

F 2812

CITIES AND THEIR SPACES

CONCEPTS AND THEIR USE IN EUROPE

herausgegeben von

Michel Pauly und Martin Scheutz

BIBLIOTHEK
des Instituts f. österreichische
Geschichtsforschung
UNIVERSITÄT 1010 WIEN



2014

BÖHLAU VERLAG KÖLN WEIMAR WIEN

SPACE AND HISTORY

AS EXEMPLIFIED BY URBAN HISTORY RESEARCH

von Michel Pauly und Martin Scheutz

In recent years the wheel of historiology has begun turning more quickly, the paradigm shifts and modernisations that we understand by the Anglo-German neologism to be its 'turns' following each other in increasingly rapid succession. On the one hand, these new approaches have clearly been inspiring historiology – and consequently urban history research – these last few years, on the other hand, 'history' seems increasingly preoccupied by an anxiety not to miss out on new developments. As such linguistic, pictorial, emotional, iconic and recently also economic turns have created new research areas, made possible new research positions at a number of universities and frequently opened up new perspectives or shed new light on old topics. After the turbulences of the linguistic revolution since the 1980s, which chiefly researched and deconstructed linguistic means of communication, the conditions of their origins and their consequences, the 1990s and onwards, against the backdrop of the Fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the attacks of September 11, 2001, have seen the arrival of the spatial revolution, at least in German-speaking areas. In 1989, the year of the fall of the Iron Curtain, the postmodern human geographer Edward W. Soja (born 1940) created the concept of the so-called 'spatial turn'. Soja thereby reacted to the 'despatialisation' of history, and tried to fathom the reasons for historiology's gradual expulsion of questions of space from sociological and historiological thinking.¹ In the context of Austro-German history, research history can explain this repression of geography. After the era of 'Volksgeographie', the postulated relationship between 'the people' and 'the land' and the intensive exploration of the 'Ostraum' (the putatively empty living space in the East) or the 'Westforschung' (the investigation of the history and culture of western border territories in view of annexation) of the 1930s and 1940s, history's concern with space, understood using National Socialist vocabulary, was for a long time suspect as it seemed to imply an ugly form of revisionism.²

¹ Doris BACHMANN-MEDICK, Spatial Turn, in: IDEM, Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften, Reinbeck 2011, pp. 284–328, here p. 284: „The spatial turn is a child of postmodernity. Toward the end of the 1980s, the American cultural theoretician Fredric Jameson, a confirmed representative of postmodernism, used the slogan ‚Always spatialise!‘“ [transl.].

² Karl SCHLÖGEL, Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit. Über Zivilisationsgeschichte und Geopolitik, Munich/

Only in the late 1990s and after was there a progressively intensive focus on the history of space. Anthropology, semiotics, literary theory, naturally also geography with its many branches and media studies centered and concentrated on space in their thinking and opened up new avenues of research.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the Eastern Europe historian and pacemaker of the ‚spatial turn‘ Karl Schlögel (born 1948), whose essayist works contributed significantly to this new understanding of space, stated thus:

‚One aspect of the development of the spatiality of human existence or human history is the discovery of the many spaces, the plurality of spaces. Nor can this be any other way. If spaces cease to only ‚be there‘ as dead, passive backdrops and repositories, if they are rather historically constituted and can have a genesis, a constitution, a decay and also an end, then it follows that there are many spaces.³ The postmodern ‚dynamisation of space with its overlaps, transgressions and fluent transitions‘⁴ seemed typical. Pointedly and polemically one might say that historiography, as an ‚immaterial temporal science‘ wherein space plays an obscure (subordinate) role, and geography, as a ‚discipline aloof from time and history‘, are being brought together to a greater extent in the interdisciplinary framework of the ‚spatial turn‘⁵ – by no means the first attempt at convergence of these related but not very cooperative disciplines.

Conceived as an interdisciplinary approach, the ‚spatial turn‘ experienced important impulses from (what a historical perspective understands to be) adjoining sciences. Thus the sociologist Georg Simmel (1858–1918) already contributed an important determination for the more recent understanding of space when he conceptualised space not as an unchanging constant but as constructed through collectivisation as a consequence of social relationships. Simmel attributed various fundamental qualities to space, such as ‚exclusivity, deconstructibility, fixation, vicinity or proximity-distance-relations‘⁶ and thus rejected a kind of absolutist assumption of the existence of space outside of human perception. Space thus exists inside human sentience and as a consequence of human interactions and relationships. Equally paradigmatic appears the approximation to a sociology of space by German sociologist Martina Löw (born 1965).⁷ In essence, Löw stated that physically existing spaces only begin to be constituted by actions and perceptions in the minds of the observers and users of space. Utilisation, appropriation and perception of space, as well as the spatial representation through maps, signs and different codes made space become a relational

Vienna 2003, pp. 52–59. [English version: SCHLÖGEL, *Reading time through space – On the History of Civilisation and Geo-Politics*].

³ SCHLÖGEL, *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit* (see footnote 2), p. 68. [transl.].

⁴ BACHMANN-MEDIK, *Spatial Turn* (see footnote 1), p. 293. [transl.].

⁵ Axel GOTTHARD, *Wohin führt uns der „Spatial turn“? Über mögliche Gründe, Chancen und Grenzen einer neuerdings diskutierten historiographischen Wende*, in: *Mikro – Meso – Makro. Regionenforschung im Aufbruch*, ed. by Wolfgang WÜST/Werner K. BLESSING/David PETRY, Erlangen 2005, pp. 15–49, here p. 16f.

⁶ Referenced from Christian HOCHMUTH/Susanne RAU, *Stadt – Macht – Räume. Eine Einführung*, in: *Machträume in der frühneuzeitlichen Stadt*, ed. by IDEM (*Konflikte und Kultur. Historische Perspektiven* 13), Konstanz 2006, pp. 13–40, here p. 27. [transl.].

⁷ Martina LÖW, *Raumsoziologie* (stw 1506), Frankfurt a. M. 2001.

Die historische Stadt wird in den Augen der neueren Stadtgeschichtsforschung vielfach als eine soziale Theaterbühne und als verdichteter Kommunikationsraum, der durch vielfältige sprachliche, bauliche, performative Tätigkeiten bestimmt wird, gedeutet. Machtbeziehungen strukturieren einerseits den Stadtraum und der Stadtraum visualisiert andererseits Machtbeziehungen, die im sozialen Raum ständig präsent sein müssen, damit hohe Wirksamkeit erzielt wird. Die herrschenden Machtverhältnisse erscheinen dabei dauerhaft eingebettet in die Raumkonstruktion.⁷² Die räumliche Stadtentwicklung spiegelt deshalb diese Machtzonen wider, etwa die Bedeutung der Kaufmannssiedlungen für die Stadtwerdung,⁷³ die Veränderungen im konfessionellen Rahmen⁷⁴, die Raumnutzung im Kontext von Prozessionen wie Umzügen⁷⁵ oder die antikisierende Betrachtungsweise von Städten, die den „historischen städtischen“ Raum in den Köpfen der vielfach an italienischen Vorbildern geschulten Betrachter erst mitbegründet.⁷⁶

Der Stadtraum und die sich wandelnden Nutzungskonzepte von Stadtraum werden auch an den Stadtvierteln⁷⁷ deutlich. Die Stadtviertel, deren Ursprung sich aus militärischen, verwaltungs- und steuertechnischen Ursachen herleitet, erleben bedingt durch politische, wirtschaftliche und soziale Rahmenbedingungen neue Besiedlung, wie sich an Häuserverzeichnissen und Gerichtsbüchern⁷⁸, an gewandelten, durch Migration und soziale Segregation bedingten städteplanerischen Konzepten⁷⁹ und letztlich auch an den Möglichkeiten von freiem „grünen“ Raum⁸⁰ zeigt.

Die Beiträge des vorliegenden Bandes bestätigen⁸¹, dass für Historiker der Raum sowohl materiell als auch diskursiv produziert wurde, dass die Raumkategorie sowohl eine physische als auch eine symbolische ist, dass der Raum aber auf sehr unterschiedlichen Ebenen und mit sehr differenzierten Begriffen untersucht werden kann: vom Stadthaus oder dem umbauten Stadtplatz über die Stadtmauer mit ihren Toren bis zu der städtischen Zentralität, vom Raum als Container über den Raum als Schutz, den Raum als Bühne, den umkämpften Raum, den kontrollierten Raum bis zum privaten oder öffentlichen Raum. Das unterscheidet die Herangehensweise der Historiker möglicherweise von jener der Soziologen.

⁷² Löw, Epilog (wie Anm. 8), S. 463; BOONE, Urban Space and Political Conflict (wie Anm. 26).

⁷³ Siehe den Beitrag von Karlheinz BLASCHKE in diesem Band, wo er die Bedeutung der „Nikolaus-Bewegung“ für die Stadtentwicklung hervorstreicht. Siehe auch DERS./Uwe Ulrich JÄSCHKE, Nikolaikirchen und Stadtentstehung in Europa. Von der Kaufmannssiedlung zur Stadt, Berlin 2013.

⁷⁴ Siehe den Beitrag von Anngret SIMMS für irische Städte in der Reformation.

⁷⁵ Am Beispiel von böhmischen Städten im Spätmittelalter siehe den Beitrag von Robert ŠIMŮNEK.

⁷⁶ Am Beispiel italienischer und englischer Städte Rosemary SWEET.

⁷⁷ Siehe als Überblick Robert JÜTTE, Das Stadtviertel als Problem und Gegenstand der frühneuzeitlichen Stadtgeschichtsforschung, in: Blätter für Deutsche Landesgeschichte 127 (1991), S. 235–270; Bram VANNIEUWENHUYZE, Buren, straten en aanknopingspunten. Plaatsbepaling in het laatmiddeleeuwse Brussel (dertiende–zestiende eeuw), in: Stadsgeschiedenis 4 (2009), S. 97–114.

⁷⁸ Am Beispiel der neuen Ratssetzung von 1350 für die Prager Altstadt siehe den Beitrag von Martin MUSÍLEK.

⁷⁹ Siehe den Beitrag von Lars NILSSON für Stockholm.

⁸⁰ Siehe den breiten Überblick von Peter CLARK zu Grünflächen in diesem Band.

⁸¹ ARNADE/HOWELL/SIMONS, Fertile Spaces (wie Anm. 9), S. 541f.

dimension. According to Löw, the decisive importance lies not in the composition in space („Anordnung im Raum“) but the ‚disposition towards spaces‘ („Anordnung zu Räumen“).⁸ Two important processes help create these spaces: ‚spacing‘ and the human synthesis activity („mapping“). Löw’s ‚spacing‘ refers to ‚physical‘ space, the active positioning of social commodities like people in space and the symbolic marking of space (as through monuments, buildings, structural design). But it is only the simultaneous synthesis activity by humans („mapping“ occurring simultaneously with ‚spacing“) that joins together social assets and spaces and thus allows for a meaningful organisation of knowledge.

The preoccupation with space looks back on a long tradition, without us having to refer here explicitly or in detail to Herodotus or Thukydides and their description of history developed through space. In his 1974 book *La production de l'espace* („The production of space“), the (post-) marxist French sociologist Henri Lefebvre (1901–1991) already indicated space as an important but underestimated factor in social sciences.⁹ He declared space to be a ‚social product‘¹⁰ and not an empty container for objects and practices. The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1930–2002) also reflected intensely on the connections between space, power and social relations. According to Bourdieu, the relationship between ‚physical space‘ and ‚social space‘ is one of tension. Social space, determined by humans and their social relations and hierarchies (the ‚appropriated physical space‘) takes place within an urban space determined by construction.¹¹ „The space that is in certain ways inhabited by and known to us is socially constructed and marked.“¹² Social and physical space are however chiefly shaped by relations, i. e. relationships. Social standing in a society is directly expressed in physical space. The availability of economic, social and cultural capital contributes decisively to determining the spatial position of a person in the social field.¹³ Social and physical reality are inextricably intertwined, and thus space, or use of space, becomes a category for analysis, since concrete use of space within societies represents a kind of indicator of social position within societies. Following research

⁸ Martina Löw, Epilog, in: Zwischen Gotteshaus und Taverne. Öffentliche Räume in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit, ed. by Susanne RAU/Gerd SCHWERHOFF (Norm und Struktur 21), Cologne 2004, pp. 463–468. [transl.].

⁹ Henri LEFEBVRE, *La production de l'espace*, Paris 1974 [English version: *The Production of Space*, transl. by Donald Nicholson-Smith, Oxford 1991]; IDEM, *Die Produktion des städtischen Raums*, transl. by Franz Hiss/Hans-Ulrich Wegener, in: ARCH+ 34 (1977); cf. Peter ARNADE/Martha C. HOWELL/Walter SIMONS, *Fertile Spaces: The Productivity of Urban Space in Northern Europe*, in: *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32/4 (2002), pp. 515–548; Jörg DÖRING/Tristan THIELMANN, *Was lesen wir im Raum. Der „Spatial Turn“ und das geheime Wissen der Geographen*, in: *Spatial Turn. Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften*, ed. by IDEM, Bielefeld 2009, pp. 7–45, here p. 7.

¹⁰ Jörg DÖRING, *Spatial Turn*, in: *Raum. Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch*, ed. by Stephan GÜNZEL, Stuttgart 2010, pp. 90–99, here p. 91 (referencing Lefebvre pp. 91–93).

¹¹ Pierre BOURDIEU, *Espace social et genèse des „classes“*, in: *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 52–53 (1984), pp. 3–14.

¹² Pierre BOURDIEU, *Sozialer Raum* [1989], in: *Raumtheorie. Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften*, ed. by Jörg DÜNNE/Stephan GÜNZEL, Frankfurt a. M. 2006, pp. 354–370. [transl.].

¹³ Pierre BOURDIEU, *Physischer, sozialer und angeeigneter physischer Raum*, in: *Stadt-Räume*, ed. by Martin WENTZ, Frankfurt a. M. 1991, pp. 25–35.

by Michel Foucault or Edward Said, there emerged disjoined spaces (‘third space’), that have been designated as ‘non-place’ (Heterotopias, Foucault) or ‘global ethno-scapes’.¹⁴ These spaces are no longer real or physical or merely symbolic, but both at the same time.

A structuralist approach to space centered on the key concept of the ‘boundary’ has proven equally helpful, as in its differentiation of space and location, of ‘sacred’ and ‘profane’, of ‘public’ and ‘private’. Thus the sociologist Karl-Siegbert Rehberg (born 1943) proposed a distinction between locations and spaces. While he interpreted locations as ‘spatial condensation of actions’ as well as ‘a setting for activities’ (such as rituals) [„räumliche Verdichtung von Handlungsvollzügen“ sowie als „Bühne für Handlungswiederholungen“]¹⁵, where concrete action takes place, he conceived of space as a field of possibility (field of latency) determined by each human being. In the course of the ‘spatial turn’, space was no longer thought of as a fixed dimension, but as a process, in which perception, the perspective of the protagonists and space users as well as the staging of locations and space are of crucial importance. Were one to try to sum up with moderate success a presently unconcluded debate, one might surmise that space is created by human beings and is in no way inalterable. Crucial for the interpretation of space is the perspective of the protagonists – the opposite has at times held sway here. Where previously the investigation of spaces was strongly influenced by art historical exegeses that meticulously deciphered the construct of space, so now, against the backdrop of the ‘spatial turn’, the ‘constructional substrate’ shifts towards the outer edge while the evaluation of space by users differentiated by age, ethnicity and gender has become the focus of research.

Each ‘turn’ almost automatically leads to the historiography of the respective turn. Scientists from very different disciplines strive to locate the intellectual precursors of their respective movement and thus anchor them in research history. In the case of the ‘spatial turn’, chief importance is attributed to the interdisciplinary school of historians of the ‘Annales’ around Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre, as its founders already demonstrated a pronounced interest for geography as spatial historiography. Thus the geographer and historian Paul Vidal de la Blache (1845–1918) already played a major role here.¹⁶ As a prospective historian, Marc Bloch’s education included a complete course of compulsory geographical studie.¹⁷ Geography always played an important role in Bloch’s work in terms of curiosity and openness to new influences on history. Influential masterworks like Fernand Braudel’s (1902–1985) three-volume book *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l’époque de Philippe II* (*The Mediterranean sea and the Mediterranean world in the era of Philip II*)¹⁸ would not

¹⁴ BACHMANN-MEDIK, *Spatial Turn* (see note 1), p. 297f.

¹⁵ Karl-Siegbert REHBERG, *Macht-Räume als Objektivierungen sozialer Beziehungen. Institutionenanalytische Perspektiven*, in: *Machträume in der frühneuzeitlichen Stadt* (see note 6), pp. 41–58, here p. 47.

¹⁶ Peter BURKE, *Offene Geschichte: Die Schule der „Annales“*, Berlin 1991, pp. 26–35.

¹⁷ Peter SCHÖTTLER, *Marc Bloch (1886–1944)*, in: *Klassiker der Geschichtswissenschaft. Bd. 1: Von Edward Gibbon bis Marc Bloch*, ed. by Lutz RAPHAEL, Munich 2006, pp. 232–250, here p. 235.

¹⁸ Fernand BRAUDEL, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l’époque de Philippe II*, Paris 1949, 2nd 1966 [German version: *Das Mittelmeer und die mediterrane Welt in der Epoche Philipps II.*, Frank-

have been conceivable without the intertwining of spatial and temporal dimensions. In this work, Braudel contrasts in terms of ‚longue durée‘, the slow time that is influenced by natural events and ponderous space (‚géohistoire‘) with the more rapid political time that is influenced and co-determined by human beings. The time horizons and the spatial dimension of politics, economics and social history seemed to Braudel to be inextricably intertwined. Braudel connected cultural geography and political history, unlike the historians of the 19th century however he did not see pivotal movers and shakers in the great figures, but in the sense of a ‚histoire totale‘ he increasingly focused on geographical constraints, which besides politics he made causally responsible for economic ups and downs.¹⁹ In Braudel's conception, begun in German prison camps, the political figures of the 16th century were only responsible for the short-term history of events, while the natural spaces supplied the barely alterable stage for the politics of Philip II.

From the mine shaft of the social sciences, the historiography of the ‚spatial turn‘ has yielded additional textual witnesses for the spatialisation of history. In addition to Braudel and Bourdieu's conceptions, there were important, chiefly ethnological, research approaches by the French ethnologist and specialist for ‚rites of passage‘ Arnold van Gennep (1873–1957) as well as the symbolic anthropologist Victor Turner (1920–1983)²⁰ about ritual, procession, boundaries and liminality. Following this research, there have in the last two decades been pronounced studies into performative acts and their anchoring in space: such as the space of council elections in church and city hall,²¹ the multifunctional religious spaces,²² the Alps,²³ the city as a stage

furt a. M. 1990]; see Eric PILTZ, „Trägheit des Raums“. Fernand Braudel und die Spatial Stories der Geschichtswissenschaften, in: *Spatial Turn* (see note 9), pp. 75–102, here pp. 75–96.

¹⁹ Lutz RAPHAEL, Fernand Braudel (1902–1985), in: *Klassiker der Geschichtswissenschaft*, Bd. 2: Von Fernand Braudel bis Natalie Z. Davies, ed. by Lutz RAPHAEL, Munich 2006, pp. 45–62, here pp. 49–62.

²⁰ Arnold van GENNEP, *Les rites de passage*, Paris 1909 [German version: *Übergangsriten*, Frankfurt a. M./New York 1986]; Victor TURNER, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Antistructure*, New York 1969 [German version: *Das Ritual. Struktur und Anti-Struktur*, Frankfurt a. M./New York 1989].

²¹ Dietrich POECK, *Rituale der Ratswahl. Zeichen und Zeremoniell der Ratssetzung in Europa (12.–18. Jahrhundert)* (Städteforschung A 60), Cologne/Vienna 2003; Stephan ALBRECHT, *Rathäuser in Deutschland. Architektur und Funktion*, Darmstadt 2004; *Rathäuser als multifunktionale Räume der Repräsentation, der Parteiungen und des Geheimnisses*, ed. by Susanne Cl. PILS/Martin SCHEUTZ/Christoph SONNLECHNER/Stefan SPEVAK (Forschungen und Beiträge zur Wiener Stadtgeschichte 55), Vienna 2012; Gerhard AMMERER/Thomas WEIDENHOLZER, *Rathaus, Kirche, Wirt. Stadtraum zwischen stadtherrlicher, geistlicher, kommunaler und privater Nutzung*, in: *Rathaus. Kirche. Wirt. Öffentliche Räume in der Stadt Salzburg*, ed. by IDEM (Schriftenreihe des Archivs der Stadt Salzburg 26), Salzburg 2009, pp. 225–236; Gerd SCHWERHOFF, *Verortete Macht. Mittelalterliche und frühneuzeitliche Rathäuser als institutionelle Eigenräume städtischer Politik*, in: *Institution und Charisma. Festschrift für Gert Melville zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by Franz J. FELTEN/Annette KEHNEL/Stefan WEINFURTER, Cologne/Weimar/Vienna 2009, pp. 215–228.

²² *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Will COSTER/Andrew SPICER, Cambridge et al. 2005; *Political space in pre-industrial Europe*, ed. by Beat KÜMIN, Farnham/Burlington 2009; Gerd SCHWERHOFF, *Sakralitätsmanagement. Zur Analyse religiöser Räume im späten Mittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit*, in: *Topographien des Sakralen. Religion und Raumordnung in der Vormoderne*, ed. by Susanne RAU/IDEM, Hamburg 2008, pp. 38–69.

²³ Marcus SANDL, *Geschichtswissenschaft*, in: *Raumwissenschaften*, ed. Stephan GÜNZEL, Frankfurt a. M. 2009, pp. 159–174, here pp. 168–170.

for processions, inns and public houses²⁴ as a space to negotiate conflicts in, and the marketplace²⁵ as a stage to settle social, economic and cultural conflicts, the space for insurrections²⁶ or 'the space of power'²⁷ of the Pre-Modern era in general.

The spatial turn can also look back on conceptual ancestors like the notion of 'mental maps' designed by social and urban geography. In the middle of the 20th century, the question of spatial cognition, spatial imagination and behaviours of direction and orientation was already a object of research for such varied disciplines as anthropology, philosophy, psychology and physiology,²⁸ which followed up on older 19th century research into the 'inner compass' and 'the map in the mind', oriented towards measurement and cartography. Fundamental for the concept of 'mental maps' was the work of the American psychologist Edward C. Tolman (1886–1959),²⁹ who created the notion of 'cognitive maps' on the empirical basis of the spatial behaviour of rats in a maze. According to his research, their spatial behaviour is not based on chain of stimulus and reaction, but on an internal representation of their surroundings. The question of how living beings orient themselves in their spatial surroundings also occupied urban planner Kevin Lynch (1918–1984) in his conception of the environmental image of (car-owning) city dwellers, when he undertook an empirical study of the perception of the city, using as examples Boston, Jersey City and Los Angeles,³⁰ and

²⁴ Dagmar FREIST, *Wirtshäuser als Zentren frühneuzeitlicher Öffentlichkeit: London im 17. Jahrhundert*, in: *Kommunikation und Medien der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. by Johannes BURKHARDT (*Historische Zeitschrift*, Beih. 41), Munich 2005, pp. 201–224; Susanne RAU, *Orte der Gastlichkeit – Orte der Kommunikation. Aspekte der Raumkonstruktion von Herbergen in einer frühneuzeitlichen Stadt*, in: *Kirchen, Märkte und Tavernen. Erfahrungs- und Handlungsräume in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. by Renate DÜRR/Gerd SCHWERHOFF (*Zeitsprünge. Forschungen zur Frühen Neuzeit* 9, Heft 3/4), Frankfurt a. M. 2005, pp. 394–417; Beat KÜMIN, *Drinking Matters. Public Houses and Social Exchange in Early Modern Central Europe (Early modern history: Society and culture)*, Houndsmills 2007.

²⁵ Michaela FENSKE, *Marktkultur in der Frühen Neuzeit. Wirtschaft, Macht und Unterhaltung auf einem städtischen Jahr- und Viehmarkt*, Cologne/Weimar/Vienna 2006.

²⁶ Marc BOONE, *Urban Space and Political Conflict in Late Medieval Flanders*, in: *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32/4 (2002), pp. 621–640; Alexander SCHUNKA, *Revolten und Raum – Aufruhr und Bestrafung im Licht des Spatial Turn*, in: *Die Stimme der ewigen Verlierer? Aufstände, Revolten und Revolutionen in den österreichischen Ländern (ca. 1450–1815)*, ed. by Peter RAUSCHER/Martin SCHEUTZ (*Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 61), Vienna 2013, pp. 369–385.

²⁷ HOCHMUTH/RAU, *Stadt – Macht – Räume* (see note 6), pp. 13–40; Jörg ROGGE, *Politische Räume und Wissen. Überlegungen zu Raumkonzepten und deren heuristischen Nutzen für die Stadtgeschichtsforschung (mit Beispielen aus Mainz und Erfurt im späten Mittelalter)* in: *Tradieren – Vermitteln – Anwenden. Zum Umgang mit Wissensbeständen in spätmittelalterlichen und frühneuzeitlichen Städten*, ed. by IDEM (*Beiträge zu den Historischen Kulturwissenschaften* 6), Berlin 2008, pp. 115–154; *D'une ville à l'autre: structures matérielles et organisation de l'espace dans les villes européennes (XIII^e-XVI^e siècles)*, ed. by Jean-Claude MAIRE VIGUEUR, Rome 1989.

²⁸ Kirsten WAGNER, *Kognitiver Raum. Orientierung – Mental Maps – Datenverwaltung*, in: *Raum. Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch*, ed. by Stephan GÜNZEL, Stuttgart 2010, pp. 234–249, here p. 234; see the example of early modern beggars Martin SCHEUTZ, *„Mental Maps“ von Vagierenden in der Frühen Neuzeit. Mobilität und deren textliche Repräsentation im niederösterreichischen Voralpengebiet aus der Perspektive von Verhörten*, in: *Volkskunde in Sachsen* 24 (2012), pp. 111–140, here pp. 114–118.

²⁹ Edward C. TOLMAN, *Cognitive Maps in Rats and Men*, in: *Psychological Review* 55/4 (1948), pp. 189–208.

³⁰ Kevin LYNCH, *Das Bild der Stadt*, Braunschweig/Wiesbaden 1989 [English edition 1960].

empirically demonstrated how a cognitive map can function on the basis of partial perceptions. The connection between spatial memory and spatial imagination about 'the world in our minds' has been advanced significantly in a 1974 monograph by a pair of authors, the geographer Roger M. Downs and the psychologist David Stea.³¹ 'Cognitive cartography' is an abstract term regrouping those cognitive faculties that allow us to gather, order, store, retrieve and process information about our spatial surroundings.³² Kevin Lynch's investigation into the mental-spatial visualization, or the visual strategy of city streets and paths has yielded five differentiators as distinguishing features for the environmental image of city dwellers in the 20th century:³³ '(1) Paths, (2) edges, (3) districts, (4) nodes, (5) landmarks'. By no means to be understood only as maps, but rather as images or verbal statements, these 'mental maps' depend on various factors of individual, schematic, symbolic, distorted or incomplete representation of our surroundings. As orientation schemata, 'mental maps' have variegated functions in the sense of spatial memory for navigation, as in daily routing and path finding.³⁴ The fundamental problem of 'mental maps', resolving the tendentially competitive relationship of physical space and mental representation, remains an aporia.

To sum up Karl Schlögel's plea for the spatialisation of history, Schlögel differentiates between physical space and historical spaces, which originate because of political and governmental structures, and living space, which individuals create for themselves. The Eastern Europe historian acts on the assumption of a plurality of spaces, wherein all spaces appear not only as dead spaces, but are historically constituted and determined by the protagonists.³⁵ Space is by no means a solid object of reference, but conspicuously shaped by discourses (in the sense of 'commemoration spaces', memorials, etc).³⁶ The motive for the efforts of the 'spatial turn' seems to be an intention for history to evolve to a greater extent from a temporal to a spatial science. Conversely, there exists in the present the simultaneous phenomenon, driven by the new means of communication, of global despatialisation and delocalisation – synchrony and diachrony facing each other. Thus it is with equal justification that one may speak with Vilém Flusser (1992) of 'the end of geography' and with Michel Foucault of 'the age of space' (2005).³⁷ The tension between dissolution and return of space

³¹ Roger M. Downs/David Stea, *Maps in Minds. Reflections on Cognitive Mapping*, New York 1977 [German edition: *Kognitive Karten. Die Welt in unseren Köpfen*, New York 1982].

³² Downs/SteA, *Kognitive Karten* (see note 31), p. 23. The term 'Mental Maps' originates in the eponymous publication by geographers Peter Gould and Rodney White: Peter Gould/Rodney White, *Mental Maps*, Harmondsworth 1974, London 2002.

³³ Lynch, *Das Bild* (see note 30), pp. 60–109.

³⁴ Anton Hartl, *Kognitive Karten und kognitives Kartieren*, in: *Repräsentation und Verarbeitung räumlichen Wissens*, ed. by Christian Freska/C. Habel (*Informatik-Fachberichte* 245), Berlin 1990, pp. 34–46, here pp. 34–46.

³⁵ Schlögel, *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit* (see note 2), p. 68f.

³⁶ Sandl, *Geschichtswissenschaft* (see note 23), p. 166f.

³⁷ Frederic Jameson (1986), cited following Markus Schroer, *Spatial turn*, in: *Lexikon der Raumphilosophie*, ed. by Stephan Günzel/Franziska Kümmerling, Darmstadt 2012, p. 380.

is likely to occupy historiography further,³⁸ but the critical reflection on the understanding of space ought to remain. Above and beyond their metaphorical character, spatial categories like center, periphery, edge, hub, or outskirts should be taken seriously and studied in their complexity.³⁹ Repeatedly, however, there are also warnings from the fields of various scientific disciplines not to fall into the ‚spatial trap‘, that is to completely lose sight of other analytical categories (social practices) through sheer overuse of the concept of space. Historians especially will warn of the inherent danger of space suggesting synchrony where in actuality there is development and process.

Urban history and the missed ‚spatial turn‘?

The ‚founding father‘ of the ‚spatial turn‘, Edward Soja, saw the city and the ‚urban built environment‘ as ‚embedded in the restless geographical landscape of capital, and specified as part of a complex and contradiction-filled societal spatialization that simultaneously enhances and inhibits, provides new room and imprisons, offers solutions but soon revokes them‘.⁴⁰ The city as concentrated constructive form has always also been recognised as a space. For many centuries, cities have been perceived through city maps, that is by means of charts of urban topography and landmarks, traffic infrastructure and urban outlines. Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl (1823–1897) already saw ‚the city map as blueprint for society‘,⁴¹ since the outward appearance of the city was perceived as socio-geographic and topographic space. Elites, middle classes and lower classes settled socio-geographically in cities, and made their living spaces in the city identifiable by their buildings. The city map as the memory of the city can therefore be read as a ‚sum of complementary locations [...] that exist side by side, overlap or intertwine each other. [...] The city can thus be read as a collage, in which urban development attitudes, social criticism and the handling of history have become structurally manifest.‘⁴² To interpret space as a ‚relational organisation of social assets and living things in a location‘⁴³ has proven itself to be a highly promising approach for urban history research.

³⁸ BACHMANN-MEDIK, *Spatial Turn* (see note 1), p. 288f.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 315; FRANZ IRSIGLER, *Zentrum, Grenze und Achse als Elemente einer historischen Raumtypologie*, in: *Zwischen Maas und Rhein. Beziehungen, Begegnungen und Konflikte in einem europäischen Kernraum von der Spätantike bis zum 19. Jahrhundert. Versuch einer Bilanz*, ed. by IDEM (*Trierer Historische Forschungen* 61), Trier 2006, pp. 11–26.

⁴⁰ EDWARD SOJA, *Postmodern Geographies. The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, London 1989, p. 108, quoted in SCHLÖGEL, *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit* (see note 2), p. 67. [transl.]

⁴¹ SCHLÖGEL, *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit* (see note 2), p. 304. [transl.]

⁴² HANS STIMMANN, *Die Textur der Stadt*, in: *Foyer. Journal für Stadtentwicklung* 3 (2000), pp. 22–23, quoted in SCHLÖGEL, *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit* (see note 2), p. 308. [transl.]

⁴³ See the example of urban typologies (city rankings, economic developments etc.) of Martina Löw, *Soziologie der Städte*, Frankfurt a. M. 2008, p. 238. [transl.]

Urban history research's preoccupation with space, however, is substantially older,⁴⁴ as some following examples are meant to document. The medieval foundation of cities already necessitated a precisely and accurately organised inclusion of planned city space, a geo-strategical interpretation of space and an organisation of urban layout planned in terms of space.⁴⁵ Many material witnesses document the significance of space for the city – thus in antiquity already, scaled models were crafted, usually for purposes of fortification. Modern city models took up this tradition, such as the unfortunately non-existent three-dimensional city portrait of Florence from 1529, the scale model of Nuremberg created by Hans Sebald Beheim in 1540 or the model Hans Rogel crafted of Augsburg in the 1560s.⁴⁶ In thousands of 'view of the city/town' portraits, the face of the European city has been caught and preserved since the Middle Ages. Thousands of city maps have modeled the 'image and perception of the city'⁴⁷ and worked out urban development in map images or cityscapes. There have been notions of ideal and real city blueprints since antiquity (such as Plato's *Politeia* or Vitruv's architectural treatises), or since the urban planning endeavours of Bologna (1221) and Brescia (first half of the 13th century). Modernity saw chief developments in new urban function types such as new citadels, mountain or mining towns, garrison or trade towns, colonial cities built outside Europe in part according to design regulations, and the residence or capital typical for early modern nation building. In addition to the reorganisation of city centres via street straightening, the creation of long vistas and the construction of town squares, urban planning of the modern era has been shaped by increasing segregation (such as the relocation of hospitals from the centre to the outskirts).⁴⁸ To a phase of medieval and early modern fortification there followed a phase of defortification commanded by the sovereign, beginning in the 18th century.

⁴⁴ As an overview, cf. Peter JOHANEK, *Stadtgeschichtsforschung – ein halbes Jahrhundert nach Ennen und Planitz*, in: *Europäische Stadtgeschichte. Ausgewählte Beiträge*, ed. by Werner FREITAG/Mechthild SIEKMANN (*Städteforschung A 86*), Vienna/Cologne/Weimar 2012, pp. 47–94, here p. 59f., and: Franz IRSIGLER, *Raumkonzepte in der historischen Forschung*, in: *Zwischen Gallia und Germania, Frankreich und Deutschland. Konstanz und Wandel raumbestimmender Kräfte. Vorträge auf dem 36. Deutschen Historikertag, Trier 8.–12. Oktober 1986*, ed. by Alfred HEIT (*Trierer Historische Forschungen 12*), Trier 1987, pp. 11–27.

⁴⁵ Including multiple examples of city foundations: *Stadtgründung und Stadtwerdung. Beiträge von Archäologie und Stadtgeschichtsforschung*, ed. by Ferdinand OPLL (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Städte Mitteleuropas 22*), Linz 2011. Including a critical discussion of the foundation city: Martina STERCKEN, *Gebaute Ordnung, Stadtvorstellungen und Planung im Mittelalter*, in: *Städteplanung – Planungsstädte*, ed. by Bruno FRITZSCHE/Hans-Jörg GILOMEN/IDEM, Zurich 2006, pp. 15–37. As a prime example for the concrete processes of city foundation 'on a green meadow' and its inscription in space, see: Franz IRSIGLER, *Über Stadtentwicklung: Beobachtungen am Beispiel von Ardres*, in: *Zeitschrift für Archäologie des Mittelalters 11* (1983) pp. 7–19, newly published in: *Miscellanea Franz Irigler. Festgabe zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by Volker HENN/Rudolf HOLBACH/Michel PAULY/Wolfgang SCHMID, Trier 2006, pp. 169–185.

⁴⁶ Andrew John MARTIN, *Stadtmodelle*, in: *Das Bild der Stadt in der Neuzeit 1400–1800*, ed. by Wolfgang BEHRINGER/Bernd ROECK, Munich 1999, pp. 66–72.

⁴⁷ *Bild und Wahrnehmung der Stadt*, ed. by Peter JOHANEK (*Städteforschung A 63*), Vienna/Cologne 2012.

⁴⁸ Susanne RAU, *Stadtplanung*, in: *Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit 12* (2010), pp. 782–785.

The founders of the new German urban history research after World War II – legal historian Hans Planitz (1882–1954)⁴⁹ and historian Edith Ennen (1907–1999)⁵⁰ – already indicated the significance of cartography and the importance of city layouts for urban history research. Reconnecting with research from the 1930s, urban historiography after 1945 saw the use of cartographical material and urban planning research as essential. This material allowed for the working out of genesis, growth and diminution of cities. In addition to the cartography of individual cities, there was to be for 'the German city' a comparative interpretation of urban planning based on cadastral maps accurate to the level of small plots according to Hans Planitz's specifications. Founded in 1955, the 'Commission Internationale pour l'Histoire des Villes' determined during its annual conference in Vienna in 1965 the fundamental rules for the creation of city atlases.⁵¹ Through the work on the European city atlas, overseen by a group of researchers from each country, the urban space was to be studied comparatively. Significant impulses of development can be made out in the creation of the European city atlases in the 1970s and 1990s. Until 2010, around 500 cities and their urban layouts (urban development maps) have been worked out in seventeen countries.⁵² The study of city blueprints on the basis of historical foundations (cadastral maps, billeting and inhabitation records, etc.) has yielded outstanding insights into the development of cities (keywords including nobility in the city, churches in the city, civil servants in the city). The transition from residential towns to the modern City, the relocation from the historic center to the suburbs, social change, the decentralisation of commerce and so forth were impressively well documented for Vienna for instance on the basis of historical maps.⁵³

Crucial for urban history research – but also for the 'Commission Internationale pour l'Histoire des Villes' – are maps that establish a complex connection to urban space and overall an equally fascinating as problematic representation of urban space.⁵⁴ Critical reflection on the nature of a map, what it should achieve, what role cartography plays in the representation of space and whether urban space is only perceivable as text⁵⁵, will have to continue to intensely occupy the discussions of urban historians, geographers, cartographers and urban research. The influence of geo-information systems of the last 20 years has significantly impacted and enriched the in-

⁴⁹ Hans PLANITZ, *Die deutsche Stadt im Mittelalter von der Römerzeit bis zu den Zunftkämpfen*, Vienna 1954.

⁵⁰ Edith ENNEN, *Die europäische Stadt des Mittelalters*, Göttingen 1987.

⁵¹ Ferdinand OPLL, *Europäische Städteatlanten. Ein Beitrag zu vier Jahrzehnten Stadtgeschichtswissenschaft in Europa*, in: *Arhivistika – zgodovina – pravo: Vilfanov spominski zbornik/Archivkunde – Geschichte – Recht. Gedenkschrift für Sergij Vilfan (Zgodovinski Arhiv Ljubljana 30)*, Ljubljana 2007, pp. 71–86.

⁵² <http://www.ria.ie/getmedia/68e4e609-8662-494a-8885-72b2e7c5c4e0/European-towns-atlases-updated-November-2012.pdf.aspx> [accessed: 10th May 2013].

⁵³ Elisabeth LICHTENBERG, *Die Wiener Altstadt. Von der mittelalterlichen Bürgerstadt zur City*, Vienna 1977.

⁵⁴ See Keith D. LILLEY's contribution in this volume. As an overview, see Uta LINDGREN, *Kartographie*, in: *Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit* 6 (2007), pp. 407–421.

⁵⁵ Martha C. HOWELL, *The Spaces of Late Medieval Urbanity*, in: *Shaping Urban Identity in Late Medieval Europe. L'apparition d'une identité urbaine dans l'Europe du bas moyen âge*, ed. by Marc BOONE/Peter STABEL, Leuven/Apeldoorn 2000, pp. 3–23.

terdisciplinary discussion. Maps as 'accurate graphical illustrations of space-related data'⁵⁶ enable the placing at our disposal of information on the Earth's surface, on topical questions and on a spatial order. The relation to space of objects depicted in maps results on the one hand from the relative position of marked features, and on the other hand from the reference to an absolute coordinate system of horizontal and vertical axes. Every map thus has to be understood as a model, and precisely not as a representation, a pictorial reproduction of reality. Like any historical document, maps are thus subjected to source criticism as memorial, land appropriation and knowledge repository, since each map 'intervenes in a dividing and structuring way in the space of social coexistence'.⁵⁷ Space is being created in complex maps as 'a frame of reference for the organisation and reproduction of material and mental objects through use of positions, distances, proximities and connections'⁵⁸. Against the backdrop of an interdisciplinary discussion, the spatial constitution of maps thus proves to be questionable and an epistemological problem area.

For a long time now, urban history has been explicitly looking into the question of urban topography, the urban core, the suburb and fortification. The city wall, long considered – with some exaggeration – to be a constitutive element of cities, separates the 'inner' city from its suburbs. The example of the denomination of city gates illustrates not only topographical features and spatial perceptions of cities, but other functionalities also become visible through the names of city gates. These names frequently also mirror confessional (e. g. 'Frauentor' – 'women's gate'), topographical (e. g. 'Spitaltor' – 'hospital gate'), social (e. g. 'Judentür' – 'Jews' door') or economic (e. g. 'Tuchmachertor' – 'weavers' gate') conditions.⁵⁹ The specific investigation of city maps or the reconstruction of city layouts in many European cities shows a high degree of urban planning, but also the city layouts' dependence on factors such as population development or developments in trade and commerce.⁶⁰ Many city plans have been shaped by ecclesiastical architecture, 'feudal' structures (alderman/ministries, castle) and increasingly by medieval bourgeois elements of marketplace, town hall and guild houses etc.⁶¹ Market rights and trade privileges had significant importance for the organisation of cities, during the phase of defortification in the 18th cen-

⁵⁶ Matthias BAUER, Karte, in: *Lexikon der Raumphilosophie* (see note 37), pp. 198–200, here p. 198. [transl.]

⁵⁷ BAUER, Karte (see note 56), p. 199. [transl.]

⁵⁸ Jürgen BOLLMANN quoted in Gyula PÁPAY, *Kartographie*, in: *Raumwissenschaften*, ed. by Stephan GÜNZEL, Frankfurt a. M. 2009, pp. 175–190, here p. 180. See also *ibid.* the model map of the representation of cartographical spaces p. 186. [transl.]

⁵⁹ See Ferdinand OPLL's contribution in this volume, which investigates Austrian and Irish cities from this perspective.

⁶⁰ Paul NIEDERMAIER investigates city layouts using the example of cities in Siebenbürgen (also in relation to open squares and urban spatial markings). Laurențiu RĂDVAN highlights the orderliness(/planning fidelity) of city layouts.

⁶¹ As an overview, compare Eberhard ISENMANN, *Die deutsche Stadt im Mittelalter 1150–1550. Stadtgestalt, Recht, Verfassung, Stadtrecht, Kirche, Gesellschaft, Wirtschaft*, Vienna 2012. See also in this volume the significance of economic questions for city layouts in the case studies by Maria Crîngaci ȚIPLIC for Saxonian cities in Siebenbürgen for the Late Middle Ages or in the contribution of Dan Dumitru IACOB for a cross section of the marketplaces of Iași (Romania).

tury some city centers experienced radical changes, which led to fundamental change for the marketplace.⁶²

The question of the relationship between urban and rural areas has long been a sustained concern of urban history research. Besides the differentiation between city/town and village and the separation between urban district and hinterland, approaches following the work of Walter Christaller (1893–1969)⁶³ have focused on the centrality of the city. The urban market (such as the one for agricultural products and meat production) economically co-determined the terms of trade for products of the surrounding rural areas with the city, terms of trade that were divided according to zones, but also dependent on territorial power relations. Further importance was given to artisanal/commercial production, demographic factors (such as influx and departure of urban population, new citizens), but also cultural aspects (schools, universities, schedules, fashion and so forth).⁶⁴ Following the example of practitioners of human geography, one attempts to grasp urban-rural relationships with terms like ‚umland‘ (environs) and ‚hinterland‘ in order to create a kind of model blueprint for an urban cultural landscape.

The ‚umland‘, tightly and permanently connected to the respective central city via ownership and property laws, is distinguished from the ‚hinterland‘, which is marked by subcentral locations and stands in medium functional connection (exchange of goods and services) with the city. At the edge of the central domain of each city lies its ‚urban catchment‘, a tributary area bound in an unstable relationship of dependence marked by irregular contacts.⁶⁵ City-umland-relations can not only be conceived of in economic regards, but also in terms of immigration, landholding (adjacent property owned by city dwellers), education policy, processions and pilgrimages, origin of convicts and hospital patients, and so forth.⁶⁶ Propagated into multiple languages from human geography and law, the notion of the ‚hinterland‘⁶⁷ – although

⁶² See Roman CZAJA's contribution in this volume which uses the example of Elbing regarding the evolution of the centre.

⁶³ Walter CHRISTALLER, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland. Eine ökonomisch-geographische Untersuchung über die Gesetzmäßigkeit der Verbreitung und Entwicklung der Siedlungen mit städtischen Funktionen*, PhD thesis Erlangen 1933. For the ideological background of Christaller see Mechthild RÖSSLER, *Die Geographie an der Universität Freiburg 1933–1945. Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte des Faches im Dritten Reich*, in: *Geographie und Nationalsozialismus. 3 Fallstudien zur Institution Geographie im Deutschen Reich und der Schweiz*, ed. by Michael FAHLBUSCH/IDEM/Dominik SIEGRIST (*Urbs et regio* 51), Kassel 1989, pp. 77–152, here p. 123–127.

⁶⁴ Rolf KIESSLING, *Stadt-Land-Beziehungen*, in: *Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit* 12 (2010), pp. 703–711; ISENMANN, *Die deutsche Stadt* (see note 61), pp. 669–689.

⁶⁵ For a glossary of terminology see Rolf KIESSLING, *Die Stadt und ihr Land. Umlandpolitik, Bürgerbesitz und Wirtschaftsgefüge in Ostschwaben vom 14. bis ins 16. Jahrhundert* (*Städteforschung A* 29), Cologne 1989, pp. 1–9 and particularly p. 712f. See also the still inspiring compilation in Peter SCHÖLLER, *Aufgaben und Probleme der Stadtgeographie*, in: *Erdkunde* VII/3 (1953), pp. 161–184, here pp. 172–176.

⁶⁶ *Städtisches Um- und Hinterland in vorindustrieller Zeit*, ed. by Hans K. SCHULZE (*Städteforschung A* 22), Cologne/Vienna 1985.

⁶⁷ For a demonstration, see the ‚collection‘ of hinterland-documents (e.g. from colonial law) in Hermann DÜRINGER, *Eine Hommage an das Hinterland. Die Heimat Werner Schneider-Quindeaus*, in: *Religion und Urbanität. Herausforderungen für Kirche und Gesellschaft*, ed. by Carsten BURFEIND/Hans-Günter HEIMBROCK/Anke SPORY, Münster 2009, pp. 205–212.

challenged somewhat by concepts like the 'urban network' – lends itself to use for the 'measuring' of religious, economic, social and demographic urban catchment of port cities,⁶⁸ the territorial politics of certain European cities⁶⁹ and for instance for marine arsenals (regarding requirements of such materials as wood, rope, tar etc.).⁷⁰ The overall still very insufficiently studied concept of the 'hinterland' is a Janus-faced model here, since it targets rural and urban population alike. When attempting to investigate the highly complex 'hinterland' of a city against changing political backgrounds, one thus realises the dependence of the respective 'hinterland' of a city on economic, political and social factors.⁷¹

In the eyes of more recent urban history research, the historic city is frequently interpreted as a social stage and a concentrated space for communication, which is determined by manifold linguistic, constructional and performative activities. Power relationships on the one hand structure urban space, while urban space on the other hand visualises power relationships, which have to be constantly present in social space in order to achieve high effectiveness. The dominant power structures thereby appear to be permanently embedded in spatial construction.⁷² The spatial urban development therefore reflects these zones of power, such as the importance of merchant residential areas for urbanisation,⁷³ changes in confessional conditions,⁷⁴ space utilisation in the context of processions like carnival processions⁷⁵ or the antiquating point of view of cities, which initially co-founds the 'historic urban' space in the minds of observers in many cases instructed using Italian examples.⁷⁶

Urban space and the changing utilisation concepts for urban space also become manifest in urban districts.⁷⁷ Originating from military, administrative and taxation-oriented causes, urban districts experienced new settlement based on political, economic and social conditions, as evidenced by property registers and tribunal

⁶⁸ For the example of French port cities (such as Bordeaux, Nantes, Rouen/Le Havre, Marseille) see the contribution in this volume by Jean-Pierre POUSSOU. For the hinterland debate and its significance for urban development, see Tom SCOTT, *The city-state in Europe, 1000–1600. Hinterland, Territory, Region*, Oxford 2012.

⁶⁹ See Máximo DIAGO HERNANDO's contribution in this volume about modern Spanish cities and their territorial politics, which also illustrates differences in city-umland-politics of Spanish cities.

⁷⁰ See Caroline LE MAO's contribution in this volume.

⁷¹ See the also methodologically inspiring contribution in this volume by Howard B. CLARKE regarding medieval Dublin.

⁷² Löw, Epilog (see note 8), p. 463; BOONE, *Urban Space and Political Conflict* (see note 26).

⁷³ See Karlheinz BLASCHKE's contribution in this volume, wherein he underlines the significance of the 'Nikolaus-movement' for urban development. See also IDEM/Uwe Ulrich JÄSCHKE, *Nikolaikirchen und Stadtentstehung in Europa. Von der Kaufmannssiedlung zur Stadt*, Berlin 2013.

⁷⁴ See Anngret SIMMS's contribution in this volume regarding Irish cities during the Reformation.

⁷⁵ See Robert ŠIMŮNEK's contribution in this volume for the example of Bohemian cities in the Late Middle Ages.

⁷⁶ See Rosemary SWEET for the example of Italian and English cities.

⁷⁷ For an overview, see Robert JÜTTE, *Das Stadtviertel als Problem und Gegenstand der frühneuzeitlichen Stadtgeschichtsforschung*, in: *Blätter für Deutsche Landesgeschichte* 127 (1991) pp. 235–270; Bram VANNIEUWENHUYZE, *Buren, straten en aanknopingspunten. Plaatsbepaling in het laatmiddeleeuwse Brussel (dertiende-zestiende eeuw)*, in: *Stadsgeschiedenis* 4 (2009), pp. 97–114.

records⁷⁸, urban planning concepts altered by migration and social segregation,⁷⁹ and finally also by the possibilities for open 'green' space.⁸⁰

The contributions to this present volume confirm⁸¹ that, for historians, space has been created both materially and discursively, that the spatial category is both physical and symbolic, that space however can be studied on very different levels using highly differentiated terms:

from the city hall or the enclosed city square via the city wall with its gates all the way to urban centrality, from space as container via space as protection, space as a stage, contested space or controlled space all the way to private or public space. This may well be what distinguishes the approach of historians from that of sociologists.⁸²

⁷⁸ See Martin MUSÍLEK's contribution regarding the example of the new council meeting of 1350 for the historic centre of Prague.

⁷⁹ See Lars NILSSON's contribution for Stockholm.

⁸⁰ See the broad overview of Peter CLARK concerning green spaces in this volume.

⁸¹ ARNADE/HOWELL/SIMONS, *Fertile Spaces* (see note 9), p. 541f.

⁸² We thank Christian Steinmetz (Luxembourg) for his translation.