Contents

Acknowledgments

This book is the result of a five-year preoccupation with the transformations that the concept of the Lithuanian region in Prussia underwent during several eras. I took my first steps in this direction as I entered the final stages of my doctoral research and became interested in how the appropriation of spaces functioned in the former German-Lithuanian border region. This interest was later elaborated into a separate undertaking while working on the research project "Mental Maps and Making of National Spaces: The Case of Lithuania." Thus, the current study is an individual contribution to a larger research assignment that has been implemented in the Lithuanian Institute of History in 2013–2015. The project resulted in a monograph, which in a slightly revised version now appears in English for the first time. Its preparation and translation into English have benefited from the generous support of the European Social Fund and the Research Council of Lithuania.

Over the years I have been aided in probing the findings and issues dealt with in this study by colleagues and friends. I am indebted to Alvydas Nikžentaitis, who granted me some freedom while I was working on my PhD project and thus allowed me to include this topic among my research interests. Darius Staliūnas encouraged my initial curiosity and was engaged in this research until its final stage. I collected the materials for this study in many European libraries and some archives, among which the Library of the Herder Institute in Marburg, the Berlin State Library, and the University Library of Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin deserve special mention. This book, however, would never have appeared without the long-standing collection of materials in the Library of Klaipėda University and the Martynas Mažvydas Lithuanian National Library in Vilnius. The librarians of all these institutes and libraries were always very cooperative. I am grateful to Tamara Bairašauskaitė, Tomas Balkelis,

Vytautas Jokubauskas, Olga Mastianica, Zita Medišauskienė, Vytautas Petronis, Eva Pluhařová-Grigienė, Silva Pocytė, and Axel Ernst Walter, who offered their constructive feedback and observations on my conference presentations, individual chapters, and entire drafts of this manuscript. I would also like to express my gratitude to Albina Strunga, Kerry Kubilius, and Carolyn Pouncy for all the work that has been done in preparing the translation.

Articles derived from my research appeared in print in the journals *Ab Imperio* (2014), *Forschungen zur baltischen Geschichte* (2015), *Istorija* (2012), and in the series *Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis* (2011, 2013). I am grateful to the members of the editorial boards and the peer reviewers of these publications for their comments. None of these articles are reprinted here in extenso. The book combines some of the previously published preliminary findings, elaborates on them, and supplements the earlier papers with new materials and insights.

List of Figures

Introduction

An important and, it appears, paradigmatic change in historiography during the second half of the twentieth century was associated with historians' interest in the dynamics of concepts and images regulating people's self-conceptions and worldviews. The appearance of *Begriffsgeschichte* in Germany and the invention of *mentalités* and *lieux de mémoire* in France signaled a methodological turning point, where not just political, social, or economic phenomena but also the meanings given to these phenomena, as well as the perceptions of these phenomena, became an object of interest for historians.

At the same time, historians paid more attention to the theme of space. For a long time, the spatial component, compared to the time component, was neglected by historians and other scholars. As Michel Foucault once said, "Space was treated as the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile. Time, on the contrary, was richness, fecundity, life, dialectic."[1] But since the time of Foucault, major advances have taken place in the humanities and social sciences in connecting space with the objects of research in these fields, primarily in justifying the social nature of space. As a result of the broad impact these ideas have had on cultural and social studies, sometimes scientists, using a term proposed by Edward Soja, speak of the so-called spatial turn—like a separate stage in the development of interest in these studies,[2] which they encountered in the second

1 Quoted in Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies. The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989), 119.

2 Cf. Karl Schlögel, "Kartenlesen, Augenarbeit. Über die Fälligkeit des spatial turn in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften," in *Was sind Kulturwissenschaften? 13 Antworten*, ed. Heinz Dieter Kittsteiner (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2004), 261–283; Doris Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften,* 2nd ed. (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 2007), 284–328; Jörg Döring and Tristan Thielmann, "Einleitung: Was lesen wir im Raume? Der Spatial Turn und das

half of the twentieth century after other "turns"—namely, the linguistic and the cultural.

It was precisely in this context that space in research about the past started to play a more visible role: historians began to raise new questions about the spatial concepts of contemporary society and of societies that existed before us, as well as the categories used to express them. The concepts of "cognitive" and "mental maps," which were already well established in psychology and geography, had a direct influence on the appearance of such a field of interest. Some historians tried to transfer their application from the individual to the social and from the present to the past.[3] Indeed, with such transfers, the content of these concepts breaks away from the definitions given to them by psychologists and geographers.[4] As a result, to maintain interdisciplinary relationships, the search for additional compatible research objects is worthwhile.[5] Even so, the very idea of the existence of a spatial imagination and the body of knowledge that organizes this kind of view prompts us to raise new questions in historic awareness.

Such questions are raised in this book. The idea is not to reveal someone's cognitive maps or spatial imaginations, because these, I am certain, are not spheres of awareness that comply with historians' methods. The object of this research is rather the systems of meanings that offer ways

geheime Wissen der Geographen," in *Spatial Turn. Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften*, ed. Jörg Döring and Tristan Thielmann (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2008), 7–45; Barney Wolf and Santa Arias, "Introduction: The Reinsertion of Space in the Humanities and Social Sciences," in *The Spatial Turn. Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Barney Wolf, and Santa Arias, vol. 26 of *Routledge Studies in Human Geography* (London: Routledge, 2009), 1–10. See also Peter Haslinger, "Der *spatial turn* und die Geschichtsschreibung zu Ostmitteleuropa in Deutschland," *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 63, no. 1 (2014): 74–95.

3 See the special issue of *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28, no. 3 (2002) on *mental maps*, in particular Frithjof Benjamin Schenk, "Mental Maps. Die Konstruktion von geographischen Räumen in Europa seit der Aufklärung," 493–514.

4 See Scott Bell, "Mental Maps," in *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, ed. Bob Kitschin and Nigel Thrift, vol. 7 (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2009), 70–75.

5 Cf. Andreas Langenohl, "*Mental Maps*, Raum und Erinnerung. Zur kultursoziologischen Erschließung eines tranzdisziplinären Konzepts," in *Mental Maps—Raum—Erinnerung. Kulturwissenschaftliche Zugänge zum Verhältnis von Raum und Erinnerung*, ed. Sabine Damir-Geilsdorf, Angelika Hartmann, and Béatrice Hendrich, vol. 1 of *Kulturwissenschaft. Forschung und Wissenschaft* (Münster: LIT, 2005), 51–72.

and means of understanding space and aspects that regulate the spatial imagination. In that sense, this book is not so much about how people understood space but about how they were guided to understand that space. Of interest here is the information generated about space and the ways that made it possible to add meaning to space by harnessing that knowledge. The systems of meanings analyzed in this book were nationalistic in nature. Their formation was determined by the goal of ensuring national solidarity. This was a new form of community life typical of the modern era. However, its formation depended on ancient beliefs typical among clan cultures, where land was "the exclusive property of a clan, blessed with a certain sacredness."[6] Use of the concept "national space" instead of "national land" has the goal of accentuating the dynamics of the belief in question in the modern era. Exclusivity and sacredness were transferred away from the clearly tangible size of an area of land, whose arrangement and direction of continuity became relative.

The point is that many past societies never had the opportunity to appreciate the physical spaces that open up before people living in today's world, thanks to contemporary means of communication. Even in the early modern period, in Europe only representatives from relatively narrow social layers had a broader geographical outlook, such as merchants, pilgrims, or members of *res publica literaria*—the Republic of Letters.[7] However, the spread of printing technologies, as Benedict Anderson once noted,[8] changed this situation. Books, and later newspapers, spreading geographical knowledge and the meanings of national culture, had to become widespread and accessible to the lower layers of society so that their worldview would also extend beyond the limits of their parish. That worldview was broadened by the development of the public education system and the inclusion of geography into school curriculums. All of this made it possible to gain relative awareness of a

6 Florian Znaniecki, *Modern Nationalities. A Sociological Study* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952), 93.

7 Cf. Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism. A Study in Its Origins and Background* (New York: Macmillan, 1961), 8.

8 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1991), 46.

physical space larger than one's own land—to understand its relief, fields, and forests in a wider geographical context. The spread of this knowledge also broadened people's understanding about the cultural differences in different spaces and made those concepts of territorialism that became entrenched in Europe in the early modern period the only "normal" ones.[9] The idea that a territory had to belong to a particular nation should not be associated with the modern nationalism that started to spread after the French Revolution. A concept of territorial sovereignty that offered an alternative to the hierarchical ruling system and *res publica christiana* was already spreading in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In 1648, the Peace of Westphalia put into place the principles of territorial sovereignty and sovereign equality as the cornerstone of order in the new Europe.[10] The idea of sovereign nations (political communities) was also related to the concept of sovereignty. Its application in different political systems on the continent in the early modern period varied, and its content gradually changed and expanded to include more of the lower social strata.[11] The values of national culture in this enlightened milieu enculturated not just a standardized language and ideological mission in these social strata but also the concept of a national space (although the criteria for defining its boundaries differed in different parts of Europe).

Probably the first challenge thrown at ancien régime Europe that encouraged the lower strata across the continent to defend such "national spaces" came from revolutionary France and later, Napoleon. During the Napoleonic Wars, spaces were already assigned to nations, and nations did not refer solely to the political elite of the day. Not only spaces were mythologized in those times. The wars themselves, despite being led by the old elite, now acquired a subtler meaning, being called battles for "liberation" and the "homeland." Attempts at mobilizing the lower strata, which earlier had not even figured as part of the nation, were associated

9 Cf. Robert David Sack, *Human Territoriality. Its Theory and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Stuart Elden, *The Birth of Territory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013).

10 Peter J. Taylor, *Political Geography: World-Economy, Nation-State and Locality* (London: Longman, 1985), 96; Adam Watson, *The Evolution of International Society. A Comparative Historical Analysis* (London: Routledge, 1992), 186–189.

11 For more about the development of the idea, see Kohn, *Idea of Nationalism*, 187–259.

with a crisis in the legitimacy of ruling "by the Grace of God" and aimed at showing the people that the fate of the homeland depended on them as well. In Europe, this shift in viewpoint marked the beginning of the creation of national spaces, giving the old continent categories from today's political map, and the understanding that a territory does not belong to a ruler but to the nation.

In this book I analyze the creation of such territories, show how national space was formed in the long nineteenth and the short twentieth centuries, and how specific cultural and political challenges could have influenced the spatial imagination. When looking at the existing historiography, these questions are not new. They have already been discussed in terms of this or that nation's efforts to grab territory in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries,[12] or the attempts by certain nationalists to assign to different nations pluricultural border regions.[13] Nevertheless, I believe it is important to investigate the construction of national spaces in pluricultural border regions because doing so both allows us to compare the strategies applied by different types of nationalisms against one another and clarifies the interactions among national cultures. This kind of research can demonstrate the different roles assigned to the same physical space

12 Cf. Katariina Kosonen, *Kartta ja kansakunta: Suomalainen lehdistökartografia sortovuosien protesteista Suur-Suomen kuviin 1899–1942*, vol. 779 of *Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2000); David Gugerli and Daniel Speich, *Topografien der Nation: Politik, kartografische Ordnung und Landschaft im 19. Jahrhundert* (Zürich: Chronos, 2002); Vytautas Petronis, *Constructing Lithuania. Ethnic Mapping in Tsarist Russia, ca. 1800–1914*, vol. 91 of *Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis* (Stockholm: Stockholm University, 2007); Peter Haslinger, *Nation und Territorium im tschechischen politischen Diskurs: 1880–1938* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2010); Jason D. Hansen, *Mapping the Germans. Statistical Science, Cartography, and the Visualization of the German Nation, 1848–1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

13 Cf. *"Arbeit am nationalen Raum." Deutsche und polnische Rand- und Grenzregionen im Nationalisierungsprozess*, vol. 15, no. 2 (2005) of *Comparativ: Leiziger Beiträge zur Universalgeschichte und vergleichenden Gesellschaftsforschung*, ed. Peter Haslinger and Daniel Mollenhauer (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2005); Anton Kotenko, "Construction of Ukrainian National Space by the Intellectuals of Russian Ukraine, 1860–70s," in *Osteuropa kartiert—Mapping Eastern Europe*, ed. Jörn Happel and Christophe von Werdt, in cooperation with Mira Jovanović (Münster: LIT, 2010), 37–60; Steven Seegel, *Mapping Europe's Borderlands. Russian Cartography in the Age of Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012); Catherine Tatiana Dunlop, *Cartophilia: Maps and the Search for Identity in the French-German Borderland* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015).

that exist in different cultures and offer an understanding that these roles are not givens but reactions to these ongoing interactions.

The border region on which this book focuses was called Lithuania for almost four centuries. It should not be confused with the Republic of Lithuania on today's political map. Rather, this Lithuania was a pluricultural region in Prussia, later—in Germany, in its easternmost part, populated mostly by Prussian Lithuanians and Germans; it was a region where the population was for the most part separated from its land due to the outcomes of the Second World War and where "division" between the Lithuanians and the Germans for a long time brought into confrontation two cultures that had lived alongside one another for centuries. In a sense, this book can be considered a history of the changing meaning of this Lithuania, its spatial definition and the continuation of its national image in the "age of extremes." I present an answer to the question of how, in the long nineteenth century, the same physical space was transformed into the "nation's own" in two neighboring cultures, and what relationship formed between the different spatial imaginations regarding this space. I hope that this study contributes to understanding how the ways and means that are used to add meaning to and mark spaces and through which they are imagined depend on specific historical conditions. It is precisely these conditions that frame the spatial imagination, define the choice of possibilities for this imagination, and urge us to transfer that imagination to the map and from the map to the physical space itself. Being aware of these conditions is important if we are to understand the variety we sometimes fail to see when we use the concepts of "Lithuania" and "Lithuanian" only in today's sense, and when we decide to project these meanings onto the past. Today's concepts and today's political boundaries should not be applied to the past.

Historians adopted this view of Lithuania not long ago. Egidijus Aleksandravičius and Antanas Kulakauskas wrote the first synthesis offering a new approach to the nineteenth century in Lithuanian history after 1990 and were probably the first ones to raise the question of what Lithuania was in the nineteenth century.[14] Other studies later raised this question in one way or another, starting with the works of Zita Medišauskienė and

14 Egidijus Aleksandravičius and Antanas Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje: XIX amžiaus Lietuva* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1996), 21–25.

Paulius Subačius.[15] But most often, the context has been the territory of the Romanovs' Russia and includes only two alternatives for Lithuania—an early duchy or a national space defined by linguistic criteria, incorporating several Russian gubernias.[16] Vytautas Petronis uses the methodological tools encouraged by the *spatial turn* to answer the question of how Lithuania was defined in the nineteenth century.[17] Petronis revealed what influence the emergence and spread of linguistic (ethnic) territorialization had on the concept of Lithuania's boundaries in cartography. However, the author nevertheless limited his research to the Russian imperial space. The search for the development of Lithuanian spatial concepts only within the territory of nineteenth-century Russia,[18] in a sense, stops us from going beyond the conviction that only two alternatives for this concept existed. Orientation toward the temporal and spatial depictions of Lithuanias that were maintained in nineteenth-century Russia cast aside the existence of "another" Lithuania in Prussia (from 1871, in Germany). Even in the latest summarizing works, the latter type of Lithuania is given comparably less attention,[19] although it was in Prussia that the name "Lithuania" was continually used throughout the whole nineteenth century. Only a handful of historians have allocated one or two sentences to the history of the

15 Zita Medišauskienė, "Lietuvos samprata XIX a. viduryje," in *Praeities baruose: Skiriama akademikui Vytautui Merkiui 70-ies metų jubiliejaus proga* (Vilnius: Žara, 1999), 217–224; Paulius Subačius, *Lietuvių tapatybės kalvė: Tautinio išsivadavimo kultūra* (Vilnius: Aidai, 1999), 149–161. See also Rimantas Miknys and Darius Staliūnas, "Das Dilemma der Grenzen Litauens am Ende des 19. und Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts," in *Literatur und nationale Identität*, vol. IV: *Landschaft und Territorium. Zur Literatur, Kunst und Geschichte des 19. und Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts im Ostseeraum: Finnland, Estland, Lettland, Litauen und Polen*, ed. Yrjö Varpio and Maria Zadencka, vol. 25 of *Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Studia Baltica Stockholmiensis* (Stockholm: Stockholm University, 2004), 196–215; and Darius Staliūnas, "Lietuvos idėja *Aušroje*," *Archivum Lithuanicum* 15 (2013): 271–292, especially 277–280.

16 For more on the variety of historic and ethnographic concepts of Lithuania in the mid-nineteenth century, see Medišauskienė, "Lietuvos samprata."

17 Petronis, *Constructing Lithuania*.

18 See also Darius Staliūnas, "Territorializing Ethnicity in the Russian Empire? The Case of the Augustav/Suvalki Province," *Ab Imperio* 3 (2011): 145–166.

19 *Lietuvos istorija*, ed. Jūratė Kiaupienė, vols. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7/1, 8/1, 10/1, 10/2 (Vilnius: Baltos lankos; Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2009–2015); Andres Kasekamp, *A History of the Baltic States* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Alfonsas Eidintas, Alfredas Bumblauskas, Antanas Kulakauskas, and Mindaugas Tamošaitis, *Lietuvos istorija* (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2013).

concepts "Prussian Lithuania" and "Lithuania Minor," relating to the same physical space.[20] However, up until now this was usually done only because historians had to explain to their audiences that they had in mind not the Lithuania we recognize from today's political map. A more comprehensive analysis has been made of the application of the term "Lithuania" in cartography presenting Prussia.[21] A more detailed analysis demonstrating what "Prussian Lithuania" and "Lithuania Minor" meant to different cultures and how their understanding changed has not yet been carried out, which is what has motivated the innovativeness of this research.

It is also new in another respect. Usually studies dedicated to mental geography map the spatial imagination and analyze its discourses and practical formation as well as the dynamics in concepts denoting space. Symbolic appropriation of spaces is becoming an ever-weightier field of research. One aim of this book is to try to connect a majority of these aspects, showing them to be elements of one macrolevel process. I have called that process the construction of national spaces, seeing it as the

20 Cf. Kurt Forstreuter, "Deutsche Kulturpolitik im sogenannten Preußischen Litauen," [1933] in Kurt Forstreuter, *Wirkungen des Preußenlandes*, vol. 33 of *Studien zur Geschichte Preussens* (Cologne, Berlin: Grote, 1981), 335; Kurt Forstreuter, "Die Entwicklung der Grenze zwischen Preussen und Litauen seit 1422," *Altpreussische Forschungen* 18 (1941): 67–68; Kurt Forstreuter, *Deutschland und Litauen im Mittelalter*, vol. 1 of *Studien zum Deutschtum im Osten* (Cologne, Graz: Böhlau, 1962), 17–18; Juozas Jakštas, "Žvilgsnis į Mažosios Lietuvos istoriografiją," in [*Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademijos*] *Metraštis*, vol. IV (Rome: Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademija, 1968), 3–7; Algirdas Matulevičius, "Dėl lietuvių Prūsijoje pietinės etninės ribos XVIII a. pradžioje," *Lietuvos TSR Mokslų akademijos darbai*, *serija A* 1 (1972): 103–105; Jochen D. Range, "Preußisch-Litauen in kulturhistorischer Sicht," in *Deutsche, Slawen und Balten. Aspekte des Zusammenlebens im Osten des Deutschen Reiches und in Ostmitteleuropa*, ed. Hans Hecker and Silke Spieler (Bonn: Kulturstiftung der deutschen Vertriebenen, 1989), 56; Algirdas Matulevičius, *Mažoji Lietuva XVIII amžiuje. Lietuvių tautinė padėtis* (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1989), 6–7; Ingė Lukšaitė, *Reformacija Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje ir Mažojoje Lietuvoje: XVI a. trečias dešimtmetis–XVII a. pirmas dešimtmetis* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1999), 48; and Silva Pocytė, *Mažlietuviai Vokietijos imperijoje, 1871–1914* (Vilnius: Vaga, 2002), 7–8.

21 Rudolf Nadolny, "Litauen und Masuren als Bezeichnungen ostpreußischer Landschaften," *Europäische Revue* 12 (1936): 557–564; Povilas Reklaitis, "Kleinlitauen in der Kartographie Preussens. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Gebietsnames Litauen im ehemaligen Königreich Preussen," in *Lithuania Minor: A Collection of Studies on Her History and Ethnography*, ed. Martin Brakas (New York, NY: Lithuanian Research Institute, 1976), 67–119; Rasa Seibutytė, "Kleinlitauen auf den preußischen Karten des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Annaberger Annalen* 15 (2007): 89–113.

sum of factors through which space was made "one's own" within a certain national culture. Therefore, in this study, attention will be paid to not just the dynamics in concepts and the spaces defined by them but also to the systems of meanings via which the physical space was specifically given significance and described, as well as representation of spaces in the discourse and the representation of the spatial imagination in the physical space itself.

The set of questions discussed in this book was determined by the theoretical approach based on which the research was conducted. Three main sources inspired it. The first one was already briefly mentioned. It is related to the experiments on orientation in space conducted in the postwar period by representatives of behavioral psychology and human geography, in the course of which concepts such as *cognitive map* and *mental map* appeared. The phrases are often used as synonyms; however, the different histories of their emergence alone signals that they are indeed different. Geographer Scott Bell offers the following descriptions: "Cognitive Map, the internal spatial representation of the world as we know it, and the accompanying affective responses that this knowledge evokes"; "Mental Map, preference surfaces generated by asking people about their attitudes and perceptions of different places."[22] In this way the cognitive map is understood as a spatial representation of the external world, carried in the mind until its manifestation (often, an illustration) is generated, and that manifestation is called the mental map. So cognitive mapping is the unexpressed, while mental mapping is the expressed part of the same process. As historians' abilities to apply survey and observation methods to the past are limited, it would not be accurate to consider the aforementioned concepts, as they have been described in psychologists' and geographers' discourse, as the object of this research. Nevertheless, the idea used to describe that object, whereby people have a structurized spatial imagination functioning based on certain associations, is in itself beneficial. Other statements based on psychological and geographical research also help to give a more precise description of the object of this research. For example, in the beginning of the 1970s, when studies were

22 Bell, "Mental Maps," 70.

made in behavioral geography looking at the importance of cognitive maps and their influence on people's behavior in a given space, the conclusion was reached that cognitive maps never matched the physical Earth or the map representing Earth that we usually imagine. Cognitive maps are always incomplete, the meaning of distances and directions is distorted, and they are schematized (simplified, conventionalized to a very limited amount of cognitive categories and concepts) and enhanced (embellished). This leads us to understand that the imagination of any space differs from the placement of objects in the physical space. "Cognitive maps are convenient sets of shorthand symbols that we all subscribe to, recognize, and employ: these symbols vary from group to group, and individual to individual, resulting from our biases, prejudices, and personal experiences."[23] It turns out, then, that a cognitive map is more of an individual than a collective expression, recognized via symbols that mark a particular space. This alone would suggest that a historical study has to be directed at that marking, at the systems of meanings that form a person's spatial imagination, and it is precisely those systems that this book aims to reconstruct.

To answer the question of how this should be done and what specific cognitive tasks had to be formulated, I searched through the social space interpretation and postcolonial studies discourses. Even though Foucault achieved a great deal in explaining the nature of social space, the greatest influence on the creation of the social space concept was made by Henri Lefebvre.[24] This influence was first of all revealed in his statements that (1) space never exists of its own accord: it depends on the social organism and is a product of society; (2) as space, like time, is not universal, they can be

23 Roger M. Downs and David Stea, *Image and Environment: Cognitive Mapping and Spatial Behavior* (Chicago: Aldin, 1973), 9.

24 Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991). Lefebvre's theory is presented here based on the interpretation made by sociologist Christian Schmid. Cf. Christian Schmid, *Stadt, Raum und Gesellschaft—Henri Lefebvre und die Theorie der Produktion des Raumes*, vol. 1 of *Sozialgeographische Bibliothek* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2005), 71–112; and Christian Schmid, "Henri Lefebvre's Theory of the Production of Space: Towards a Three-Dimensional Dialectic," in *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*, ed. Kanishka Goonewardena, Stefan Kipfer, Richard Milgrom, and Christian Schmid (New York: Routledge, 2008), 27–45.