

HENRI LEFEBVRE'S THEORY OF SPACE IN THE "SPATIAL TURN" WITHIN CULTURAL STUDIES

Background. The "spatial turn" as a radical positing of spatiality as the central problem and foundation of inquiry in the humanities and social sciences inevitably relies on a new, and distinctly cultural theory of space. Deriving from the conceptual framework of the 1970s French discourse on space in general, and of Henri Lefebvre's approach in particular, this basis of the late-modern spatial turn and its generalizing potential within cultural studies still calls for theoretical clarification.

Methods. The study employs general theoretical methods of critical analysis and conceptual synthesis.

Results. The "revaluation" of space, inspired and delineated by the French intellectual milieu of the 1970s, encompasses two dimensions: on the one hand, revealing the crucial activity and organizational efficacy of space in its inseparable connection with knowledge and power production; and on the other hand, outlining "other spaces," alternative to this abstract configuration, as immanently meaningful outcomes and drivers of lived experience. The significance of Lefebvre's approach lies not only in unifying these dimensions within the interrelated tripartite structure but, most importantly, in his direct articulation of a new theory of (social) space – or rather, of spaces – as always, the products of diverse, contradictory, and interdependent practices, which simultaneously shape those very practices. These real-and-imaginary spaces range from almost purely material and body-related, yet always saturated with meaning, to almost purely abstract concepts, no less real in their production and effect.

Conclusions. Henri Lefebvre's theory offers a foundation for the spatialization of cultural studies, proposing a general conceptual framework that reveals and systematizes diverse, always practically produced real-and-imaginary spaces. These spaces exist in parallel – often unnoticed by one another – yet constantly interact and alter the overall balance of their fundamental socio-cultural influences.

Keywords: spatial turn, theory of space, spatialization, spatiality, practice, Henri Lefebvre, cultural turn.

Background

The epistemological reactualization and ontological revaluation of spatiality, which has long been marginalized both in sociological narratives of modernization and in the hermeneutic traditions of the humanities, has become one of the key features and driving forces in late-modern methodological rearrangements in the humanities and social sciences. However, both the foundations and general heuristic potential of such a "spatialization" are still theoretically underexplored or blurred.

Partially these issues stem from the narrow understanding of the "spatial turn" to which such a spatialization is directly related. It is often regarded just as a response to transformations of contemporary reality: as an attempt to address the hyper-urbanized, globalized, or postcolonial conditions that have redefined both the problems and explanatory frameworks of sociocultural complexity. Spatiality, in such case, becomes reduced to quite abstract models derived from human geography or urban ecology. From a mutually dependent perspective of methodological transformation, the spatial turn has been interpreted as the emergence of space as a new dominant analytical category. Yet in this case, attention often shifts away from the inquiry into concrete spaces toward the production of mental "mappings" and "topographies": that is, toward spatial representations as manifestations of a new epistemological imagination.

On the other hand, the reassertion of spatiality in its material concreteness emerges as an immanent tendency that extends from phenomenological accounts of embodiment and poststructuralist analyses of the materialities of meaning and subject formation to culturalist notions of the groundedness of cultural practices, as well as to studies of visual images and apparatuses. Accordingly, the spatial turn can be viewed as a synthesis and further intensification of these trajectories, converging around new shared positions of what Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht calls the problem of "presence" and its effects that were largely neglected by earlier meaning-centered approaches in

cultural theory (Gumbrecht, 2004). Defining such a perspective requires situating the spatial turn within the broader context of the "cultural turn" – a general methodological reorientation that has been unfolding since the late twentieth century between, on the one hand, the culturalization of a wide range of disciplines through the adoption of practice-oriented and constructivist approaches, and, on the other hand, the continuous expansion and redefinition of "culture" itself within this new field, gradually moving toward an anti-linguistic and post-hermeneutic paradigm.

Yet the potential of this generalized spatial optics or, more precisely, of the spatial revision of culture equally depends on the revision of the problem space, or rather, of spaces. The emergence of this tendency can be traced across various research directions, from phenomenology to anthropology. However, the appearance of a new – albeit not directly articulated, yet distinctly cultural – theory of space, which not only proves most fruitful within the outlined general context but has also had a direct impact on the original Anglophone conception of the spatial turn (as developed by David Harvey, Edward Soja, Derek Gregory, and others), is primarily connected with the approaches emerged within the French post-Marxist and post-structuralist intellectual milieu of the 1970s: notably those of Michel Foucault and Michel de Certeau, but above all of Henri Lefebvre. This conceptual framework still calls for further theoretical clarification.

Thus, the aim of this study is to delineate the general conceptual contours of the 1970s French discourse on space in general, and of Henri Lefebvre's theory of (social) space in particular, as the foundation of late-modern spatial turn and its generalizing potential within cultural studies.

Methods

The study employs general theoretical methods of critical analysis and conceptual synthesis to trace the epistemological transformations underlying contemporary rethinking of spatiality and to underscore their significance for spatial turn.

Results

It has already been outlined that the common understanding of the spatial turn and, consequently, of spatialization unfolds between two tendencies: responding to the contemporary "age of the simultaneous, of juxtaposition, of the near and the far, the side by side and the scattered" (Foucault, 1997, p. 330), and constituting space as the primary mode of "representation, empirical inquiry, and (social) theorization" (Soja, 1996, p. 172).

Such a perspective remains confined to an important but, in many respects, one-sided orientation toward "making of geography" rather than history within the social sciences and humanities (Soja, 1989, p.1). In general, it entails a critical reconsideration of the radicalized imbalance between these two "generic ways of thinking, all-encompassing and synthesising schemata comprehensive and synthesizing schemes for understanding everything in the empirical world" – the Kantian "nacheinander" and "nebeneinander" – that emerged at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Soja, 1996, p. 168). More specifically, it does so by incorporating the achievements of geographical discourse, within which spatial problematics had long been both confined and "preserved": developed under the conditions of dominant historicism, yet conceptualized in a distinct and self-contained manner.

In a broader context, this discussion addresses the effort to overcome the long-established nineteenth-century conceptual dominance of time and history over passive space. The primary critique here is directed against the radical "despatialized historicism" of social theories (Soja, 1989, p. 4), generally characterized by an idea of progress that, as such, "entails the conquest of space, the tearing down of all spatial barriers, and ultimate 'annihilation of space through time'" (Harvey, 1989, p.205). Particularly significant is the critique of classical Marxism which, while overcoming Hegelian idealism, simultaneously abandoned its, albeit specific, "spatial consciousness," dismissing it as a form of "spatial fetishism" (Soja, 1989, p. 46). Equally important is the critique of modern philosophy's despatialization, which, as Foucault argued, in its anthropological orientation (that of the invention of man, the constitution of man both as an object of knowledge and as a knowing subject), from Immanuel Kant to Martin Heidegger, privileged temporality once space had been displaced into the domains of politics and the natural sciences (Foucault, 1980, p. 149).

Although the study focuses on the significance of spatialization and its interconnection with culturalization in another dimension, it is worth noting that even this "making of geography" in the social sciences and humanities basically depends on a critique of human geography itself as a modern spatial science in general, as well as on its "culturalization," which has been dominant since the 1980s and 1990s.

As Derek Gregory observes, modern geography "claimed to disclose fundamental and enduring geometry underlying the apparent diversity and heterogeneity of the world" (Gregory, 1994, p. 70). From the late eighteenth century onward, it came to be defined "through a series of strategic encounters": first with anthropology, then with sociology and economics. The critique of this program and its practical consequences (termed by Gregory "cartographic anxiety"), which emerged in the second half of the twentieth century and, in turn, enabled the critical potential of geography, was driven by a reactivation of these "dialogues" in reverse order: from political economy, through social theory, to cultural studies (Gregory, 1994, p. 5–6).

Although Marxist geography remained confined to an economic focus – as opposed, for instance, to the "cultural materialism" of Edward P. Thompson and Raymond Williams, which would later become emblematic for subsequent generations of Anglophone geographers – its connection to political economy, Gregory argues, had already undermined the abstract geometricity of modern geography, opening up a problematic field of social processes within concrete material spaces (Gregory, 1994, p. 87–88). The dialogue with critical social theory revealed for geography the intricate relations between space, power, and representation (Gregory, 1994, p. 124).

Ultimately, in the final decades of the twentieth century, human geography saw the emergence and eventual centrality of the "new cultural geography," shaped by the field of "cultural politics" and the problem of "practical involvement of its 'maps of meaning' into the diverse worlds they seek to represent" (Gregory, 1994, p. 133). This development became prominent in geographical discourse at the intersection of postmodern textualization and postcolonial critique.

Definition of the other, not only post-historical, but in our view much more important posthermeneutical essence and potential of spatial turn (and spatialization in general) equally rests on its interconnection with cultural turn. At this point, the conceptual scheme developed by Doris Bachmann-Medick becomes especially relevant.

It is worth noting that, although one of the central claims of Bachmann-Medick is that the basic criterion for attaining the status of a "turn" is the shift from the study of a specific subject field to the level of analytical categories (Bachmann-Medick, 2016, p. 16–17), she maintains that within the "spatial turn" the issue arose that "not everything can be taken as a mere sign, symbol or text" – "the world also consists of material and matter and is governed by power relations and spatial politics" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016, p. 27).

However, the more significant point here lies in the broader context: Bachmann-Medick defines the entire range of contemporary "turns" as fundamentally cultural and united by a general, essentially culture-centered tendency – simultaneously shaped by the linguistic (meta)turn and by its critical undermining. She argues that while the linguistic turn "has been the common thread running through all the turns in the study of culture," it was increasingly deconstructed through new foci that "gradually reintroduced the dimensions of culture, everyday life, history and above all agency that had been ignored and hidden," and generally suppressed by its constraints (Bachmann-Medick, 2016, p. 27).

It should be noted that Bachmann-Medick's study is itself rather debatable. For example, Olga Bryukhovetska convincingly argues that the German scholar primarily emphasizes, within the series of cultural turns, the escalation of the linguistic turn program, through which in the 1990s "the cultural turn effectively became synonymous with postmodernism," and culture was understood as "a mechanism for producing reality through the production of meanings" (Bryukhovetska, 2024, p. 13). However, we do not support Bryukhovetska's alternative view that the formation of an anti-linguistic orientation toward a certain "metaphysics of presence" resulted from a later reverse "pendulum movement," primarily associated with visual studies (Bryukhovetska, 2024, p. 18). Agreeing with Bachmann-Medick's overall conceptual framework, we consider that the fact that "the 'life' of the world, materially manifest, once exorcised in the name of readability and rationality, has returned to haunt us" (Moxey, 2008, p. 131) is a consequence of the unfolding of the cultural turn as a whole.

For us, the most important point is that this general process fundamentally underlies the immanent actualization of spatiality. As Gumbrecht notes regarding this general new problem of the non-interpretative "presence" of the "things of the world" and our immediacy with them – this very word, at least for the most part, "does not refer (at least does not mainly refer) to a temporal but to a spatial relationship to the world and its objects" (Gumbrecht, 2004, p.XIII).

A revealing example for both these observations is provided by British Cultural Studies. Despite being conditioned by the problem of "communicative reason" and language models (Hall, 1997), the "practicing" of culture they actualized – from actions that seem natural because they are quick, imperceptible, and routine, to clearly complex action complexes, all constituting the "living" fabric of social life (Skokova, 2018, p. 5) – directly engages the material, bodily, and broadly spatial elements mediating cultural practices (Skokova, 2018, p. 17), the "pressures of experience, contact, and discovery, writing themselves into the land" (Williams, 2014, p. 2).

Overall, in this "down-to-earth" focus on physical materiality (Bachmann-Medick, 2016, p. 232–233), the spatial turn can be understood as the foundational "basis for the formation, interaction, and intertwining" of all cultural turns, since attention to space generalizes the interest in the "here and now," in the visible, tangible, and material (Brodetska, 2022, p. 8).

However, just as the affirmation of a purely spatial (ultimately geographical) imagination tends toward a limited extreme, such an understanding of spatialization similarly risks reductionism. Each of these dimensions, by reactivating the problem of spatial parameters in human-world relations, in a new way reinforces two fundamental modern illusions about space, which Lefebvre termed the illusions of "transparency" and "opacity" (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 27–29), and which Soja, developing this idea, described as idealist "hypermetropia" and empirical "myopia" (Soja, 1989, p. 123–125). In the "illusion of opacity," space becomes "naturalized," reduced to physical objects and forms of passive, sensually perceived nature, subordinated to necessity. Conversely, in the "illusion of transparency," an "ideal" reflexive space emerges – either predominantly mental (most clearly as for Immanuel Kant during his critical period) or logical-mathematical construct – an "image" of reality that "takes epistemological precedence over the tangible substance and appearance of the real world" (Soja, 1989, p. 125).

Ultimately, an integral and central aspect of spatialization – the analysis of and through "the materialized and socially constructed spatiality of human life" (Soja, 2009, p. 12) – is the emergence of a new theory of space. More precisely, it is a theory of spaces and their specifically real-imaginary nature. This theory concerns the understanding of space as a problem that, in various ways, synthesizes ever-present and burdensome materiality with its practical constructedness through "social translation, transformation, and experience" (Soja, 1989, p. 80).

A general common motif of the quite distinct approaches analyzed here, originating from the French intellectual milieu of the 1970s, which justify speaking of their outlining of a new theory of space, lies in their shared challenge to the modern "devaluation" of space.

On one hand, this entails rejecting the notion of space as a realm of the "dead, fixed, inert", generally subordinated, while critically recognizing it as "historico-political problem" (Foucault, 1980, pp. 149–150) – not merely inseparable from but, to some extent, determining production of knowledge and power.

For Foucault, the transition from his early, already spatial but largely imaginary archaeology to the genealogy of power – "poor in resources, sparing of its methods, monotonous in the tactics it utilizes, incapable of invention" (Foucault, 1978, p. 85) – marks a shift toward the analysis of its mechanisms, its machinery: the dispositif or apparatus, a heterogeneous ensemble through which power operates, and which it simultaneously unifies and develops. It encompasses the ways, specific to particular societies and historical circumstances, in which the expressed and the unexpressed, the visible and the invisible, law and architecture, are unified and interdependent – structured by a dominant strategic function (Foucault, 1980, pp. 98–102, 194). Conversely, such apparatuses provide power with its concrete, mostly unarticulated techniques and methods – its operational technology.

As Gilles Deleuze argues, all of Foucault's work was haunted by "the form of the visible, as opposed to the form of whatever can be articulated." Already recognized though negatively designated in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* as a non-discursive formation opposed to the "field of sayability," this environmental spatial formation not only became a central focus of his attention in *Discipline and Punish* but was also extended into a specific "form of expression": "environments also produce statements, just as statements determine environments" (Deleuze, 2006, pp. 31–32). It is such a spatial configuration itself that constitutes a decisive and operative component of the overall power technology of Western European industrialism – a panoptic regime of vision upon which the modern apparatus of science and discipline is founded.

While in this context Foucault's interest lies primarily in biopolitics, he goes even further – though only in his unrealized plans – toward what he called "some sort of geopolitics" of the deployment of military and administrative tactics and strategies "through implantations, distributions, demarcations, control of territories and organizations of domains" (Foucault, 1980, p. 77): their inscription "both on a material soil and within forms of discourse" (Foucault, 1980, p. 69).

On the other hand, "revaluation" of space rejects (inspired notably by Gaston Bachelard) precisely this utilitarian and regulative fusion of rationality and space throughout the "long nineteenth century" – of the modern "abstract space" (Lefebvre, 1991) with its claim to totality.

For example, Michel de Certeau argued (quite directly in opposition to Foucault) that it is necessary not only to clarify the emergence of disciplinary technologies through the spatial order of power (particularly at the scale of the city), but also to uncover inherent incompleteness of the later and the ways in which it is resisted. He turned to "ways of operating" space by everyday "consumers" – the countless practices through which "users reappropriate the space organized by techniques of sociocultural production" (Certeau, 1984, p. xiv). Overall, de Certeau's approach is aimed at revealing alternative experiences of space, searching for "practices that are foreign to the 'geometric' or 'geographical' space of visual, panoptic, or theoretical constructions" – practices that concern "another spatiality" (the 'anthropological,' poetic, and mythic experience of space)" (Certeau, 1984, p. 93).

At the same time, Foucault himself brought attention to the question of "another spatiality" – more concretely, genuinely "other spaces." He argued that "contemporary space has not yet lost those sacred characteristics (which time certainly lost in the nineteenth century), in spite of all the techniques that assail it and the web of knowledge that

allows it to be defined and formalized" (Foucault, 1997, p. 331). In this context, he outlined the project of "heterotopology," a directive to identify and study of external and heteronomous space – "in which we live, from which we are drawn out of ourselves, just where the erosion of our lives, our time, our history takes place, this space that wears us down and consumes us" (Foucault, 1997, p. 331). As Soja observes, this approach can apply to "every created space, from the most intimate spaces of the body and the home, to the global spaces of geopolitics and military conflict" (Soja, 2009, p. 190).

This second aspect can be summarized as follows: even in a differentiated condition of modernity, humans define spaces and are defined by their materiality also in another way – through the total inseparability and meaningfulness of inhabitation.

A particularly important figure in this generation of French intellectuals – who in various ways established that "space matters" and set the vector for the spatialization of the social and human sciences – is Henri Lefebvre. Not only did he develop, in his own way, the motifs outlined above from the mid-twentieth century, opposing the dominant neo-Marxist historicist discourse, but in his later work *The Production of Space* (*La production de l'espace*) he united them in the directly formulated new, "unitary" (in his own terms) theory of space.

Actually, it was his concept that influenced the initial unfolding of the "spatial turn" within Anglophone discourse (in its characteristic expansion of the positions of human geography). Moreover, as Bachmann-Medick argues, it was precisely Lefebvre's concept that serves as "a common point of departure" for all approaches associated with the transdisciplinary spatial turn in general (Bachmann-Medick, 2016, p. 216).

At the core of Lefebvre's concept lies the problem of "(social) space" This framing is fundamentally important in two respects.

On the one hand, the qualifier "social" in this case does not denote a specific type of space (as opposed to, for example, physical or cultural space), but rather serves to mark a new understanding of "space" as such. One of the problems, according to Henri Lefebvre, lies in the fact that the very concept of "space" until recently had a mostly geometrical meaning and was "ultimately mathematical" (Lefebvre, 1991, p.1). This dominant modern, abstract understanding of space is connected – despite their contradictions – both with Isaac Newton's "absolute" space, conceived as an empty, pre-given container (which, in its relation to René Descartes' analytic geometry, corresponds to a fundamental for modernity mechanistic theoretical and practical orientation), and with Gottfried Leibniz's "relative" space. It is worth noting that common use of terms such as "social space" or "cultural space" still tends to be a borrowing precisely of such an abstraction for structuring the specific object of research within a given field.

At the same time, Lefebvre directs his critique not primarily at the "appropriation" and abstraction of space by mathematicians – the modern "masters of science" in general, and of the "science of space" in particular – through their detachment from common metaphysical roots (Lefebvre, 1991, p.2). More important, within the already established context, is his critique of the very natural philosophy of space, with its substantial and attributive approaches.

According to Lefebvre, "space" consists "neither by a collection of things or an aggregate of (sensory) data, nor by a void packed like a parcel with various contents, and it

is irreducible to a 'form' imposed upon phenomena, upon things, upon physical materiality" (Lefebvre, 1991, p.27). His central thesis is that "(social) space is a (social) product." (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 26). More precisely, multiplicity of spaces are products of diverse and historically variable practices.

And it is precisely with this definition that the reverse side of the bracketing of "(social) space" is connected. It lies in revealing the inherent sociality of spaces in general – not only of variations of the "ideal space," abstract concepts, or representations, but also of "physical space" itself. This inherent "sociality," despite Lefebvre's own use of the term "culture" in a narrower sense, can, from a contemporary perspective, be understood precisely as "culturality."

Practice-centered thinking has, in general, undermined, as Harvey mentioned, the very "nature of space" (Harvey, 2006, p.275). However, while he himself, in a postmodernist spirit, tends toward the opposite extreme – where the "the question 'what is space?' is therefore replaced by the question 'how is it that different human practices create and make use of different conceptualizations of space?'" (Harvey, 2006, p.275) – Lefebvre's approach is far more synthetic. Overall, he reveals and generalizes practical modes through which diverse, contradictory but interdependent, yet always real-and-imaginary spaces are produced. Moreover, these spaces – from those that are almost purely physical, material extensions linked to the body, to those that are nearly abstract rational constructs – conversely, in various ways, shape practices and produce the human being.

The first generalized mode, which, tending toward exclusivity and dominance, defined the modern condition, is based, according to Lefebvre, on the "representations of space" (*les représentations de l'espace*). In such case emerges "conceptualized space, the space of scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers", in which the lived and the perceived are equated with what has been conceived (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 38). The conceived nature of such a space, as an organizational unity of reflection and construction, is grounded in symbolic language, particularly geometric, through which rational images of material reality are formed, and through which this reality is attempted to be defined, ultimately abstracted, and mastered.

Besides the fact that "representations of space have a practical impact, that they intervene in and modify spatial textures" (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 42) and structure the very basis of human life, it is also important to note, following Soja, that these representations cannot be understood as projections of modes of thought independent of socio-material conditions (Soja, 1989, pp. 121–126). After all, mapping – both as concrete cartography, particularly in its modern, rationalized form and strategic implementations, which is the most evident example of "representations of space", and as their metaphorical generalization – is, according to Gregory, "necessarily situated, embodied, partial: like all other practices of representation" (Gregory, 1994, p. 7).

On the other hand, fundamental and unavoidable is the space for which the "body serves both as point of departure and as destination" (Lefebvre, 1991, p.194). This second generalized mode of production, according to Lefebvre, is based on the "spatial practices" (*la pratique spatiale*), whose bodily concreteness, conversely, is always in-corporated and shaped by the materialities of the spaces.

This mode concerns sensory perception, production, and reproduction, which presuppose and shape the various ways of "the use of the hands, members and sensory organs, and the gestures of work" (Lefebvre, 1991, p.40). And its

highlighting aims, at core, to re-actualize bodies, grasped, "transported out from themselves, transferred and emptied out" through a network of images and signs (Lefebvre, 1991, p.98). Or, as Gregory formulates in Foucauldian terms, it is the overcoming of the disposition of useful and docile bodies, produced by "representations of space" as naturalized technologies of power (Gregory, 1994, p.405).

At the same time, this aspect of Lefebvre's theory is not limited just to the overcoming of the "decorporealization" of space (Gregory, 1994, p.368) within the modern condition. Ultimately, in our view, the significance of Lefebvre's theory lies in the fact that, just as the imagined representations of space are, at their core, real (in their consequences and in their very production) so too are bodily spaces imagined. In this context, a central role is played by the third element of Lefebvre's conceptual apparatus – *les espaces de représentation* – "spaces of representation" or "representational spaces" (a formulation popularized through the first English translation). They embody a "complex symbolism, sometimes coded, sometimes not", unfolding at a largely neglected "unconscious" level of lived experience and directly shaping it (Lefebvre, 1991, pp.33–34). The actualization of these spaces not only reveals the material imprint of myriad everyday practices but also emphasizes and, in a post-hermeneutic spirit, extends the understanding of their intrinsic involvement in the production of meaning, as outlined by British Cultural Studies (Hall, 1997, p.15).

It should be noted that this aspect of Lefebvre's theory has been received and developed quite differently by his American interpreters/followers, but generally it has been reduced to providing "counter-discourses" and creating "alternative spatial imaginaries" (Gregory, 1994, p.405). For example, Harvey saw in Lefebvre's "spaces of representation" not the inseparable "emotionality and affectivity, as well as materiality" of lived experience as such but rather the alternative, specifically artistic, representations capable of capturing and generating it (Harvey, 2006, p. 279). For Soja, drawing on Lefebvre's thesis that his conceptual triad can be related, respectively, to "conceived space", "perceived space", and "lived space" (*espace vécu*) (Lefebvre, 1991, p.40), only the latter matters as the sole real-and-imaginary space – a dialectical synthesis of the other two, which he reduces to traditional extremes. And he regards it, at the first place, as the basis for a new spatial knowledge: the epistemological perspective of "Thirdspace" (Soja, 1996, pp.10, 74).

Although more concrete, we believe an equally limiting way to understand this aspect of Lefebvre's theory is to reduce it exclusively to experiences of "tactical" reappropriation and reinterpretation, similar to de Certeau's approach. Lefebvre indeed names "spaces of representation" "spaces of the 'inhabitants' and 'users'" (Lefebvre, 1991, p.39) and points their connections with the "clandestine or underground side of social life" (Lefebvre, 1991, p.33). However, they do not align with distinctions such as those made, for example, by Harvey – between production and its domination and appropriation of space – where practices of "spaces of representation" are limited to the production of imaginary landscapes, or to mythologies and poetics of space (Harvey, 1989, p. 221). Nor do they align with Setha Low's distinction between "social production" (the material creation of space, encompassing economic, ideological, and technological factors) and "social construction" – the phenomenological and symbolic experience of this space through "people's social exchanges, memories, images, and daily use of the material settings," which "transforms" it and endows it with meaning (Low, 2000, pp. 127–128).

Lefebvre himself indeed marks the distinction between the obvious practical impact of the representations of space and the solely symbolic outcome of the spaces of representation, but notes that "such distinction must be handled with considerable caution," treating it primarily as a heuristic one (Lefebvre, 1991, pp. 42–43). On the one hand, his purpose is to show how representations of space – whose historical and cultural dominance defined the Western "abstract space" – separated from spaces of representation in the dynamics of modernization and displaced, subordinated, and marginalized them (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 40). On the other hand, he emphasizes not only that they never fully eliminated this alternative, and shows that over a much longer period – indeed, throughout almost all of history – spaces of representation, in their specific monumental and material concreteness, prevailed, playing a decisive and, so to speak, both "official" cultural-genetic and productive role, generating the "absolute space" that "embodies all places" (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 236).

Finally, it is important to note that the flip side of the outlined French "spatial theory" is its demand in new historiographies. This refers both to Foucauldian histories about space, "from the great strategies of geo-politics to the little tactics of the habitat, institutional architecture from the classroom to the design of hospitals, passing via economic and political installations" (Foucault, 1980, p.149) and to "history of space" in Lefebvre's sense – the histories of "its production qua 'reality', and of its forms and representations," which not only do not coincide with "the causal chain of 'historical' (i.e. dated) events, or with a sequence, whether teleological or not, of customs and laws, ideals and ideology, and socio-economic structures or institutions" (Lefebvre, 1991, p.46), but must also serve as a way "to look at history itself in a new light" (Lefebvre, 1991, p.42), in other words, to become a spatial history.

This aspect is particularly significant within the broader context of spatialization. To overcome the conceptual limitations imposed by the modern unifying "culture of meaning" on non-modern "non-meanings" – or rather, on the oversaturated, tense, and always-materialized "hyper-meanings" – as well as the illusions that justified its own "meaningfulness," critical revisions of the history of culture are required. At the same time, it is precisely through such revisions that the value and variability of the spatiality of human ways of life can be explicated.

Discussion and conclusions

The basic heuristic and generalizing potential of spatial turn, understood not merely as one of the manifestations or drivers of the broader cultural turn but as its general dialectical counterpart, is grounded on the radical positing of spatiality as the central problem and foundation of inquiry in contemporary culturalized paradigm of humanities and social sciences. As not merely the substitution of historical imagination with a geographical one, nor solely the emphasis on the material dimensions of human experience – both grounded in the two traditional, limited concepts of space – the complex essence and impact of such spatialization must be understood through a new comprehensive theory of space.

Both of this mutually connected "revaluation" and reconceptualization, foundational for spatial turn, can be traced back to the French poststructuralist and post-Marxist approaches of the 1970s. The former, characteristic of them in general, encompasses two dimensions: on the one hand, revealing the crucial activity and organizational efficacy of space in its inseparable connection with knowledge and power production; and on the other hand, outlining "other spaces," alternative to this

abstract configuration, as intrinsically meaningful outcomes and drivers of living and experiencing.

Most distinctly and comprehensively this shift appears in Lefebvre's directly articulated new theory of (social) space or rather spaces as always, the products of diverse, contradictory, and interdependent practices, which at the same time determine those very practices. Such spaces are ranging from almost purely material and related to the body, yet always undifferentiatedly saturated with meaning, to almost purely imaginary abstract constructs (no less real in their production and effect). Conceptual tripartial scheme he proposes generalizes this multiplicity of spaces: whereas "representations of space" tend toward secularization and autonomization from the "density" of "spatial practices", objectifying and abstracting them along with the material extensions within which they unfold, "spaces of representation" (while no less ordering) remain inseparable from these practices and are, as a whole, syncretic within lived and experienced reality. In general, Lefebvre's concept provides a general framework within which diverse, always practically produced real-and-imaginary spaces exist in parallel – often unnoticed by one another, yet constantly interacting, mutually influencing, and altering the overall proportion of their impact within historical and cultural dynamics.

Sources of funding. This study did not receive any grant from a funding institution in the public, commercial, or non-commercial sectors. The research was funded by Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.

References

- Bachmann-Medick, D. (2016). *Cultural Turns: New Orientations in the Study of Culture*. De Gruyter.
- Brukhovetska, O. (2024). Mapping Turns: From the Linguistic Model to the "Metaphysics of Presence". *NaUKMA Research Papers. History and Theory of Culture*, 7, 11–23 [In Ukrainian]. [Брюховецька, О. (2024). Картографування поворотів: від лінгвістичної моделі до 'метафізики

- присутності'. *Наукові записки НаУКМА. Історія і теорія культури*, 7, 11–23]. <https://doi.org/10.18523/2617-8907.2024.7.11-23>.
- Brodetska, Yu. (2023). The spatial turn: The chronotopicality of being. *Doksa*, 2(40), 6–14 [In Ukrainian]. [Бродецька, Ю. (2023). Просторовий поворот: хронотопність буття. *Докса*, 2 (40), 6–14]. [https://doi.org/10.18524/2410-2601.2023.2\(40\).307195](https://doi.org/10.18524/2410-2601.2023.2(40).307195)
- Certeau, M. de (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press.
- Deleuze, G. (2006). *Foucault*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.). Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1997). On Other Spaces. In N. Leach (Ed.), *Rethinking Architecture. A reader in cultural theory* (pp.330–336). Routledge.
- Gregory, D. (1994). *Geographical Imaginations*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Gumbrecht, H.U. (2004). *Production of Presence. What Meaning Cannot Convey*. Stanford University Press.
- Hall, S. (1997). The Work of Representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation. Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (pp. 13–75). SAGE.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity. An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2006). Space as a Keyword. In N. Castree, D. Gregory (Eds.), *David Harvey. A Critical Reader*. (pp. 270–295). Blackwell Publishing.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Basil Blackwell.
- Low, S. (2000). *On the Plaza. The Politics of Public Space and Culture*. University of Texas Press.
- Moxey, K. (2008). Visual Studies and the Iconic Turn. *Journal of Visual Culture*, 7 (2), 131–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470412908091934>
- Skokova, L. (2018). *Cultural practices in contemporary society: Theoretical approaches and empirical dimensions*. Kyiv: Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.[In Ukrainian] [Скокова, Л. (2018). Культурні практики в сучасному суспільстві: теоретичні підходи та емпіричні виміри. Київ: Інститут соціології НАН України.]
- Soja, E. (1989). *Postmodern Geographies. The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. Verso.
- Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace. Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Soja, E. (2009). Taking space personally. In B. Warf, S. Arias (Eds.), *The spatial turn: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 11–36). Routledge.
- Williams, R. (2014). Culture is ordinary. In J. McGuigan (Ed.), *Raymond Williams on culture & society: Essential writings* (pp. 1–19). SAGE.

Отримано редакцією журналу / Received: 25.09.25
Прорецензовано / Revised: 15.10.25
Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 24.11.25

Ростислав ФАНАГЕЙ, д-р філософії з культурології
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8640-082X

e-mail: rostyslav.fanagei@knu.ua

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

ТЕОРІЯ ПРОСТОРУ АНРІ ЛЕФЕВРА В "ПРОСТОРОВОМУ ПОВОРОТІ" КУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЧНИХ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ

Вступ. "Просторовий поворот", як радикальне висування просторовості в центр проблематики та методології гуманітарних і соціальних наук, необхідно спирається на нову всебічну та виразно культурну теорію простору. Ця основа просторового повороту та його генералізуючого потенціалу в пізнюмодерних культурологічних дослідженнях, що походить з французького дискурсу про простір 1970-х років загалом, та підходу Анрі Лефевра зокрема, досі потребує теоретичного уточнення.

Методи. Дослідження використовує загальнотеоретичні методи критичного аналізу та концептуального синтезу.

Результати. Подолання "знецінності" простору, інспіроване французьким інтелектуальним середовищем 1970-х років, охоплює два виміри: з одного боку, актуалізацію його визначальної організаційної дієвості у нерозривному зв'язку зі знанням та владою; з іншого боку, виявлення альтернатив цієї абстрактної просторової конфігурації – "інших просторів", які постають в тотальному й питомо означеному проживанні-переживанні та визначають його. Значущість підходу А. Лефевра полягає не лише в поєднанні цих вимірів, а, першочергово, у визначенні ним нової теорії (соціального) простору, або радше просторів, які завжди є продуктами різноманітних, суперечливих та взаємозалежних практик, що водночас визначають ці практики. Ці реально-уявні простори варіюються від майже виключно матеріальних і пов'язаних із тілом, але завжди іманентно насичених значенням, до майже виключно абстрактних конструкцій, які не менш реальні у своєму виробництві та впливі. Пропонована ж А.Лефевром концептуальна тріада дозволяє узагальнити цю множину: якщо "репрезентації простору" тяжіють до секуляризації та автономізації з "товці" питомо просторових практик – об'єктивують й абстрагують їх та матеріальні протяжності, з якими вони спільно розгортаються, – то "простори репрезентації", не меншою мірою впорядковуючі, є недиференційованими з ними та загалом є синкретично означеними.

Висновки. Теорія А.Лефевра надає основу для спеціалізації культурологічних досліджень, пропонуючи узагальнюючу концептуальну рамку, яка оприянює та систематизує різноманітні, завжди практично продуктовані, реально-уявні простори, що існують паралельно, часто не помічають одне одного, але водночас постійно взаємодіють та змінюють загальний баланс своїх фундаментальних соціокультурних впливів.

Ключові слова: просторовий поворот, теорія простору, спеціалізація, просторовість, практика, А. Лефевр, культурний поворот.

Автор заявляє про відсутність конфлікту інтересів. Спонсори не брали участі в розробленні дослідження; у зборі, аналізі чи інтерпретації даних; у написанні рукопису; в ухваленні рішення про публікацію результатів.

The author declares no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; in the decision to publish the results.