justify a given order and to lend it endurance and stability.¹⁰⁷

Point of view analysis, as introduced by Wayne Booth (1921–2005), describes how narration manages distance. It thus aims at revealing how narration controls sympathy in the reader.¹⁰⁸ How does this work? Narrative theory can be used to distinguish between an actual narrator and who she allows to narrate in a text. For example, the narrator in a text can be concealed by not referring to herself—simply put, by not using the word “I.” This technique makes narration sound like a commonly accepted reality instead of a subjective account, and belongs in the narratologist realms of focalization and diegesis. When the narrator chooses to describe events as if the narrator in the text (the implicit author, according to Booth), was very close to those events (e.g., in terms of time, space, emotion, etc.), this will lead to a strong impact on the reader in combination with the claim to general validity that the author had created before through focalization. The narration feels simultaneously as a generally established fact and as a subjective experience, because the reader will grow acquainted with the situation of the hero and develop a certain degree of sympathy with that figure. Mike Currie sums it up this

way: “Narratology has provided methods and concepts to understand how stories, narratives can control us.”¹⁰⁹ This basic trait of narration and this potential of narratology make it central in any consideration of power and hegemony, whether it is the subject of research or fosters the research itself.

Besides point of view, the third characteristic that makes narrative theory so interesting for other disciplines is a topic that has received theoretical attention relatively late as compared to others described here. This is narration’s unique potential to convey the qualia of events, the feelings, and the situations; it is only with some sort of narration that humans are able to develop an impression of the experiences of someone else.¹¹⁰ This potential of referring to what it was or is like is a dear commodity—not only for journalists who earn their keep, in part, by reporting the emotional side of events, but also for social scientists, historians, and anthropologists who over the last several decades have increasingly longed to learn more about the actual experience of their subjects of study. Finally, as already noted, narration’s ubiquity makes it indispensable for researchers to understand how it works. Like everyone else, scholars cannot escape narration, because it is “simply there, like life itself,” as Roland Barthes noted.¹¹¹

Narratology has also created a close connection between the concepts of narration and space. Soviet semioticians attempted to create a universal meta-language to describe cultural phenomena of all times and places in the 1960s. This initiative, which began among small circles of Soviet academics during the Khrushchev thaw before extending to France and farther afield, led to a body of writing that attempts to strictly analyze cultural products—for example, Orthodox icons, the layout of a church or village, or a movie—in spatial or topological terms. In effect, this amounted, for instance, to an attempt to describe a cultural text in a highly abstracted terminology made up of basic spatial categories such as in, out, above, and below, reminiscent of mathematical terminology. (A late representative of this trend was again de Certeau with his spatial stories.¹¹²) Vladimir Toporov, one of the main proponents of the Moscow-Tartu Semiotic school, proposed that the separation of space and time was the very end of the mytho-poetic (or primitive) worldview and thus these categories stood at the early beginnings of modern thinking. One of the most influential examples from this school is the spatial description of narrative texts as in Yurii M. Lotman’s analysis of Nikolay Gogol’s prose.¹¹³ “Literary space,” Lotman argues, “represents an author’s model of the world, expressed in the language of spatial representation.”¹¹⁴ Lotman examined the basic function of the spatial category of the border in narrative (operationalized by such motifs as doors, win-

dows, thresholds), as well as central and peripheral spaces (urban and rural) often separated by the woods, which stand for certain worldviews, and the road the hero has to travel as a linear, connecting space.¹¹⁵ This is interesting to note in connection to chapter 2, which traces the agency of the masses as a literary hero to transgress boundaries in Caracas city space. Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of the *chronotopos* was a still more dynamic spatial approach to narrative.¹¹⁶ These theorists have, decades before Foucault, already introduced spatiality into cultural analysis—not in the sense of territorialism, but of space as an abstract yet all-the-more-meaningful descriptive category.

Narratology has not spread to other disciplines as methodology, rather its basic ideas have been popularized in poststructuralist academic debates. Postmodern theory, although very much based on narrative theory, has been particularly critical of the scholarly aspirations of narratology and has therefore dropped the suffix *-ology*. More importantly, postmodernists emphasized the aspect that had already been present in Propp's approach (and in the semiotic strand of structuralism): the expansion of narrative theory to nonliterary texts. This development is especially crucial to this volume, as all contributions but one deal with factual texts. This was one important step as the study of narration shifted from an apolitical, even antipolitical to a political project—from formalism to neo-Marxism, poststructuralism, and cultural studies. Narrative theory, especially in its current postmodern form, has been attractive for nonliterary scholars not least due to its politicization and its critique of hidden ideology in narrative and its potential to control people. What else can it do for other disciplines?

Not all of the insights provided by narrative theorists are of direct relevance for researchers in other disciplines, though (consider time sequence, e.g.). And not all disciplines profit from all features narrative theory offers. This is because many disciplines do not work with texts as subjects of study. What is important to all disciplines, however, are the second and third features identified above: the ability to understand narrative and to refer to experiences, connected to point-of-view theory and the *qualia*. As we have noted, this is because different disciplines employ narration even if they do not make it an object of study. The ability to understand author and reader helps researchers to deal with narrative accounts. This is especially important to disciplines that employ interviews (i.e., oral accounts, which are represented in four chapters in this book).¹¹⁷ To be sure, in most cases written accounts have narrative traits, too. Historical sources are narrative texts more often than not. Sources like the letters used in Berg's chapter on housing requisitions in post-Second World War Vienna contain very specific narratives, for

instance narratives of suffering, which were designed to justify claims on living space. Even laws contain narrative passages—for example, in their preambles.

There is one aspect of narrative theory that is of broader scholarly interest however: its self-reflexive quality, which is important in all fields, including the natural sciences. Science, as Jean-François Lyotard has shown, employs strategies of persuasion apart from logical arguments, including rhetorical and political arguments. Narration is one of these strategies.¹¹⁸ Communication of knowledge in a discipline even as scientific as physics would simply be impossible without narration. For instance, in order to describe such a basic physical category as movement, one needs to say, “Something moves.” This sentence, according to narratology, essentially is the definition of a basic narration.¹¹⁹ In 1984, Randall Collins demonstrated how “words seem to be a necessary and inescapable frame within which mathematics is embedded,” and in 1993 David R. Maines echoed this for sociologists, who face the dilemma that they “must use words and discursive representations in their work, although there is strong advocacy of the superiority of non-discursive display of research findings and knowledge.”¹²⁰ These are also examples of how an understanding of narrative form, as opposed to other explanatory forms like pure description, makes one aware of the nature of one’s own academic work.

Some of the disciplines contaminated with narration have had a traditional understanding of the concept for a long time, but just not in the sense of narrative theory. This is true, for instance, in the case of law. Aristotle’s treatise on rhetoric and most subsequent teachings on the subject were developed from court arguments.¹²¹ Scholars working in cultural studies, and others in traditional disciplines like sociology or medicine, have quite intentionally adopted elements of narrative theory. New and related fields, like discourse analysis, whether in the linguistic or Foucauldian sense, have incorporated it. Michel Foucault recognized narration as one of the major strategies of ordering discourse and he understood it as one important kind of discursive events.¹²² Additionally, in sociology, economics, business, and organization studies, actor-network theory has recently introduced elements of structuralist semantics and thus incorporated some narratological elements, most prominently the most well-known proponent of this theory, Bruno Latour.¹²³ Not all practitioners of narrative methodologies in social sciences are as radical as Latour. Today there is a substantial social science scholarship, particularly in sociology, that recognizes that narrations of individual actors are the basic material of inquiry: “Storytelling sociology views lived experience as constructed, at least in part, by the stories people

tell about it. Stories are not merely ways of telling others about ourselves but of constructing our identities, of finding purpose and meaning in our lives.”¹²⁴ The contributors to this volume, regardless of their own disciplinary training, offer their own evidence of the depth and breadth of this conclusion.

Historians and Narration

The disciplines most consistently represented in this volume are history and social anthropology, both of which are quite narrative-centered and have developed their own ways of theorizing and employing narration. Historians began to accept narrative analysis as a viable methodology in its own right in the 1980s. Under the label new historicism or narrativism, historians began to rehabilitate narrative sources over and against the accusation of prevailing social historians’ assertion that they were less scientific than quantitative or mass data. Moreover, in recent decades historiography itself has been the object of narratological analysis, influenced by developments in literary studies by scholars like Hayden White, who described the writings of eight classic modern historians from Ranke and Croce to Marx and Nietzsche in terms of the basic tropes they employed: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony.¹²⁵ Our chapters “City and Cinema” and “Adjudicating Lodging” are two contemporary responses to the challenge narrative theory has posed to the historical guild.

Historians have always thought about narration, though, and the distinction between story and history has been a longstanding one in historiography. Until the nineteenth century, debates regularly emerged that accused the field of literature of being based on lying (which is what narratology would describe as fictional narration). Even Herodotus was called both the father of history and the father of lying.¹²⁶ Considering these reservations against storytelling, it is no wonder that modern historians did not want to be confused with mythmakers—even if, in cultural-historical perspective, there is a relationship. As no historian can deny that storytelling has been and will remain the central occupation of historians (even quantitative data have to be presented in a narrative form), a technique had to be found to legitimize narration for modern historiography.

The first attempt coincided with the introduction of modern historiography and is still valid. In the mid nineteenth century, Leopold von Ranke (1795–1886) and Jakob Burckhardt (1818–1897) developed a critical method of source interpretation to guarantee reliability and accountability of historical accounts. It has remained the standard among

historians up to the present. While it had always been possible to tamper with sources, the new method made sure that well-trained historians could differentiate between research that is solid and balanced and that which is biased or untenable. The key to this was a meticulous technique of making traceable which sources a historian employed to make which claim, and an interpretation of what a source tells us—often according to the presumable intentions of the source producer. Thus, a narrative account could still claim truth as long as it was based on verifiable sources, and narration was saved for the discipline of historiography.

This took care of what narratologists call *fabula* or plot. But what about the story, which is, as narrative theory was able to show, the narrative level where points of view come in? Nineteenth-century historians were well aware that different points of view could be introduced into the presentation of identical facts. They tried to eliminate this by imposing the imperative to do history *sine ira et studio*.¹²⁷ They would not concede that they essentially utilized the same principles as any fiction writer, however. Perhaps they were aware of the point-of-view issue but did not see a problem in following what would, in the 1980s, come to be criticized and termed master narratives by Jean-François Lyotard.¹²⁸ Earlier historians understood these constructs as their legitimate frames of reference, and traditionalists still do.

Nonetheless, in the 1960s, before the impact of poststructuralism, another cure for the problems of traditional historiography was found in introducing scientific methodology into the narrative discipline of historiography. The turn to quantitative methods borrowed largely from social theorists like Paul Lazarsfeld. But, as we have shown, science is not detached from narration either, especially not when it is connected to the master narrative of modernization (as it usually is). Quite to the contrary, a tendency has been criticized to bolster the modernization paradigm at all costs, especially in social history.¹²⁹ So, by turning to scientific methods, historians had actually jumped out of the frying pan into the fire.

In the mid twentieth century oral history gained momentum as an effort at writing counterhistories, to offer an alternative to traditional historiography. The method was also the message: recording or transcribing eyewitness accounts of the past. Methodological predecessors in the early twentieth century were more interested in national historical events such as the U.S. Civil War, living conditions of the masses, or folk culture. Oral history as an actual discipline-specific movement turned rather to describing everyday life, and not infrequently its adherents simply used oral sources as a supplement to other, written mate-

rial, (e.g., in regional economic history, history of medicine, technology, and of course labor history).¹³⁰ Classic projects primarily involved interviews with working-class people like the Yorkshire coal miners in *Coal Is Our Life* (1956), or more recently the Fiat workers of Torino or peasants in southern England.¹³¹ Our chapter “Urban Information Flows” is informed by this tradition. Practitioners of oral history sought to give voice to those who had previously only figured in history as the anonymous masses or even to capture the views of a representative sample of the population.¹³² While the earlier tendency to retrieve the voices of the oppressed seemed to be linked to a progressive ethos, in the course of time oral historians have also turned to previously invisible actors of working-class conservatism and racism, like Jeremy Seabrook did when he asked, “What Went Wrong [with] Working People and the Ideals of the Labour Movement[?]” in 1978.¹³³

Despite their extensive use of narratives, oral historians were not initially involved in theoretical or methodological reflections about narrativity. Some of their work has been characterized by a belief in the matter-of-factness of “real people” and in a greater authenticity of their accounts (again, e.g., in Norman Dennis, *Coal Is Our Life*).¹³⁴ Put in narratological terms, such authors were especially interested in what it was like, and in a different point of view.¹³⁵ Thus, oral historians did not, at first, invest much energy in theoretical reflection on these qualia and focalization or point of view, although oral history had its peak during the same period—the 1970s and 1980s—as narratology, conversational analysis, qualitative sociology, and cultural anthropology. They had borrowed their interview methods primarily from the field of sociology, not literature or linguistics. Over recent years, practitioners of oral history have become more self-reflective and have let the interviewees speak for themselves. They have grown aware of the perilous temptation of transforming the authenticity retrieved from eyewitnesses into an argument developed by an omniscient historian, as the Johnston and McIvor contribution on the asbestos hazard in twentieth-century Scotland demonstrates. Instead, this chapter draws on oral accounts to describe how interaction around this dangerous material worked, as well as to describe the experience of the workers with asbestos and how their bodies are affected by it. Thus, in a fashion similar to the experiences of qualitative social scientists, oral historians have come to appreciate the impact of context (i.e., of the interview situation) on the results. Interestingly, the traditional link to sociology has made oral history open to ethnomethodology and conversational analysis, maybe more so than the humanities-based narrative theory.¹³⁶

Cultural Anthropologists, Ethnographers and Narration

Cultural anthropology and ethnography have always dealt with stories, too, originally those of so-called primitive cultures, stories that were then labeled “mythology.”¹³⁷ These disciplines’ reflections on narrative have also contributed to the theory of narration. For example, the anthropologist Walter Goldschmidt put the researcher herself on the agenda via his proposal in a 1977 article to introduce self-reflective methodology (auto-ethnography). For Goldschmidt the field trip represented an initiatory rite and the entire discipline formed a subculture.¹³⁸

Because mythical narration is an important practice in communal, religious institutions, anthropologists used methodologies developed in the humanities rather early in their work—for example, the analysis of mythology as practiced by classical philologists. In 1966 John Fontenrose championed the idea that ancient rituals were the origins of modern theater and, in general, that Greek mythology contained universal anthropological information—in the process drawing not only from philology, but also from Freudian psychology.¹³⁹ Claude Lévi Strauss was perhaps the first in 1958 to open a back door through which linguistic and literary knowledge found entry into cultural anthropology in his *Structural Anthropology*, by borrowing from the structuralist linguist Nikolay Trubetskoy (1890–1938). However, as early as 1949 Joseph Campbell had anticipated the structuralist idea of comparable narrative structures in his *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, in which he advanced the idea that a basic myth underlies all mythological narratives.¹⁴⁰

Conversely, after anthropology had become an established discipline, scholars in the 1970s who were disenchanted with fields such as positivist sociology, quantitative history, or structuralist linguistics reinvigorated their work by allowing anthropological approaches to inform them. This resulted in fruitful new perspectives like those that could be found in such hyphenated disciplines as historical-anthropology, urban-anthropology, and ethnomethodology.¹⁴¹ This is perhaps the background to the fact that in our volume not only the urban-anthropology inspired work of Rubić and Leutloff-Grandits employs narrative interviews as its source material, but also the contributions offered by Reinders and Schober.

To a significant extent, then, anthropologists’ interest in myth concerned the relationship between myth and ritual, which has been equated to the relation between libretto and a (dramatic) performance. This would mean that the performance of narrative could also be studied and interpreted similar to the narrative itself, thus suggesting that social interaction could be studied like a drama—an idea advanced by Erving

Goffman in the late 1950s.¹⁴² Thus, cultural anthropologists and ethnographers contributed to an early theory of narration-in-practice.

Spaces are produced by narrating them. The everyday evolves in spaces that are conceivable only through narration. Only narration can transmit the quality of the everyday. The everyday is the space where hegemony is produced. The city is a space where hegemony is produced and challenged on an everyday basis, but that is structured by rituals and dominant narratives. This is, perhaps, why more and more researchers who are working at the crossroads of the academic fields described here have turned to basic human practices: listening to stories and to reading written accounts as stories. The research represented in this book tries to understand the meaning of narrations in and about the city, and how they create spaces of the everyday.

Wladimir Fischer-Nebmaier is researcher at the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna. His main areas of teaching and research interest are identity politics in Central and Southeastern Europe from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries, migrants in the metropolis, as well as Balkan literatures and popular culture. His research has taken him to Croatia, Serbia, Germany, Canada, England, and the United States. He is currently working on a book in English on Habsburg Serb public cultures in several Central European and North American cities between 1786 and 1932. His publications include *Dositej Obradović als bürgerlicher Kulturheld* (Peter Lang, 2007); and, as coeditor (with Alexandra Millner, Waltraud Heindl and Wolfgang Müller-Funk), of *Räume und Grenzen in Österreich-Ungarn, 1867–1914* (Francke, 2010).

Notes

1. Richard Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye. The Design and Social Life of Cities*, 1st ed. (New York, 1990), 190.
2. Ibid.
3. James Donald, *Imagining the Modern City* (London, 1999). With the Cable Car line, Jack London developed a powerful metaphor of class distinctions in his *South of the Slot* (1909).
4. Mark Currie, *Postmodern Narrative Theory*, 3rd ed. (Basingstoke, 2001), 1.
5. Ben Highmore, *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory. An Introduction* (London, 2002), 16.
6. Peter Burke describes the interest in the everyday from early modern to modern history in his introduction to Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London, 1978). Ben Highmore offers a short overview of the emergence of a concept of the everyday between boredom and strangeness in Highmore, *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory*.

7. See Michael Gardiner, *Critiques of Everyday Life* (New York, 2000).
8. An overview of the relationship between German romanticists and nationalists can be found in Eugene Anderson, "German Romanticism as an Ideology of Cultural Crisis," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 2, no. 3 (1941), 301–17. German readers will find this collection instructive: Alexander von Bormann, *Volk—Nation—Europa: Zur Romantisierung und Entromantisierung politischer Begriffe*, Stiftung für Romantikforschung 4 (Würzburg, Germany, 1998).
9. A study of the transfer of the mandate to rule from medieval to modern times for England, France, Germany, and Japan can be found in Reinhard Bendix, *Kings or People: Power and the Mandate to Rule* (Berkeley, CA, 1978). An explicitly formulated theory of how a deity is replaced by a collective subject can be found in early twentieth-century Russian literary history. At a Communist Party conclave in Capri, Russian writer Maxim Gorkiy and ideologist Anatoly Lunacharsky formulated the concept of "god building" (*bogostroitel'stvo*). See George Louis Kline, *Religious and Anti-Religious Thought in Russia*, The Weil Lectures (Chicago, 1968). A thorough study in German is Raimund Sesterhenn, *Das Bogostroitel'stvo bei Gor'kij und Lunačarskij bis 1909. Zur ideologischen und literarischen Vorgeschichte der Parteischule von Capri*, Slavistische Beiträge 158 (Munich, 1982).
10. Since the French Revolution, democratic nation-state projects have been striving for a unified polity that requires cultural and linguistic streamlining. See Stephen May, *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2011). In East, Central, and Southeastern Europe during the nineteenth century, the democratic-linguistic projects initiated by the romanticists often led to the discursive erasure of linguistically different populations—and eventually, in tragic cases, to their forced assimilation, expulsion, or extinction. One such case is the Roma and their language(s), known as Romani. See Dieter W. Halwachs, "The Changing Status of Romani in Europe," in *Minority Languages in Europe: Framework, Status, Prospects*, ed. Gabrielle Hogan-Brun and Stefan Wolff (Basingstoke, 2003). The production of language atlases (like the first ones by Georg Wenker from 1881 and by Jules Gilliéron from 1902–1910) constituted ethnonational claims on territories.
11. Important early romanticist linguists were simultaneously ethnographers, such as Vuk Karadžić. See Gabriella Schubert, "Vuk Karadžić—Der Volkskundler," in *Sprache, Literatur und Folklore bei Vuk Stefanović Karadžić*, ed. Reinhard Lauer, *Opera Slavica* (Wiesbaden, Germany, 1988).
12. A classic study on ritual is Arnold van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage* (London, 1909). The Victor Turner broadened the concept but was still not interested in the everyday; see Turner, *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Rituals* (Ithaca, NY, 1967). The appearance of cultural studies seems to have been a turning point; see Paul E. Willis, *Profane Culture* (London, 1978) and Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain* (London, 1976).

13. Anderson explains this aspiration in the classic case of the German romanticists with the necessity to react to the social transformation from feudal to constitutional class states. Anderson, "German Romanticism," 301.
14. The classic introductions to urban anthropology are Edwin Eames and Judith Goode, *Anthropology of the City: An Introduction to Urban Anthropology*, Prentice-Hall Series in Anthropology (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1977); Richard Gabriel Fox, *Urban Anthropology: Cities in Their Cultural Settings* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1977); John Friedl and Noel J. Chrisman, *City Ways: A Selective Reader in Urban Anthropology* (New York, 1975). Consider also the following early studies of urban sociolinguistics: William Labov, *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* (Washington, DC, 1966); and Joshua A. Fishman, Robert Leon Cooper, and Roxana Ma Newman, *Bilingualism in the Barrio* (Bloomington, IN, 1971).
15. See Adam Kuper, *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of an Illusion* (London, 1988).
16. Julie Graham, "Post-Modernism and Marxism," *Antipode* 20, no. 1 (1988), 60–66.
17. Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou: Village Occitan de 1294 à 1324* ([Paris], 1975).
18. Carlo Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller* (New York, 1982).
19. This has been criticized as an attitude of social scientists and social historians alike in Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, Clarendon Lectures in Management Studies (Oxford, 2005).
20. Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." In *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays* (London, 1971), 168.
21. Latour, *Reassembling the Social*, 67f.
22. Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (London, 1971); Chantal Mouffe, *Gramsci and Marxist Theory* (London, 1979); Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (London, 1985). The common ground between Hall and Laclau also shows in their use of the term "articulation." Cf. Lawrence Grossberg, *We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture* (New York, 1992), 54.
23. See the concept of "dominance without hegemony" coined by Ranajit Guha for British colonialism in India. Guha, *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India* (Cambridge, MA, 1997).
24. In fact, the concepts of modernity, hegemony, and civil society are hard to disentangle.
25. See Jürgen Link, Thomas Loer, and Hartmut Neuendorff, "Normalität" im Diskursnetz soziologischer Begriffe, *Diskursivitäten* 3 (Heidelberg, 2003). Maybe the most productive field of discussion on normalization is the debate on heteronormativity. See Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 1st American ed. (New York, 1978); Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: The Discursive Limits Of "Sex"* (London, 1993); Lisa Duggan and Nan D. Hunter,

- Sex Wars: Sexual Dissent and Political Culture* (New York, 1995). For Althusser, the ideological state apparatus manifests itself in everyday practice. Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," 168.
26. Perhaps the work of Raymond Williams is best suited to illustrate this point. Williams, *Culture and Society: Coleridge to Orwell* (London, 1990); idem, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford, 1978); idem, *The Long Revolution* (London, 1975). An outstanding engagement with post-1980 forms of discursive hegemony from a linguistic perspective is Norman Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (London, 1995); idem, *New Labour, New Language?* (New York, 2000).
 27. Herbert Marcuse's analysis revolved around capitalist alienation. Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston, 1964). Adorno's rather top-down views of the culture industry play an important role in the classic collection of essays *Dialectic of Enlightenment* in its 1947 version (originally titled *Philosophische Fragmente*), whereas Horkheimer's input seems to have been more a political-philosophical one published in English as Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception," in *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments, Cultural Memory in the Present* (Stanford, 1988).
 28. See the pathbreaking Phil Cohen, "Sub-Cultural Conflict and Working-Class Community," in *Culture, Media, Language*, ed. Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe, and Paul Willis (London, 1980).
 29. See, for instance, Todd Gitlin, "The Anti-Political Populism of Cultural Studies," in *Cultural Studies in Question*, ed. Marjorie Ferguson and Peter Golding (London, 1997), 25–38; and Angela McRobbie and Jenny Garber. "Girls and Subcultures," In *Resistance through rituals. Youth subcultures in post-war Britain*, ed. Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson (London, 1976), 209–22. Another example is Paul McGuigan, "Cultural Populism Revisited," in *Cultural Studies in Question*, ed. Marjorie Ferguson and Peter Golding (London, 1997), 138–54.
 30. James Carey, "Reflections on the Project of (American) Cultural Studies," in *Cultural Studies in Question*, ed. Marjorie Ferguson and Peter Golding (London, 1997), 1–24.
 31. See M. Gottdiener, "Hegemony and Mass Culture. A Semiotic Approach," *American Journal of Sociology* 90, no. 5 (1985), 959–1001. Althusser described the social process of interpellation (or internalization of general beliefs) in marketing. Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." De Certeau explicitly mentions it also. Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley, 1984), 36. See also Grant David McCracken, *Culture and Consumption II: Markets, Meaning, and Brand Management* (Bloomington, 2005).
 32. See Kate Soper and Frank Trentmann, *Citizenship and Consumption, Consumption and Public Life* (Basingstoke, 2008); Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London, 1995); Robert John Foster, *Materializing the Nation:*

- Commodities, Consumption, and Media in Papua New Guinea* (Bloomington, IN, 2002); Tim Edensor, *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life* (Oxford, 2002); Matthew Hilton, "The Banality of Consumption," in *Citizenship and Consumption*, ed. Kate Soper and Frank Trentmann, *Consumption and Public Life* (Basingstoke, 2008), 87–103; Roland Marchand, *Advertising the American Dream: Making Way for Modernity, 1920–1940* (Berkeley, 1985); T.J. Jackson Lears, *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America* (New York, 1994).
33. See Traian Stoianovich, *French Historical Method: The Annales Paradigm* (Ithaca, NY, 1976); Philippe Ariès and Georges Duby, *A History of Private Life*, 5 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 1987). According to Peter Schöttler, George Duby claimed to have been inspired to this by concepts of Louis Althusser. Schöttler, "Mentalities, Ideologies, Discourses: On the 'Third Level' as a Theme in Social-Historical Research," in *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life*, ed. Alf Lüdtke (Princeton, 1995), 84.
 34. Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou*. Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms*.
 35. Lüdtke, *History of Everyday Life*.
 36. On oral history, see part 3 of this introduction ("Narration").
 37. Herbert Blumer, *Symbolic Interactionism. Perspective and Method* (Berkeley, 1969).
 38. Turner, *Forest of Symbols*; Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (New York, 1995); Harold Garfinkel, *Studies in Ethnomethodology* (Cambridge, MA, 1984); Harold Garfinkel and Anne Warfield Rawls, *Ethnomethodology's Program: Working out Durkheim's Aphorism, Legacies of Social Thought* (Lanham, MD, 2002).
 39. Anselm L. Strauss and Juliet Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*, 20th ed. (Newbury Park, CA, 1997).
 40. The most relevant work here is Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Goffman also deals with identity management, as the title suggests, in Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, A Spectrum Book (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1963).
 41. Blumer, *Symbolic Interactionism*. On investigating material culture see, for instance, Christopher Tilley, ed., *Reading Material Culture: Structuralism, Hermeneutics and Post-Structuralism* (Oxford, 1990).
 42. The debate started with Ernst Hartwig Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957). Peter Burke discussed related questions for the early modern period in *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven, CT, 1992). A recent overview of early modern political ritual is Philippe Buc, "Political Rituals: Medieval and Modern Interpretations," in *Die Aktualität des Mittelalters*, ed. Hans-Werner Goetz, *Herausforderungen X* (Bochum, Germany, 2000), 255–72. The Paris study is Robert Darnton, *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France* (New York, 1995).

43. First came the cross-fertilization with structuralism, most prominently in Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf (New York, 1963). Clifford Geertz has been among the first to programmatically apply narrative terminology on historiography, such as “author,” “genre,” and “interpretation.” Geertz, *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author* (Stanford, CA, 1988). Michael Carrithers even asked whether anthropology might be an art rather than a science. Carrithers, “Is Anthropology Art or Science?,” *Current Anthropology* 31, no. 3 (1990), 263–82.
44. Roman Jakobson, “On Realism in Art,” in *Language in Literature*, ed. Roman Jakobson, Krystyna Pomorska, and Stephen Rudy (Cambridge, MA, 1987), 19–27.
45. The Marxist literary theorist and critic György Lukács argued that realism, like other literary forms, was a tool in class struggle. Realism understood for him should therefore direct the reading subject in understanding the forces underlying material reality. Realism is thus seen as an instrument of modernization and revolution. Lukács’s and related theories have assumed a link between certain literary texts and interests of specific classes and were in search for the “correct” literary form for revolutionary interests. Thus, close links between progress or modernization are central, if one term or the other is not explicitly used by Lukács. György Lukács and Rodney Livingstone, *Essays on Realism* (Cambridge, MA, 1981). Subtler was the approach of the Marxist literary theorist Walter Benjamin who described how certain developments of urbanization and bourgeois self-representation, two key aspects of modernity, formulated into literary texts of the inventor of the very term “modernity.” Benjamin, *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism* (London, 1973). Russian semiotic linguist Roman Jakobson disentangled the various overlapping and contradictory meanings of realism. As mentioned above, Jakobson showed how successive generations of writers have attacked each other, claiming to have found a better way to realism. Jakobson, “On Realism in Art.” A different approach was used by Raymond Williams in Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, rev. ed. (New York, 1985), 257–62. He presented an updated post-Marxist theory of literature and society in idem, *Marxism and Literature*.
46. See Andreas Huyssen, *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Indianapolis, IN, 1986).
47. For example, Tolstoy concentrated primarily on Anna Karenina’s handbag in his description of her suicide. See Jakobson, “On Realism in Art,” 25.
48. Mieke Bal and Christine van Boheemen, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, 3rd ed., Toronto, 2009.
49. Ronald J. Berger and Richard Quinney, *Storytelling Sociology: Narrative as Social Inquiry*. Boulder, CO, 2004. Also see part three of this introduction (“Narration”).
50. Michel Foucault, “Of Other Spaces,” *Diacritics* 16, no. Spring (1986): 22.

51. De Certeau, *Practice of Everyday Life*, 117.
52. On the concept of mental maps and applications in urban studies, see Peter Gould, *People in Information Space: The Mental Maps and Information Surfaces of Sweden* (Lund, Sweden, 1975); John Rosslyn Clark, *Turkish Cologne: The Mental Maps of Migrant Workers in a German City* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1977). On space and cyberspace, see Peter Gould and Rodney White, *Mental Maps*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1986). On space and power see Daniel J. Walkowitz and Lisa Maya Knauer, *Contested Histories in Public Space. Memory, Race, and Nation*, Radical Perspectives (Durham, NC, 2009) as well as Simon Gunn and R.J. Morris, *Identities in Space: Contested Terrains in the Western City since 1850* (Aldershot, 2001).
53. Doreen Massey has described several central aspects of space and power, including geopolitics and gender. See Doreen B. Massey and John Allen, *Geographical Worlds* (Oxford University in association with the Open University, 1995); Doreen Massey, *Space, Place and Gender* (Cambridge, UK, 1994); idem, *Power-Geometries and the Politics of Space-Time* (Heidelberg, 1999). See below for a discussion of space-time or chronotope. The concept of a European East and West came about in the late eighteenth century in Enlightenment discourse on Russia. See Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford, CA, 1994).
54. Walter Christaller, *Die Zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland: Eine ökonomisch-geographische Untersuchung über die Gesetzmäßigkeit der Verbreitung und Entwicklung der Siedlungen mit städtischen Funktionen*, 2 ed. (Darmstadt, Germany, 1968); and Walter Christaller and Carlisle W. Baskin, *Central Places in Southern Germany* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1966). The latter's concept of "centrality" is an early example of relational thinking on space. Critical approaches in geography include Massey, *Power-Geometries and the Politics of Space-Time*; idem, *Imagining the World*; Benno Werlen, *Society, Action and Space: an Alternative Human Geography*, 1. publ. ed. (London, 1993); David Harvey, "The Geopolitics of Capitalism," in *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*, ed. Derek Gregory and John Urry (New York, 1985).
55. Three classic examples are: Ellen Churchill Semple and Friedrich Ratzel, *Influences of Geographic Environment of the Basis of Ratzel's System of Anthropo-Geography* (New York, 1911); Friedrich Ratzel, *Anthropogeographie*, 2. Aufl. ed., Bibliothek Geographischer Handbücher (Stuttgart, 1899); Ellsworth Huntington, *Civilization and Climate* (New Haven, CT, 1915); and idem, *The Character of Races as Influenced by Physical Environment, Natural Selection and Historical Development* (New York, 1924).
56. The idea has been made even more popular through the seminal writings of Yugoslav politician and researcher Jovan Cvijić. Cvijić, *La Péninsule Balkanique. Géographie Humaine* (Paris, 1918). On his political agenda cf. Snezhana Dimitrova, "Jovan Cvijić on the Periphery and the Centre," *Études Balkaniques*, no. 3–4 (1996), 82–91.

57. Carl O. Sauer, "The Morphology of Landscape," *University of California Publications in Geography* 2, no. 2 (1925), 19–53.
58. A more recent example of this tradition is Martin L. Cody and Jared M. Diamond, *Ecology and Evolution of Communities* (Cambridge, MA, 1975).
59. Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* (London, 1972).
60. For the debate on architecture, see Adolf Behne, *Eine Stunde Architektur* (Stuttgart, 1928); Maurice Broady, "Social Theory in Architectural Design," *Arena* 81, no. 898 (1966); Bill Hillier et al., "Creating Life: Or, Does Architecture Determine Anything?," *Architecture and Behaviour* 3, no. 3 (1987), 233–50. The classic proponents of geodeterminism were Ellen Churchill Semple, Ellsworth Huntington, and Thomas Griffith Taylor. See, for example, Ellen Churchill Semple, *The Geography of the Mediterranean Region: Its Relation to Ancient History* (New York, 1931). The idea itself seems to go back to the Arab philosopher Ibn Khaldûn (1332–1406), however. See Warren E. Gates, "The Spread of Ibn Khaldûn's Ideas on Climate and Culture," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 28, no. 3 (1967), 415–22.
61. See Philippe Simon, *Paris, Visite Guidée: Architecture, Urbanisme, Histoire et Actualité*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 2009).
62. Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London, 1989). Space as experienced by its inhabitants is a subject of environmental psychology. See Paul A. Bell, Jeffrey D. Fisher, and Ross J. Loomis, *Environmental Psychology* (Philadelphia, 1978).
63. Henri Lefèbvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford, 2001), 38f.
64. Henri Lefèbvre, *Critique of everyday life* (London, 2008).
65. De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*.
66. *Ibid.*, 118. Emphasis added.
67. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies*.
68. De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 190ff.
69. Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought (Cambridge, MA, 1989). His book was originally published in 1962, and not only for this reason distinctly not influenced by Foucault, but rather an attempt to rescue the positive aspects of Enlightenment thinking in a Frankfurt school sense.
70. Note that the concept of "public space" is not the same concept as "public sphere," but the two are often seen as overlapping, because *Öffentlichkeit* is supposed to take place both in public places like coffee houses, but also in streets and squares, and in print. See Nancy Fraser, "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy," in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA, 1992, 109–42).
71. Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," 25.
72. Foucault, "Of Other Spaces."
73. George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Makings of the Gay Male World, 1890–1940* (New York, 1994); Judith R. Walkow-

- itz, *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London*, Women in Culture and Society (Chicago, 1992). See also Massey, *Space, Place and Gender*.
74. Anne-Marie Fortier, *Migrant Belongings: Memory, Space, Identity* (Oxford, 2000). Disability studies is not necessarily a domain of historians, but from the beginning this academic movement did include a historical perspective, as documented in Brendan Gleeson, *Geographies of Disability* (London, 1999). *Urban Studies* dedicated an issue to disability studies in 2001 with an instructive introduction: Rob Imrie, "Barriered and Bounded Places and the Spatialities of Disability," *Urban Studies* 38, no. 2 (2001), 231–37.
 75. Mica Nava, "Modernity's Disavowal: Women, the City and the Department Store," in *Modern Times: Reflections on a Century of English Modernity*, ed. Mica Nava and Alan O'Shea (London, 1996).
 76. Massey, *Imagining the World*; Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, London, 1983; David Morley and Kevin Robins, *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries* (London, 1995). Mapping should not necessarily be understood in the sense of mental mapping referred to above; it can also include a postmodern, cartographic sense of drawing up landscapes of culture, economy, and power or strategically visualizing territories of desire. See, for instance, Jeremy Black, *Maps and History: Constructing Images of the Past* (New Haven, CT, 1997); and Simon Ryan, "Inscribing the Emptiness: Cartography, Exploration and the Construction of Australia," in *De-Scribing Empire: Post-Colonialism and Textuality*, ed. Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson (London, 1994), 115–30.
 77. Donald, *Imagining the Modern City*, 27, 28ff., 96.
 78. Simon Gunn, "The Spatial Turn. Changing Histories of Space and Place," in *Identities in Space: Contested Terrains in the Western City since 1850*, ed. Simon Gunn and Robert J. Morris, *Historical Urban Studies* (London, 2001), 1f. and 5f; David Harvey, *Consciousness and the Urban Experience: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization* (Baltimore, 1985); David Cannadine, "Victorian Cities: How Different?," *Social History*, no. 2 (1977), 457–87; David Ward, "Victorian Cities: How Modern?," *Journal of Historical Geography* 1, no. 2 (1975), 135–51.
 79. Soviet semiotician Yurii M. Lotman has laid out a general description of these cultural representations. See Y. M. Lotman, "On the Metalanguage of a Typological Description of Culture," *Semiotica* 14, no. 2 (1975), 97–123.
 80. See Doreen Massey, *For Space* (London, 2005), 27f.
 81. See Gunn, "Spatial Turn."
 82. Donald, *Imagining the Modern City*, 1–26.
 83. Walter Benjamin, *The Writer of Modern Life. Essays on Charles Baudelaire*, ed. Michael William Jennings (Cambridge, MA, 2006), 40.
 84. Sennett, *Conscience of the Eye*, 190f.
 85. Katherine Brickell and Ayona Datta, eds., *Translocal Geographies. Spaces, Places, Connections* (Farnham, 2011).

86. Simon Gunn, *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class. Ritual and Authority and the English Industrial City 1840–1914* (Manchester, 2000).
87. Pieter M. Judson, *Inventing Germanness: Class, Ethnicity, and Colonial Fantasy at the Margins of the Habsburg Monarchy* (Minneapolis, 1993); idem, "Frontier Germans: The Invention of the *Sprachgrenze*," in *Cultural Practices and the Formation of Imagined Communities around 1900. A Comparison between North America and Central Europe*, ed. Susan Ingram, Markus Reissenleitner, and Cornelia Szabó-Knotik (Wien, 2001), 85–100.
88. Nava, "Modernity's Disavowal.;" Mica Nava and Alan O'Shea, eds., *Modern Times: Reflections on a Century of English Modernity* (London, 1996).
89. De Certeau, *Practice of Everyday Life*, 97f; emphasis in original.
90. Hoggart, *The Uses of Literacy* (Harmondsworth, 1990); Willis, *Profane Culture*.
91. Meaghan Morris, "Things to Do with Shopping Centres," in *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Simon During (London, 1993), 392–409.
92. Meaghan Morris, "'On the Beach,'" in *Cultural Studies*, ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler (New York, 1992), 450–78; Hall and Jefferson, *Resistance through Rituals*; Willis, *Profane Culture*.
93. See, for instance the classic study on culture of poverty: Oscar Lewis, *La Vida. A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty—San Juan and New York* (New York, 1966); idem, *A Study of Slum Culture. Backgrounds for La Vida* (New York, 1968); William Foote Whyte, *Street Corner Society. The Social Structure of an Italian Slum* (Chicago, 1943).
94. Whyte, *Street Corner Society*; Ulf Hannerz, *Soulside. Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community* (New York, 1969).
95. Roland Barthes, *Image, Music, Text* (London, 1977), 20.
96. W.J.T. Mitchell, *On Narrative* (Chicago, 1981); Berger and Quinney, *Storytelling Sociology*; Todd Goodsell, "Defending Narrative: A Virtue Ethics Approach to Narrative Sociology," in *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Marriott Hotel, Loews Philadelphia Hotel, Philadelphia, PA, Aug 12, 2005* (2005); Charles P. Smith, "Content Analysis and Narrative Analysis," in *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology*, ed. Harry T. Reis and Charles M. Judd (Cambridge, 2000), 313–35.
97. The reception of narrative theory in Althusser was a mediated one. It was connected to the concept of the cultural ideological state apparatus. Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." The quote is from Currie, *Postmodern Narrative Theory*, 21 and 23.
98. Currie, *Postmodern Narrative Theory*, 4.
99. See Eric J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983); and E.J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge, 1990). Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* infused into other disciplines an adaptation of narrativist ideas closer to postmodern narrative theory.

100. Hoggart, *The Uses of Literacy*; Williams, *Marxism and Literature*.
101. Vladimir Propp, "Morfologija skazki." *Voprosy poetiki* XII (1928). The first English translation was Vladimir Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale* (Bloomington, IN, 1968).
102. Tsvetan Todorov, *The Poetics of Prose* (Ithaca, NY, 1977).
103. Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse Revisited* (Ithaca, NY, 1988); idem, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (Ithaca, NY, 1980). A successor of sorts is Mieke Bal; see Bal, *Narrative Theory*, 4 vols., Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies (London, 2004). An alternative tradition of narrative theory is Mihail Bakhtin, mentioned above, who developed concepts such as the polyphonic novel and the chronotopos. See the collection Pam Morris ed., *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev and Voloshinov* (London, 1994).
104. These terms depend on which terminology one is using, of course. In this case they are Genette's. Most of these topics are covered in Genette, *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. For event-story-plot, see E.M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (London, 1927). For event-fabula-story-text, see Bal and van Boheemen, *Narratology*. For *événement-histoire-discours* see Todorov, *Poetics of Prose*.
105. Terry Eagleton, *After Theory* (New York, 2003).
106. See the gradual model developed in *ibid.*, 102f.
107. André Jolles, *Einfache Formen. Legende, Sage, Mythe, Rätsel, Spruch, Kasus, Memorabile, Märchen, Witz*, Forschungsinstitut für Neuere Philologie Leipzig: Neugermanistische Abteilung 2 (Halle/S., Germany, 1930). There is a French translation of this work, but not an English one: *Formes Simples, Poétique* (Paris, 1972).
108. The background of this theory is a larger argument about narrative being a sort of rhetoric aimed at creating a response in the reader. The concept of distance as developed by Booth means the distance an author (to whom Booth refers as an implied author, because author is a theoretical construct) takes toward the narrated events. See Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago, 1961), 243–70.
109. Mike Currie, *Postmodern Narrative Theory*, 17f. Of course, Currie also contended that this kind of interpretation was criticized as removing the reader's agency. On the other hand, the theory also encompasses an implicit reader in the text and in scholarship, inspired by the German *Rezeptionsästhetik* (reader-response-theory) that has tried to reconcile agency and authority. See Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore, 1974); and Hans Robert Jauss, *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics* (Minneapolis, 1982). Michel Foucault has deconstructed the author concept altogether in Foucault, "What Is an Author?," in *The Art of History: A Critical Anthropology*, ed. D. Preziosi (New York, 1998), 299–314.
110. David Herman, *Basic Elements of Narrative* (Chichester, 2009).
111. Barthes, *Image, Music, Mext*, 20.

112. De Certeau, *Practice of Everyday Life*.
113. Boris Andreevič Uspenskij et al., "Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures (as Applied to Slavic Texts)," in *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture*, ed. Jan van der Eng and Mojmir Grygar (The Hague, 1973), 1–28; Lotman, "On the Metalanguage of a Typological Description of Culture"; idem, "Artistic Space in Gogol's Prose," *Russian Literature* 24 (1990), 199–241.
114. Lotman, "Artistic Space in Gogol's Prose," cited in Katharina Hansen-Löve, *The Evolution of Space in Russian Literature: A Spatial Reading of 19th and 20th Century Narrative Literature* (Amsterdam, 1994), 33.
115. Lotman, "Artistic Space in Gogol's Prose."
116. Morris, *Bakhtin Reader*, 184f.
117. See "Reimagining Nieuwland," "City and Cinema as Spaces for (Transnational) Grassroots Mobilization," "Urban Information Flows," and "Creating a Familiar Space" in this volume.
118. Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Manchester, 1987).
119. Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale*.
120. Randall Collins, "Statistics Versus Words," *Sociological Theory* (1984): 352; David R. Maines, "Narrative's Moment and Sociology's Phenomena: Toward a Narrative Sociology," *Sociological Quarterly* 34, no. 1 (1993): 18.
121. Aristotle, *Treatise on Rhetoric*, Great Books in Philosophy, ed. Theodore Alois Buckley (Amherst, NY, 1995). For the common ground shared by rhetoric and narrative theory see Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*.
122. Michel Foucault, "Order of Discourse," in *Untying the Text. Post-Structuralist Reader*, ed. Robert Young (Boston, 1981), 48–78.
123. The very acronym ANT (for actor-network theory) also hints to narratological influences, as the word actor is linked to Algirdas J. Greimas' "actants," as defined in Harjeet Singh Gill and Algirdas Julien Greimas, *Structural Semantics* (New Delhi, 1989). See Latour, *Reassembling the Social*.
124. Berger and Quinney, *Storytelling Sociology*, 10.
125. Hayden White, *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, 9th ed. (Baltimore, 1997).
126. Cf. W.K. Pritchett, *The Liar School of Herodotos* (Amsterdam, 1991).
127. Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity' Question and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, 1988), 648.
128. Lyotard, *Postmodern Condition*, xi, xix.
129. See, for instance, the case of migration history: Ewa Morawska, "The Sociology and Historiography of Immigration," in *Immigration Reconsidered. History, Sociology and Politics*, ed. Virginia Yans-McLaughlin (New York, 1990), 187–238.
130. Paul Thompson provides a detailed overview of the "achievement of oral history" in these fields in Paul Thompson, *The Voice of the Past. Oral History*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 2000), 81–116. Alistair Thomson noted a shift from a primary interest in English oral history to retrieve the "real facts" that

- was critically influenced by the Italian oral history scholarship that was more interested in memory. Alistair Thomson, "The Memory and History Debates: Some International Perspectives," *Oral History* 22, no. 2 (1994), 33–43.
131. Norman Dennis, *Coal Is Our Life: An Analysis of a Yorkshire Mining Community* (London, 1956); George Ewart Evans, *Where Beards Wag All: The Relevance of the Oral Tradition* (London, 1970); idem, *Ask the Fellows Who Cut the Hay* (London, 1956); Alessandro Portelli, *Biografia di una città. Storia e racconto: Terni 1830–1985*, *Microstorie* 11 (Torino, 1985).
 132. Luisa Passerini, *Fascism in Popular Memory: The Cultural Experience of the Turin Working Class* (Cambridge, 1987); Paul Richard Thompson, *The Edwardians: The Remaking of British Society*, 2nd ed. (London and New York, 1992).
 133. Thompson refers to these studies: Kathleen M. Blee, *Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s* (Berkeley, 2008); Jeremy Seabrook, *What Went Wrong? Working People and the Ideals of the Labour Movement* (London, 1978).
 134. Dennis, *Coal Is Our Life*. Although not an oral historian, Hoggart's ethos was a similar one; see his *Uses of Literacy*.
 135. Not coincidentally, oral history overlapped with the history-from-below movement, a distinct, yet assumed, point of view.
 136. For example, David Henige did not use the word "narration" at all in his rather technical introduction. Paul Thompson uses the term in the 2006 edition of his important introduction to oral history, but not in its broad definition and mentions William Labov only as a field researcher. Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson did include various texts in their reader that reflect the limits and constraints of the method on grounds of narrative theory. Thompson, *The Voice of the Past*; Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, *The Oral History Reader*, 2nd ed. (London, 2006); David Henige, *Oral Historiography* (London, 1982).
 137. The classic work is Bronislaw Malinowski, *Myth in Primitive Psychology*, 3rd ed. (Westport, CT, 1976).
 138. Walter Goldschmidt, "Anthropology and the Coming Crisis: An Autoethnographic Appraisal," *American Anthropologist* 79, no. 2 (1977): 293–308; Rosanna Hertz, ed. *Reflexivity and Voice* (Thousand Oaks, CA, 1997).
 139. See, for instance, Joseph Fontenrose, *The Ritual Theory of Myth*, *Folklore Studies* 18 (Berkeley, 1966).
 140. Trubetskoy was the founder of phonology. See Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*; on myth, see specifically idem, "The Structural Study of Myth," in *Myth: A Symposium*, ed. Thomas Albert Sebeok, *Bibliographical and Special Series of the American Folklore Society* 5 (Bloomington, 1955), 50–66. Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, 1st ed. (New York, 1949).
 141. Evans-Pritchard's reflections originally appeared in 1961. E.E. Evans-Pritchard, "Anthropology and History," in *Social Anthropology and Other*

Essays. (New York, 1966), 172–91. See also Richard G. Fox, *Urban Anthropology*; Richard Basham, *Urban Anthropology: The Cross-Cultural Study of Complex Societies* (Palo Alto, CA, 1978); Garfinkel, *Studies in Ethnomethodology*.

142. The libretto idea is again formulated in Fontenrose, *The Ritual Theory of Myth*; Goffman, *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*.

References

- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, 127–86. London: Monthly Review Press, 1971.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Anderson, Eugene. "German Romanticism as an Ideology of Cultural Crisis." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 2, no. 3 (1941): 301–17.
- Ariès, Philippe, and Georges Duby. *A History of Private Life*. 5 vols. Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Aristotle. *Treatise on Rhetoric*, Great Books in Philosophy, edited by Theodore Alois Buckley. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1995.
- Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. 3rd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Barthes, Roland. *Image, Music, Text*. Translated by Stephen Heath, Fontana communications series. London: Fontana, 1977.
- Basham, Richard. *Urban Anthropology: The Cross-Cultural Study of Complex Societies*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishers, 1978.
- Behne, Adolf. *Eine Stunde Architektur*. Stuttgart: Wedekind, 1928.
- Bell, Paul A., Jeffrey D. Fisher, and Ross J. Loomis. *Environmental Psychology*. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1978.
- Bendix, Reinhard. *Kings or People: Power and the Mandate to Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism*. London: New Left Books, 1973.
- . *The Writer of Modern Life: Essays on Charles Baudelaire*, edited by Michael William Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Berger, Ronald J., and Richard Quinney. *Storytelling Sociology: Narrative as Social Inquiry*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2004.
- Billig, Michael. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage, 1995.
- Black, Jeremy. *Maps and History: Constructing Images of the Past*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Blee, Kathleen M. *Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Blumer, Herbert. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

- Bormann, Alexander von. *Volk—Nation—Europa: Zur Romantisierung und Entromantisierung politischer Begriffe*, Stiftung für Romantikforschung 4. Würzburg, Germany: Königshausen und Neumann, 1998.
- Braudel, Fernand. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*. London: Collins, 1972.
- Brickell, Katherine, and Ayona Datta, eds. *Translocal Geographies. Spaces, Places, Connections*. Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011.
- Broadly, Maurice. "Social Theory in Architectural Design." *Arena (Architectural Association Journal)* 81, no. 898 (1966): 149–54.
- Buc, Philippe. "Political Rituals: Medieval and Modern Interpretations." In *Die Aktualität des Mittelalters*, edited by Hans-Werner Goetz, 255–72. Bochum: Dieter Winkler, 2000.
- Burke, Peter. *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- . *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. London: Smith, 1978.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: The Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Cannadine, David. "Victorian Cities: How Different?" *Social History*, no. 2 (1977): 457–87.
- Carey, James. "Reflections on the Project of (American) Cultural Studies." In *Cultural Studies in Question*, edited by Marjorie Ferguson and Peter Golding, 1–24. London: Sage, 1997.
- Carrithers, Michael. "Is Anthropology Art or Science?" *Current Anthropology* 31, no. 3 (1990): 263–82.
- Chauncey, George. *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Makings of the Gay Male World, 1890–1940*. New York: Basic Books, 1994.
- Christaller, Walter. *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland: Eine ökonomisch-geographische Untersuchung über die Gesetzmäßigkeit der Verbreitung und Entwicklung der Siedlungen mit städtischen Funktionen*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968.
- Christaller, Walter, and Carlisle W. Baskin. *Central Places in Southern Germany*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Clark, John Rosslyn. *Turkish Cologne: The Mental Maps of Migrant Workers in a German City*, Michigan Geographical Publications No. 19. Ann Arbor: Department of Geography, University of Michigan, 1977.
- Cody, Martin L., and Jared M. Diamond. *Ecology and Evolution of Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Cohen, Phil. "Sub-Cultural Conflict and Working-Class Community." In *Culture, Media, Language*, edited by Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe, and Paul Willis, 78–87. London: Hutchinson, 1980.
- Collins, Randall. "Statistics Versus Words." *Sociological Theory* (1984): 329–62.
- Currie, Mark. *Postmodern Narrative Theory*. 3rd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
- Cvijić, Jovan. *La Péninsule Balkanique. Géographie Humaine*. Paris: A. Colin, 1918.

- Darnton, Robert. *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1995.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Dennis, Norman. *Coal Is Our Life. An Analysis of a Yorkshire Mining Community*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1956.
- Dimitrova, Snezhana. "Jovan Cvijić on the Periphery and the Centre." *Études Balkaniques*, no. 3–4 (1996): 82–91.
- Donald, James. *Imagining the Modern City*. London: Athlone Press, 1999.
- Duggan, Lisa, and Nan D. Hunter. *Sex Wars: Sexual Dissent and Political Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Eagleton, Terry. *After Theory*. New York: Basic Books, 2003.
- Eames, Edwin, and Judith Goode. *Anthropology of the City: An Introduction to Urban Anthropology*, Prentice-Hall Series in Anthropology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Edensor, Tim. *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2002.
- Evans, George Ewart. *Ask the Fellows Who Cut the Hay*. London: Faber and Faber, 1956.
- . *Where Beards Wag All: The Relevance of the Oral Tradition*. London: Faber, 1970.
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. "Anthropology and History." In E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Social Anthropology and Other Essays*, 172–91. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, Language in Social Life Series. London: Longman, 1995.
- . *New Labour, New Language?* New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Robert Leon Cooper, and Roxana Ma Newman. *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Indiana University Publications, Language Science Monographs. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- Fontenrose, Joseph. *The Ritual Theory of Myth*, Folklore Studies 18. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Forster, E.M. *Aspects of the Novel*. London: E. Arnold, 1927.
- Fortier, Anne-Marie. *Migrant Belongings: Memory, Space, Identity*. Oxford: Berg, 2000.
- Foster, Robert John. *Materializing the Nation: Commodities, Consumption, and Media in Papua New Guinea*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- . "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* 16 (Spring 1986): 22–27.
- . "Order of Discourse." In *Untying the Text. Post-Structuralist Reader*, edited by Robert Young, 48–78. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- . "What Is an Author?" In *The Art of History: A Critical Anthropology*, edited by D. Preziosi, 299–314. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Fox, Richard Gabriel. *Urban Anthropology: Cities in Their Cultural Settings*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

- Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." In *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, edited by Craig Calhoun, 109–42. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992.
- Friedl, John, and Noel J. Chrisman. *City Ways: A Selective Reader in Urban Anthropology*. New York: Crowell, 1975.
- Gardiner, Michael. *Critiques of Everyday Life*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Garfinkel, Harold. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.
- Garfinkel, Harold, and Anne Warfield Rawls. *Ethnomethodology's Program: Working out Durkheim's Aphorism*, Legacies of Social Thought. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002.
- Gates, Warren E. "The Spread of Ibn Khaldûn's Ideas on Climate and Culture." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 28, no. 3 (1967): 415–22.
- Geertz, Clifford. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.
- Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- . *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Gennep, Arnold van. *The Rites of Passage*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1909.
- Gill, Harjeet Singh, and Algirdas Julien Greimas. *Structural Semantics*, Series in Semiotics and Literature 4. New Delhi: Bahri Publications, 1989.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*. New York: Penguin Books, 1982.
- . *Ecstasies: Deciphering the Witches' Sabbath*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Gitlin, Todd. "The Anti-Political Populism of Cultural Studies." In *Cultural Studies in Question*, edited by Marjorie Ferguson and Peter Golding, 25–38. London: Sage, 1997.
- Gleeson, Brendan. *Geographies of Disability*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.
- . *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Goldschmidt, Walter. "Anthropology and the Coming Crisis: An Auto-rethnographic Appraisal." *American Anthropologist* 79, no. 2 (1977): 293–308.
- Goodsell, Todd. "Defending Narrative: A Virtue Ethics Approach to Narrative Sociology." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Marriott Hotel, Loews Philadelphia Hotel, Philadelphia, PA, August 12, 2005. http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p21305_index.html (accessed May 24, 2015).
- Gottdiener, M. "Hegemony and Mass Culture. A Semiotic Approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 90, no. 5 (1985): 959–1001.
- Gould, Peter. *People in Information Space: The Mental Maps and Information Surfaces of Sweden*, Lund Studies in Geography: Ser. B, Human Geography No. 42. Lund, Sweden: Gleerup, 1975.

- Gould, Peter, and Rodney White. *Mental Maps*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1986.
- Graham, Julie. "Post-Modernism and Marxism." *Antipode* 20, no. 1 (1988): 60–66.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1971.
- Grossberg, Lawrence. *We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Guha, Ranajit. *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Gunn, Simon. *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class. Ritual and Authority and the English Industrial City 1840–1914*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- . "The Spatial Turn. Changing Histories of Space and Place." In *Identities in Space. Contested Terrains in the Western City since 1850*, edited by Simon Gunn and Robert J. Morris, 1–14. London: Ashgate, 2001.
- Gunn, Simon, and R.J. Morris. *Identities in Space: Contested Terrains in the Western City since 1850*, Historical Urban Studies. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.
- Hall, Stuart, and Tony Jefferson. *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*. London: Hutchinson, 1976.
- Halwachs, Dieter W. "The Changig Status of Romani in Europe." In *Minority Languages in Europe. Framework, Status, Prospects*, edited by Gabrielle Hogan-Brun and Stefan Wolff, 192–207. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Hannerz, Ulf. *Soulside. Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.
- Hansen-Löve, Katharina. *The Evolution of Space in Russian Literature: A Spatial Reading of 19th and 20th Century Narrative Literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994.
- Harvey, David. *Consciousness and the Urban Experience: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- . "The Geopolitics of Capitalism." In *Social Relations and Social Structures*, edited by D. Gregory and John Urry, 128–63. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.
- Henige, David. *Oral Historiography*. London: Longman, 1982.
- Herman, David. *Basic Elements of Narrative*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Hertz, Rosanna, ed. *Reflexivity and Voice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997.
- Highmore, Ben. *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory. An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Hillier, Bill, Richard Burdett, John Peponis, and Alan Penn. "Creating Life: Or, Does Architecture Determine Anything?" *Architecture and Behaviour* 3, no. 3 (1987): 233–50.

- Hilton, Matthew. "The Banality of Consumption." In *Citizenship and Consumption*, edited by Kate Soper and Frank Trentmann, 87–103. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Programme, Myth, Reality: The Wiles Lectures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J., and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Hoggart, Richard. *The Uses of Literacy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990.
- Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception." In *Dialectic of Enlightenment. Philosophical Fragments*, 94–136. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.
- Huntington, Ellsworth. *The Character of Races as Influenced by Physical Environment, Natural Selection and Historical Development*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1924.
- . *Civilization and Climate*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1915.
- Huyssen, Andreas. *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Imrie, Rob. "Barrierred and Bounded Places and the Spatialities of Disability." *Urban Studies* 38, no. 2 (2001): 231–37.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *The Implied Reader. Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Jakobson, Roman. "On Realism in Art." In *Language in Literature*, edited by Roman Jakobson, Krystyna Pomorska, and Stephen Rudy, 19–27. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1987.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics, Theory and History of Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.
- Jolles, André. *Einfache Formen. Legende, Sage, Mythe, Rätsel, Spruch, Kasus, Memorabile, Märchen, Witz*. Forschungsinstitut Für Neuere Philologie, Leipzig, Neugermanistische Abteilung II. Halle/S., 1930.
- . *Formes Simples, Poétique*. Paris: Seuil, 1972.
- Judson, Pieter. "Frontier Germans. The Invention of the Sprachgrenze." In *Cultural Practices and the Formation of Imagined Communities around 1900. A Comparison between North America and Central Europe*, edited by Susan Ingram, Markus Reisenleitner and Cornelia Szabó-Knotik, 85–100. Wien: Turia+Kant, 2001.
- . *Inventing Germanness: Class, Ethnicity, and Colonial Fantasy at the Margins of the Habsburg Monarchy*, Working Papers in Austrian Studies—Center for Austrian Studies, 93–92. Minneapolis: Center for Austrian Studies, University of Minnesota, 1993.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Kline, George Louis. *Religious and Anti-Religious Thought in Russia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Kuper, Adam. *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of an Illusion*. London: Routledge, 1988.

- Labov, William. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso, 1985.
- Latour, Bruno. *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Le Roy Ladurie, Emmanuel. *Montaillou: Village Occitan de 1294 à 1324*. Paris: Gallimard, 1975.
- Lears, T.J. Jackson. *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America*. New York: Basic Books, 1994.
- Lefèbvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*, translated by Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. 1st ed. New York: Basic Books, 1963.
- . “The Structural Study of Myth.” In *Myth: A Symposium*, edited by Thomas Albert Sebeok, 50–66. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1955.
- Lewis, Oscar. *La Vida. A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty—San Juan and New York*. New York: Random House, 1966.
- . *A Study of Slum Culture. Backgrounds for La Vida*. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Link, Jürgen, Thomas Loer, and Hartmut Neuendorff. “Normalität” im Diskursnetz soziologischer Begriffe, Diskursivitäten 3. Heidelberg: Synchron, 2003.
- Lotman, J.M. “On the Metalanguage of a Typological Description of Culture.” *Semiotica* 14, no. 2 (1975): 97–123.
- Lotman, Yurii M. “Artistic Space in Gogol’s Prose.” *Russian Literature* 24 (1990): 199–241.
- Lukács, György, and Rodney Livingstone. *Essays on Realism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987.
- Maines, David R. “Narrative’s Moment and Sociology’s Phenomena: Toward a Narrative Sociology.” *Sociological Quarterly* 34, no. 1 (1993): 17–38.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Myth in Primitive Psychology*. 3rd ed. Westport, CT: Negro Universities Press, 1976.
- Marchand, Roland. *Advertising the American Dream: Making Way for Modernity, 1920–1940*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.
- Massey, Doreen. *For Space*. London: Sage, 2007.
- . *Imagining the World*. Geographical Worlds. Oxford: Oxford University Press in association with the Open University, 1995.
- . *Power-Geometries and the Politics of Space-Time*. Heidelberg: Geographisches Institut der Universität Heidelberg, 1999.
- . *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.
- May, Stephen. *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2011.

- McCracken, Grant David. *Culture and Consumption II: Markets, Meaning, and Brand Management*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- McGuigan, Paul. "Cultural Populism Revisited." In *Cultural Studies in Question*, edited by Marjorie Ferguson and Peter Golding, 138–54. London: Sage, 1997.
- McRobbie, Angela, and Jenny Garber. "Girls and Subcultures." In *Resistance through rituals. Youth subcultures in post-war Britain*, edited by Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, 209–22. London: Hutchinson, 1976.
- Mitchell, W.J.T. *On Narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Morawska, Ewa. "The Sociology and Historiography of Immigration." In *Immigration Reconsidered. History, Sociology and Politics*, edited by Virginia Yans-McLaughlin, 187–238. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Morley, David, and Kevin Robins. *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Morris, Meaghan. "'On the Beach.'" In *Cultural Studies*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, 450–78. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- . "Things to Do with Shopping Centres." In *The Cultural Studies Reader*, edited by Simon During, 392–409. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Morris, Pam, ed. *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev and Voloshinov*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Mouffe, Chantal. *Gramsci and Marxist Theory*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Nava, Mica. "Modernity's Disavowal: Women, the City and the Department Store." In *Modern Times: Reflections on a Century of English Modernity*, edited by Mica Nava and Alan O'Shea, 38–76. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Nava, Mica, and Alan O'Shea, eds. *Modern Times: Reflections on a Century of English Modernity*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity" Question and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Passerini, Luisa. *Fascism in Popular Memory: The Cultural Experience of the Turin Working Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press/Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1987.
- Perks, Robert, and Alistair Thomson. *The Oral History Reader*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Portelli, Alessandro. *Biografia di una città. Storia e racconto: Terni 1830–1985*. 1st ed., Microstorie 11. Torino: G. Einaudi, 1985.
- Pritchett, W.K. *The Liar School of Herodotos*. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1991.
- Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale*, Bibliographical and Special Series of the American Folklore Society 9. Bloomington: Indiana University Research Center, 1958.
- Ratzel, Friedrich. *Anthropogeographie* 2nd ed. Bibliothek Geographischer Handbücher. Stuttgart: J. Engelhorn, 1899.
- Ryan, Simon. "Inscribing the Emptiness: Cartography, Exploration and the Construction of Australia." In *De-Scribing Empire: Post-Colonialism and Textu-*

- ality*, edited by Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson, 115–30. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Sauer, Carl O. “The Morphology of Landscape.” *University of California Publications in Geography* 2, no. 2 (1925): 19–53.
- Schubert, Gabriella. “Vuk Karadžić—Der Volkskundler.” In *Sprache, Literatur und Folklore bei Vuk Stefanović Karadžić*, edited by Reinhard Lauer, 309–22. Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz, 1988.
- Seabrook, Jeremy. *What Went Wrong? Working People and the Ideals of the Labour Movement*. London: V. Gollancz, 1978.
- Semple, Ellen Churchill. *The Geography of the Mediterranean Region: Its Relation to Ancient History*. New York: H. Holt, 1931.
- Semple, Ellen Churchill, and Friedrich Ratzel. *Influences of Geographic Environment of the Basis of Ratzel's System of Anthro-Geography*. New York: H. Holt, 1911.
- Sennett, Richard. *The Conscience of the Eye: The Design and Social Life of Cities*. 1st ed. New York: Knopf, 1990.
- Sesterhenn, Raimund. *Das Bogostroitel'stvo bei Gor'kij und Lunačarskij bis 1909. Zur ideologischen und literarischen Vorgeschichte der Parteischule von Capri*, Slavistische Beiträge 158. Munich: Sagner, 1982.
- Simon, Philippe. *Paris, Visite Guidée: Architecture, Urbanisme, Histoires et Actualités*. 2nd ed. Paris: Picard, 2009.
- Smith, Charles P. “Content Analysis and Narrative Analysis.” In *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology*, edited by Harry T. Reis and Charles M. Judd, 313–35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso, 1989.
- Soper, Kate, and Frank Trentmann. *Citizenship and Consumption, Consumption and Public Life*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Stoianovich, Traian. *French Historical Method: The Annales Paradigm*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976.
- Strauss, Anselm L., and Juliet Corbin. *Basics of Qualitative Research. Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. 20th ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1997.
- Thompson, Paul. *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Thompson, Paul Richard. *The Edwardians: The Remaking of British Society*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Thomson, Alistair. “The Memory and History Debates: Some International Perspectives.” *Oral History* 22, no. 2 (1994): 33–35.
- Tilley, Christopher, ed. *Reading Material Culture: Structuralism, Hermeneutics and Post-Structuralism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- Todorov, Tsvetan. *The Poetics of Prose*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Turner, Victor. *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Rituals*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967.

- . *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1995.
- Uspenskij, Boris Andreevič, Vjačeslav Vsevolodovič Ivanov, Vladimir N. Toporov, Aleksander M. Pjatigorskij, and Yurii M. Lotman. "Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures (as Applied to Slavic Texts)." In *Structure of Texts and Semiotics of Culture*, edited by Jan van der Eng and Mojmir Grygar, 1–28. The Hague: Mouton, 1973.
- Walkowitz, Daniel J., and Lisa Maya Knauer. *Contested Histories in Public Space: Memory, Race, and Nation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009.
- Walkowitz, Judith R. *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London*, Women in Culture and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Ward, David. "Victorian Cities: How Modern?" *Journal of Historical Geography* 1, no. 2 (1975): 135–51.
- Werlen, Benno. *Society, Action and Space: An Alternative Human Geography*. 1st publ. ed. London: Routledge, 1993.
- White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. 9th ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Whyte, William Foote. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.
- Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society. Coleridge to Orwell*. London: Hogarth, 1990.
- . *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- . *The Long Revolution*. London: Penguin, 1975.
- . *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Willis, Paul E. *Profane Culture*. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1978.
- Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.