Chapter 19

The Body

Michael Landzelius

The Body Reembraced

In concluding his *The Production of Space*, Lefebvre asserted that "Western philosophy has *betrayed* the body; it has actively participated in the great process of metaphorization that has abandoned the body; and it has denied the body" (1991: 407). Despite roughly 2,000 years of betrayal, Lefebvre, writing in 1974, displayed optimism: "Today the body is establishing itself firmly, as base and foundation, beyond philosophy, beyond discourse, and beyond the theory of discourse. Theoretical thought, carrying reflection on the subject and the object beyond the old concepts, has reembraced the body along with space, in space, and as the generator (or producer) of space" (1991: 407). Lefebvre's account of the unfolding of the body–space nexus is situated in Marxism, yet also critically builds upon authors important in poststructuralism and deconstruction, such as Freud, Lacan, and Kristeva (see Blum & Nast 1996; Gregory 1997; Pile 1996), as well as Nietzsche and Heidegger (see Elden 2001; Merrifield 1995). Geographers such as Gregory (1994, 1997), Merrifield (1993), Pile (1996), Shields (1989, 1991, 1999), and Stewart (1995a), incorporate aspects of Lefebvre's theorization of the body. Yet his work continues to be controversial and has been variously characterized as romantic (Thrift 1997a), melancholic (Gregory 1997), teleological (Keith & Pile 1993), and masculinist (Blum & Nast 1996; Pile 1996).

The French edition of *The Production of Space* was published roughly 30 years ago, and the three decades since have seen the emergence of second and third wave feminism, poststructuralism, deconstruction, a renewed interest in psychoanalysis, the development of cultural studies, postcolonialism, queer, nonrepresentational, and actor-network theories – to name but a few important strands of thought which have dismantled Western metaphysics. Differences apart, a shared critique in this literature concerns the Cartesian subject's view from nowhere: the masculinist and simultaneously epistemological, moral, and political 'god-trick' (Haraway 1991: 189) through which "[t]he standpoint of the privileged, their particular experience and standards, is constructed as normal and neutral" (Young 1990b: 116). In emphasizing the production of knowledge, identity, ethics and politics as positioned

practices embedded in particular social and cultural conditions, these strands of thought have turned to the body as a key site for understanding the workings and differentiation of society and thus also for the reworking of social theory as well as politics (for brief accounts, see Shilling 2001; Turner 2000).

The response in geography to this growing discourse on the body was slow. Through a number of theoretical avenues, geographers already engaged with issues that invoked the body. Behavioral research based upon environmental psychology as well as symbolic interactionism clearly implicated embodiment (see, for example, Cox & Golledge 1981; Moore & Golledge 1976). Yet, the constraints of behaviorism and mind/body dualism disallowed the articulation of the body as a particular site of inquiry. In critique of then fashionable spatial science approaches, humanistic geographers addressed the body–space nexus particularly from phenomenological perspectives (Buttimer 1976; Ley & Samuels 1978; Pickles 1985; Porteous 1990; Relph 1976; Seamon 1979; Tuan 1974, 1977). However, the influence of phenomenology decreased in a period when poststructuralist antihumanism highlighted diversity and questioned commonality and universalism. In addition, Hägerstrand's (1967, 1970) time-geography briefly surfaced among critical and feminist geographers in arguments that challenged universalist assumptions and anchored human behavior in the embodied time-spaces of everyday life (Dyck 1990; Miller 1983; Palm & Pred 1978; Pred 1981, 1984; Thrift 1983). Yet, it was soon claimed that "[t]he notation of the body in time-geography as a path which does not merge depends on this particular masculine repression of the bodily" (Rose 1993: 33; for other criticisms, see Gregory 1994; Harvey 1989).

The 1990s witnessed a radical increase in geographical research sensitive to positionality, particularity, and specificity. In this research, the body loses its definite article and becomes a plurality of differentiated bodies. Given this plurality, empirical work covers diverse social categories such as gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, disability, illness, and age. Spatial contexts correspondingly vary from merchant banks of the present to colonies of the past. In terms of theory, geographers build upon approaches developed in other fields such as philosophy, psychoanalysis, general social theory and cultural studies. Foucault's theorizing of disciplined and different bodies as emerging out of different constellations of power and knowledge is immensely important. A vast number of citations in geographies of the body are also from works by Judith Butler, Moira Gatens, and Elisabeth Grosz. Frequently mentioned are also Susan Bordo, Rosi Braidotti, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, Donna Haraway, Sandra Harding, Julia Kristeva, and Iris Marion Young. In addition, many 'second hand' references to Jacques Lacan appear, whereas the psychoanalyst Paul Schilder and body theorists such as Pierre Bourdieu, Norbert Elias, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty are rarely cited. Without normative intent, one can make the observation that a geographical text on the body has yet to appear that could be called a 'paradigm' in terms of being not only cited but also applied by fellow geographers.

Geographical work on the body can to a large extent be characterized as a response and contribution to the discourse on identity politics, in which class politics as conventionally understood in terms of [male] labor versus [male] capital are displaced by interrogations of the nature and construction of subjectivity and selfhood. In this discourse, embodiment refers to how individuals literally incorporate

social relations, psychological traits and cultural meanings, as well as to how bodily engagement in practices not only reiterates but potentially also transforms the world. This invocation of the body as a key site of personal experience, social distinction and political struggle results in a political edge different from class-based politics, as is clear in the employment of terms such as 'racism,' 'sexism,' 'heterosexism,' 'ableism,' 'ageism,' and so forth. A key issue in recent geographies of the body concerns how masculinist universalism in heteropatriarchal society produces normative spaces based upon the desires and characteristics of able-bodied and heterosexual men – distinctions understood to dominate over differentiation within this category in terms of, for example, class, education, race, and ethnicity. The resulting spaces are understood to exclude from recognition, in a both corporeal and discursive sense, 'deviant' groups and individuals and thus to both inhibit and devalue their particular embodied identities. In this fashion, much recent literature on body politics replaces analyses of class and structural economic conditions with analyses of subjectivation, oppression, and domination. While skeptical towards conventional modernist accounts of agency and intentionality, contemporary work explores spatial gaps in the conjunctions of power and conceives of the body as a potential force of political repositioning able to disrupt performative reiteration. In this context, Harvey approvingly observes that "a wide range of bodily practices and choices can be embedded in the circulation of capital" (1998: 412), yet further argues that to neglect the particular social relations of capitalism amounts to a foundational "body reductionism" that fails to identify "the direction as opposed to the locus of political action" (1998: 415). Such criticisms alongside Knopp's reasonable claim that "we construct sexuality and gender along with class, not independently of it" (1992: 652) show the importance of taking seriously the political as well as epistemological differences between positions.

The Body–Space Nexus

Different approaches to the body are indeed represented in geography, yet the majority of work is quite univocal in its reiterated references to the set of influential authors mentioned above. There is thus no clear articulation of a specifically geographical take on the body. In sociology, Turner critiques a "decorative sociology," which is "merely a description of the cultural representation of the body (2000: 481). Williams and Bendelow similarly argue that "sociology should itself be fundamentally embodied; theorising not so much about bodies . . . but from bodies as lived entities" (1998: 209). In geography, Thrift critiques a view, "pervasive . . . in current cultural geography" (1999: 318), "that human beings are engaged in building discursive worlds by actively constructing webs of significance which are laid out over a physical substrate" (1999: 300). Longhurst stresses that "[o]ne of the downsides of social constructionism . . . is that it can render the body incorporeal, fleshless, fluidless, little more than a linguistic territory" (2001: 23). In geography, such approaches are exemplified by analyses in which bodies are present only as particularized signifiers, and spaces are taken-for-granted as in themselves neutral, and as gendered, racialized or in other ways particularized and politicized only through the presence and discursive dominance of a certain individual or group.

Importantly, a number of themes in recent geographical research point towards a more clearly articulated geographical take on the body–space nexus that highlights ways in which physical substrates and bodies are interdependently constituted as well as constitutive of social relations and cultural meanings. Before turning to these themes, it should be stressed that the body, as this companion clearly shows, is implicated in much recent work in cultural geography. Hence, as already noted, the body has been discussed in feminist, poststructuralist, and psychoanalytic approaches as well as cast in terms of the gendered and sexed body, the racialized body, the young body, and the performative body. These areas are all addressed in separate chapters in this volume.

Epistemology and the body

Feminist geographers in particular have identified masculinist, heterosexist, and universalist disciplinary foundations in geography. Grounded in asymmetrical active/passive binaries, the model researcher has been a disembodied male researching an object subjected to the male gaze and molded by incarnations of passive, woman, body, and nature. Such binaries are implicated not only in a general disavowal of the body and in the dominance of the conceptual over the corporeal, of culture over nature, but also in notions of core versus peripheral areas of the discipline, of active [male] exploration and mapping of a passive [female] landscape, and so forth (see Bondi 1997; Callard 1998; Chouinard & Grant 1995; Johnson 1994; Longhurst 1995, 1997, 2001; McDowell 1999; Nash 1996; Rose 1992, 1993, 1995; Stewart 1995a). Issues of disability, impairment, and illness have also encouraged reflection on established disciplinary assumptions. Chouinard (1997, 1999a) and Chouinard and Grant (1995) articulate academic responsibilities in face of the hegemony of "ableist geographies," and Dorn and Laws critique bio-medical models of disease in arguing that geography needs a "politicized emancipatory phenomenology" (1994: 106) that incorporates social theory's rediscovery of the body. Similarly, Parr challenges medicalized notions of 'mental illness' in geography and suggests that the "mind/bodies of psychiatric patients are contested sites of control," and thereby part of "geographies of resistance" (1999: 197; see also Moss 1999).

Asymmetries between researcher and researched, and encounters with 'others' in fieldwork turn the question of how embodiment and positionality affects knowledge production into a particularly important issue. Thorny issues of relativism versus essentialism and objectivism thus unavoidably emerge out of the epistemological incorporation of the body. Bondi identifies the risk that "geographical terms of reference do the work done by essences in other formulations" (1993: 98), and contends that "geographical metaphors of contemporary politics must be informed by conceptions of space that recognize place, position, location and so on as *created*, as *produced*" (1993: 99; see also Smith & Katz 1993). The body is indeed one such geographical term of reference, and a key site in discussions of essentialism. Rose explores how certain feminist alternatives to disembodied masculinism themselves serve to reproduce visualism and notions of control through "tactics [that] work by turning extraordinarily complex power relations into a visible and clearly ordered space that can be surveyed by the researcher" (1997: 310). In contrast to such 'transparent reflexivity,' Rose refers to the anti-essentialist concept of performativity in order to suggest that "research [is] a process of constitutive negotiation" (1997:

316) of positions, knowledges, and embodied identities. The quotations from Bondi and Rose illustrate how feminist reflection on positionality deeply implicates the embodiment of identities. Yet, opinions differ with regard to epistemological and methodological responses to this researcher's conundrum of being "captured and enmeshed" (Nast 1998: 110; see also Kobayashi 1994; McDowell 1992; Nelson 1999; Sparke 1998).

Essential here is whether geographers make a specifically spatial argument on embodiment and situatedness, and, accordingly, whether terms such as 'location' and 'position' mean something beyond discursive considerations of difference. Important is also whether the critique of the disembodied mind only concerns the limits of discursive knowledge and the biased constitution of the research object, or if it also invokes another conception of what should be counted as knowledge. Longhurst critiques binary thinking (1995, 1997) and builds an argument around how the fleshy and fluid messiness of bodies challenges established social and spatial boundaries concerning, for example, pregnancy, gender assumptions, workplace behavior, privacy, and exposure (1999, 2000, 2001). Her objective is to make space for politicized microlevel 'corpogeographies' that show how "specificity seeps into generality . . . lived messy materiality seeps into cerebral knowledge" (2001: 135). Yet, messiness in Longhurst's argument suggests specificity *of* discourse more than possibilities *beyond* discourse. Such possibilities, however, are suggested in Lefebvre's antihumanist claim that "long before the analysing, separating intellect, long before formal knowledge, there was an intelligence of the body" (1991: 174), as well as in present nonrepresentational theory and actor-network theory. Hence, Thrift proposes nonrepresentational forms of knowledge beyond discourse and stresses that "a practical or situated way of knowing is contextual, and rooted especially in embodiment" (1996: 33; see also Nash 2000). Similarly, Whatmore (1999) explores agency as a hybridized collective network-capacity and then suggests a form of "sensible and relational knowledge of these hybrid worlds" which is dependent upon the human body as a corporeal organism and "the animal sensibilities of our diverse human being" (1999: 35). In terms of disciplinary consequences, questions here concern institutional academic constraints as well as what an epistemology of nondiscursive knowledge would entail in practice, with regard to methods, descriptive protocols, criteria, sharing of results, and so forth.

The body politic and the body

Explorations into relations between the body politic and the body of the individual from a geographical perspective have sought to move away from structural analyses of power towards an understanding of power as embedded in concrete spaces and bodily articulated. In this context, however, the body has been used "for contradictory theoretical agenda" (Longhurst 2001: 19) supporting accounts of disciplinary inscriptions of power as well as theories of empowerment and resistance. This state of affairs illustrates Lefebvre's remark on the body as a contested site that "cannot be destroyed without destroying the social body itself: the carnal, earthly Body is there, every day" (1976: 89). Lefebvre understands the body to be "the point of return, the redress – not the Logos, nor 'the human'" (1976: 89). His antihumanism turns the body into a differential space of hope in the midst of a growing diversity and dysfunctionality of abstract space: "Can the body in its quest for

vindication use the resulting interstices as its way back?" (1991: 388). Similarly, much recent geographical work revolves around the body as simultaneously political battleground and site of resistance.

Cresswell (1997; 1999) as well as Sibley (1995; 1999) study how spatial processes of normalization and exclusion in the body politic are interdependent with the identification of individual bodies in terms of deviance through which denigrating meanings are mapped onto real or imagined embodied differences of, for example, female tramps and hobos, travelers, or immigrant communities. Addressing the politico-spatial effects of bodily metaphors of displacement, Cresswell suggests a focus on "geographical interpretation of metaphors as they are thought and acted out in the realms of politics and ideology" (1997: 343), while Sibley relies on object relations theory in his argument for the creation of "progressive, weakly bounded and heterogeneous places" (1999: 127) that are inclusive of difference. In an article on nineteenth-century San Francisco, Craddock studies "ways in which medical theory produced Chinese bodies" (1999: 352) and how this medical framing was underpinned by segregation, racialization, and pathologization of both spaces and bodies. Craddock and Dorn focus on the geography of "nationbuilding through the lens of medical discourse" (2001: 314) in a journal issue that explores how medical interpellations of bodies support exclusionary constructions of national values and identity through processes of othering in reference to health, hygiene, race, illness, and disability.

Addressing the public/private dichotomy, Duncan (1996) focuses on the public/private boundary as immediately related to a politics of the body, yet complexly articulated and spatialized in relation to contested terrains of gender and state intervention. Sharp (1996) explicates how the articulation of dichotomies such as public/private, male/female, and work/home in Eastern Europe under communism continues to have an impact on social struggles concerning symbolic as well as productive and reproductive linkages between women's bodies, the body politic, and nationalist politics. On racialized and heteronormative politics related to issues of public/private and state intervention, Elden argues that "sexual encoding of bodies was part of the larger racial landscape in South Africa during apartheid" (1998: 162), while Kesby, likewise, in a study of postindependence developments in Zimbabwe, shows that "the social construction of space and of gendered bodies is interlinked" (1999: 27). Sensitive to issues of scale, Yeoh (1999) studies ritual practices for dead bodies in Singapore, and how local communities' shifting perceptions of such practices affect how the living situate themselves in the body politic in relation to increasing secularization and nation-state policies and interventions.

The notion that resistance emerges out of embodied experiences just as much as from conscious considerations has been invoked particularly in studies of colonial and postcolonial contexts. In studying the gendering of bodies in rural Zimbabwe as entangled with knowledge and power as well as with spatial scales, Kesby seeks to "circumvent the material/textual binary" (1999: 31) in order to suggest new ways of destabilizing patriarchy. In a study on colonial India, Mills discusses how "architectural space affects social space" (1996: 126) with regard to how the spatial microarticulation of the public/private dichotomy allowed indigenous and colonizing women forms of spatial resistance through the body beyond "notions of confinement" (1996: 142). In her work on Latin America, Radcliffe asserts that

"embodied subjectivities lie at a threshold of power, material resistance and representation" (1999a: 221) and concludes that the "constant ordering work of nation, race and gender nevertheless leaves interstices from which other orders, other geographies can be imagined and spoken" (1999b: 226). Similarly close to Lefebvre's notions, Pile, in his analysis of the spatialities of social struggle in colonial Algeria, suggests that resistance is a form of embodied creativity which employs and invents "discontinuous spaces . . . that lie beyond 'power'" (1997: 14, 5).

The economy and the body

The body is indeed a complex phenomenon, not least in relation to the capitalist space economy, which stakes out the body in a number of ways. First, the body is a commodity in its bare existence, as body parts and transplants on the organ market. Secondly, the body is a labor market commodity, as differentiated labor power in terms of manual, white collar, gendered, racialized, and so forth. Thirdly, the body is a site of survival needs and thus a site of consumption: of foods, clothes, housing, medical care, physical aids, and so forth. Fourthly, the body is a site of emotions, of desire and pleasure, with the effect of giving any kind of consumption symbolic signifying values while simultaneously enabling the emergence of a body-related economy of signs more or less disconnected from survival needs. In different ways, geographers have recently suggested that these four aspects are complexly entangled in one another. Harvey stresses that the body can never be free of capitalism's effects, which, however, will look "very different from the standpoints of production, exchange, and consumption" (1998: 414). Seager, in addressing sexuality and exploitation, points out that "[t]he world is lashed by networks of space, place, and economy that depend on the display, exchange, control, and use of women's bodies" (1997: 1522), and Knopp remarks that "the sociospatial construction of otherness, which has as much to do with representational and symbolic space as with physical space, has become key to the survival of capitalism" (1992: 664).

Some Marxist geographers have engaged with the notion of spatial scales (Brenner 1998; Smith 1993; Harvey 2000) in order to come to terms with the place of the body in the shifting landscape of capitalism. Hence, Smith outlines an incomplete and open-ended hierarchical typology that "stretches from the body to the global" (1993: 102), while Harvey sets out to elaborate a "foundational connexion" between the two based upon the fact that "globalization is about the sociospatial relations between billions of individuals" (2000: 16). Other geographical research exemplifies Lefebvre's general position that the body is "the generator (or producer) of space" (1991: 407), and suggests that the body, rather than being a discrete spatial scale, is nested with and constitutive of all spatial scales. Pred has posed the question: "Where are those social and economic practices, those routine and nonroutine daily practices, which do not involve embodied-corpo-real subjects?" (1995: 1066). In line with such reasoning, the economic deployment of bodies and interdependent construction of spatial scales are addressed in case studies such as Stewart's (1995b) study of slave codes as legal geographies that constituted the slave body, sovereign power and the plantation as a racialized spatial unit of exploitation, and in Pratt's work (1998) on how disciplinary subjectivation constrained domestic workers required to live in the middle-class Canadian homes of

their employers. Yet, the issue of how spatial scales of capitalism are constructed through embodied practices concerns not only bodies enslaved. Bell and Valentine (1997) study how differentiated practices of shopping, preparing, and consuming food contribute to the shaping of distinct kinds of bodies, as well as to the structuring of "interconnections and disjunctions between scales" (1997: 207). Studying merchant banks, McDowell and Court (1994) and McDowell (1995) demonstrate how banking practices in the City of London are embodied gendered performances based upon power asymmetries and scripts firmly rooted in heteronormativity (see also Pile & Thrift 1995), while Hinchcliffe (2000) and Thrift (2000) engage in discussions of how business management has turned to issues of embodiment and non-representational learning processes in order to produce managers able to speed-up an already fast-moving global economy.

These examples illustrate that economic processes unavoidably pass through and make use of bodies that are concretely situated and complexly enmeshed in networks of social and cultural practices (see also Binnie 1995; Gibson-Graham 1998; Longhurst 2001; Massey 1994; Pratt 1998; Thrift 1996; Valentine 1999a, 1999b). In this vein, geographers convincingly argue that what some would call "the prevailing structures of political-economic power" (Harvey 1998: 420) cannot be reified as something global in contradistinction to a separate scale of the body, but that they are in themselves local embodied practices of decision-making particularly concentrated in white, upper-class males embedded in particular ways of being in a few select locations of power and privilege.

Impairment, illness, and the body

Some of the most integrative work on body and space has been written by scholars engaged in geographies of health and healthcare especially concerned with impairment and disability issues. Dorn's contention that "some poststructural feminists ignore institutional sedimentations in the built environment" (1998: 183) points to the fact that disability cannot be framed as a purely social relation in terms of how 'normal' bodies and 'disabled' bodies are discursively constructed due to prejudices and so forth. Disability issues unavoidably invoke spatiality and questions concerning physical constraints that contribute to the construction of impaired bodies *as* disabled and disempowered (see, for overviews, Gleeson 1999a; Imrie 1996a; Park, Radford, and Vickers 1998; Parr 2002a; Parr & Butler 1999). However, Dorn, in focusing upon how medical theory has been applied to give spaces and "anomalous bodies meaning" (1999: 46), makes the point that geographers themselves too easily have adopted disabling positions and need to "acknowledge the spatio-temporal structuring of the definition(s) of disability that they work with" (1999: 63). Considering such issues, Moss and Dyck argue that "the social model of disability, that emphasizes the social construction of disability through physical and social barriers, . . . did not take into account the nuances of bodily being that feminism has been able to provide" (2002: 12–13). In a study on possible effects of the Internet on experiences of health and bodily being, Parr discusses the tensions between a spatiotechnological expansion of the medical gaze through self-diagnosed inscription, and "the potential for an emancipatory disruption of the traditional canons" (2002b: 86) facilitated by internet users' access to alternative

accounts, networks of support, and other sources for increased control of their own bodies.

Imrie and Hall (2001) focus upon the needs of people with impairments in a critical discussion of the professions particularly involved in shaping built space. In this research, the exclusionary character of ableist spaces is discussed in terms of careless planning and design, which contribute to the "estrangement of disabled bodies in the built environment" (Imrie 1999: 38). While sensitive collaborative design practices (Gathorne-Hardy 1999) and technological innovations (Golledge 1993, 1997) are suggested as remedies, the exclusionary landscapes of ableism are also seen as integrated parts of a capitalist space-economy that has "progressively devalued the labour-power of physically impaired people" (Gleeson 1999b: 109; see also Gleeson 1996; Golledge 1996; Imrie 1996b). Critical of technological utopianism, Gleeson rather asks for "a lasting transformation of the political-economic, institutional and cultural forces that shape our cities and societies" (1999b: 115). In general agreement with such a position, Dyck (1999), Moss and Dyck (1996, 2002), and Dyck and Moss (1999) address how women with chronic illness and disability forge their identities as corporeal sites of inscription and resistance at both home and work in relation to the multiple forces and social scripts that structure embodiment, while Butler and Bowlby discuss how estrangement and resistance in public spaces are related to both negotiation of constraints in physical space and oppressive "social discourses concerning disability and public behaviour" (1997: 428; see also Parr 1997). Touching upon aspects of such discourses in their interpretation of attitude surveys, Dear et al. suggest that the spatial repercussions of public opinions about disabled bodies can be understood in terms of a "landscape of (in)tolerance" (1997: 471; see also Gleeson 1997). In relation to encounters with intolerance, Dorn discusses embodied ways of knowing and being of a self-designated 'cripple' as "part of a counter-hegemonic field" (1998: 198), while Chouinard (1999a, 1999b) approaches experiences of disabled women's political activism as a form of resistance to the ranking of "bodies marked by difference" in a "corporeal class system" governed by "powerful groups such as capitalists" (1999b: 292).

Yet, capitalists come in different shapes, colors, and sizes, and the notion of a ranking system implies that othering concerns processes of hierarchization beyond both capitalist relations, and relations between an able-bodied heterosexual majority and different minorities. Hence, Valentine touches upon relations of power cutting across diverse social categories in a study of an impaired ex-miner's contradictory experiences and "the complex relationships which exist between hegemonic masculinities and disabled masculinities" (1999c: 168). Pain, Mowl, and Talbot (2000) point to overlapping effects of ableism and ageism in a study of older people and leisure spaces. Butler explicitly reflects upon "how and at what cost disabled people remain marginalised in the gay 'community,'" in which "obsessions with the perfect body . . . run deep" (1999: 203). She thereby raises questions concerning the omnipresence of power-relations and how they are embodied by individuals belonging to groups normally thought of as oppressed rather than oppressors.

Senses, practices, and nonrepresentational bodies

The body is deeply implicated in geographers' rethinking of vision and visualism, as well as in nonrepresentational theory and research on practices and the senses.

In a humanistic quest to "explore the possibilities of otherscapes" (1990: 17), Porteous stresses that "[w]e live in a multisensory world, an allscape" (1990: 196), and Sui (2000) explores visualism in relation to epistemological and political implications of a recent shift towards aural metaphors, which in his view "represents a significant – if still nascent – reconfiguration of geographical discourse during the late twentieth century" (2000: 334). In essence, this reconfiguration concerns more than metaphors, and within the broad field of work under discussion here, approaches can be differentiated with regard to focus as well as theories employed.

Recent work on body–space formation through sound accompany the shift towards aural metaphors. The aural sensing of space is a key aspect of a study on warehouse parties, in which Ingham et al. (1999) discuss how a specific place is defined through practices centered on the particular music played and the properties of sound. Explicitly suggesting an analysis "beyond geography's visible worlds," Smith (1997) turns to the role of music in delimiting and spatializing identities of places as well as people. Continuing this path, Smith (2000) explores practices of performance and listening in terms of sonic knowledges and as embodied mediation of power relations and particular social and spatial protocols. Addressing the politics of auditory space, Revill points out that music is "almost uniquely polysemic" (2000: 605), yet gains authority and contributes to the construction of national identity through the time and place specific embodiment of musical meaning. In an edited volume on the role of music in the construction of place and scale, Leyshon, Matless, and Revill (1998) collect essays that include analyses of multisensuous and particularly sonoric landscapes of politics and place identity.

In a synthetic account of geographies of subjectivity and spatial behavior, Pile builds upon Freud, Lacan, and Lefebvre in suggesting "a psychoanalysis of space which correlates sexuality, geographic space and power with the body, meaning and (real, imaginary, symbolic) spatialities" (1996: 217). Yet, his treatise ends where a case-based and grounded psychoanalysis involving real spaces and real bodies would have begun. Suggesting a feminist revision of Lacan, Rose invokes "the existence of other visualised spaces of self/knowledge" (1995: 761) than those of phallocentric masculinism, while Nast and Kobayashi (1996) argue that "recorporealizing vision" makes it possible to distinguish between different modalities of masculinities and thereby to refine forms of resistance against heteropatriarchy (see also Pile 1996: 217). Nash (1994, 1996) turns to feminist art in searching for nonpassive depictions of the female body, identity, and landscape, and "reclaims" vision for a geography of landscape seen from subject positions that are not inherently oppressive. Related concerns inform Latham's exploration of "tactile, bodily, [and] habitually grounded practices" (1999: 452) in a reading of Walter Benjamin that suggests a non-authoritarian auratic experience "that undermines any dominance of the self over the object" (1999: 467).

In his critique of phallocentric abstract visualist space, Gregory calls on Lefebvre's unfinished project "to connect the history of the body with the history of space" (1994: 416). Lefebvre asserts such a connection in stating that capitalist development includes a process "whereby the visual gains the upper hand over the other senses" that ultimately reaches a point where "space has no social existence independently of an intense, aggressive and repressive visualization" (1991: 286). In addressing multisensuous and nonlinguistic signifying practices, Landzelius

(2001) discusses the segmentation of the body as a historico-spatial phenomenon of reciprocal interdependence with specific features of the built environment. Law (2001) argues that the senses *are* a situated practice, which Filipino migrants creatively engage to reconstruct multisensuous embodied experiences of home as well as to position themselves in new spaces of power. Relating similar concerns to epistemology, Harrison (2000) argues that mind/body dualism and notions of the body as a social effect have to do with how practices and "the *configuring* roles of the body" (2000: 504) are neglected in established discourse.

Geographical work in nonrepresentational theory and actor-network theory conceives of the mind–body–space nexus in terms of heterogeneous hybrid associations of networked 'actants' that include humans and animals as well as material constructs. This entails fundamentally rethinking agency and suggests that there are fuzzy boundaries between aspects and parts of 'humans' and 'things' normally understood to be discrete ontological entities (see Murdoch 1997a, 1997b; Nash 2000; Thrift 1996, 1997b, 1999; Whatmore 1999). Although sympathetic, Pred (2004) claims that actor-network theory "inadequately deals with power relations" in its primary concern with how networks form and develop, when power relations actually come in "myriad forms." Based on the position that "because of our corpo-reality . . . there is always a thereness, a somewhereness, a here-and-nowness to practice" (2004), Pred himself has in a long series of theoretically informed case studies focused on "embodied engagement in situated practices and the power relations and meanings with which they are unboundedly interfused" (1995: 1068).

Body–Space Reciprocity

Geography is concerned with the triad of economy, society and culture as spatialized, and the themes discussed above suggest that this spatialized triad must be understood through the body. The question of the geographical specificity of the body thus concerns the ways in which spaces emerge and are shaped interdependently with bodies. Geographical work in epistemology suggests that a shift towards the body and notions of positionality must be accompanied by an exploration of other forms of embodied, multisensuous, knowledge of spaces. Research on the body in relation to politics and economics suggests that matters of domination and exploitation, and questions of 'overarching' 'global' scales and processes, must be understood in terms of situated practices, and thus in reach of various forms of embodied attempts to resist and rescale present relations of power. Inquiries into issues of impairment and disability produce knowledge of how physical as well as discursive social constructs constrain bodies that is of relevance not only for emancipating 'deviant' bodies, but also for imagining possibilities beyond the everyday confines of 'normality.' Research into senses other than vision and the related stress on nonrepresentational, embodied ways of knowing in and through practices make the insufficiency of discursive approaches to the body–space nexus particularly clear.

Yet, I suggest that an embodied geography needs mediating concepts in theorizing the interdependent formation of bodies and spaces. The shaping of a body takes place through the senses, it is through the faculties of sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch including motility, that 'performative interpellations' (see Butler 1990; Nash

2000; Nelson 1999; Rose 1997, 1999) of bodies take place, and without the senses, an individual can take part in neither space nor discourse. Rodaway (1994) maps sensuous geographies across the world with regard to how different spaces enable and constrain practices in distinct kinds of ways, and thus result in different sensuous orderings of the body. In consideration of social interaction and psychological factors, such sensuous orderings can be articulated as the formation through reiterative practices of an individual's specific 'postural model of the body' (Schilder 1935; Merleau-Ponty 1962), 'habitual body' (Merleau-Ponty 1962), 'bodily hexis' (Bourdieu 1990), or 'body idiom' (Goffman 1963). Feminists such as Butler (1990), Grosz (1994), and Young (1990a) critique these authors to the extent that women's experiences are subordinated to a male norm, yet tend to agree that their ideas represent "enormously useful rethinking of mind/body relations" and contribute "crucial insights about the forms and structure of human embodiment" (Grosz 1994: 82, 108, on Schilder and Merleau-Ponty).

However, such body-concepts need to be articulated in conjunction with the spatially embedded process of incorporation, including the actual sensuous interpellations and practices by which the malleability of bodies is turned into the relative firmness of posture and flesh. Lefebvre's account of social space as power-laden and historico-geographically specific revolves around a usually overlooked notion of "formants" (1991: 285–91) that deeply implicate the body and the senses (see also Landzelius 2001: 170–3). In recursive fashion, formants differ between socio-historical constellations, are enacted in spatial practice, affect social relations, and are materialized as sensuous hierarchies in the postural models of bodies as well as in built space. In further elaborating the geographical specificity of the body, concepts such as 'postural models' and 'formants' are useful. Not only do they direct attention to how malleable bodies are worked upon by situated interaction with other bodies differentiated in terms of particular postural models of class, gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, disability, age, illness, and so forth. They also offer ways to understand how malleable bodies both work upon *and* are worked upon by a built space of sensuous hierarchies which in itself is continually reconfigured in terms of how, which, and where functions are enabled and constrained through situated practices of architectural-material sedimentation.

REFERENCES

Bell, D. and Valentine, G. 1997: *Consuming Geographies: We Are Where We Eat*. London: Routledge.

Binnie, J. 1995: Trading places: consumption, sexuality and the production of queer space. In D. Bell and G. Valentine, eds., *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. London: Routledge, 182–99.

Blum, V. and Nast, H. 1996: Where's the difference: the heterosexualization of alterity in Henri Lefebvre and Jacques Lacan. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14, 559–80.

Bondi, L. 1993: Locating identity politics. In M. Keith and S. Pile, eds., *Place and the Politics of Identity*. London: Routledge, 84–101.

Bondi, L. 1997: In whose words? On gender identities, knowledge and writing practices. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22, 245–58.

Bourdieu, P. 1990: *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Brenner, N. 1998: Between fixity and motion: accumulation, territorial organization and the historical geography of spatial scales. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16, 459–81.
Butler, J. 1990: *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge.
Butler, R. 1999: Double the trouble or twice the fun? Disabled bodies in the gay community. In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 203–20.
Butler, R. and Bowlby, S. 1997: Bodies and spaces: an exploration of disabled people's experiences of public space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15, 411–33.
Buttimer, A. 1976: Grasping the dynamism of lifeworld. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 66, 277–92.
Callard, F. J. 1998: The body in theory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16, 387–400.
Chouinard, V. 1997: Making space for disabling differences: challenging ableist geographies. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15, 379–87.
Chouinard, V. 1999a: Life at the margins: disabled women's explorations of ableist spaces. In E. K. Teather, ed., *Embodied Geographies: Spaces, Bodies and Rites of Passage*. London: Routledge, 142–56.
Chouinard, V. 1999b: Body politics: disabled women's activism in Canada and beyond. In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 269–94.
Chouinard, V. and Grant, A. 1995: On being not even anywhere near 'The Project': ways of putting ourselves in the picture. *Antipode* 27, 137–66.
Cox, K. R. and Golledge, R. G., eds. 1981: *Behavioral Problems in Geography Revisited*. London: Methuen.
Craddock, S. 1999: Embodying place: pathologizing Chinese and Chinatown in nineteenth-century San Francisco. *Antipode* 31, 351–71.
Craddock, S. and Dorn, M. 2001: Guest editorial: nationbuilding, gender, race, and medical discourse. *Journal of Historical Geography* 27, 313–18.
Cresswell, T. 1997: Weeds, plagues, and bodily secretions: a geographical interpretation of metaphors of displacement. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 87, 330–45.
Cresswell, T. 1999: Embodiment, power and the politics of mobility: the case of female tramps and hobos. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 24, 175–92.
Dear, M., Wilton, R., Gaber, S. L., and Takahashi, L. 1997: Seeing people differently: the sociospatial construction of disability. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15, 455–80.
Domosh, M. and Seager, J. 2001: *Putting Women in Place: Feminist Geographers Make Sense of the World*. New York: Guilford Press.
Dorn, M. 1998: Beyond nomadism: the travel narratives of a cripple. In H. Nast and S. Pile, eds., *Places Through the Body*. London: Routledge, 183–206.
Dorn, M. 1999: The moral topography of intemperance. In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 46–69.
Dorn, M. and Laws, G. 1994: Social theory, body politics and medical geography. *Professional Geographer* 46, 106–10.
Duncan, N. 1996: Renegotiating gender and sexuality in public and private spaces. In N. Duncan, ed., *BodySpace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. London: Routledge, 125–45.

Dyck, I. 1990: Space, time, and renegotiating motherhood: an exploration of the domestic workplace. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 8, 459–83.
Dyck, I. 1999: Body troubles: women, the workplace and negotiations of a disabled identity. In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 119–37.
Dyck, I. and Moss, P. 1999: Body, corporeal space, and legitimating chronic illness: women diagnosed with ME. *Antipode* 31, 372–97.
Elden, S. 2001: Politics, philosophy, geography: Henri Lefebvre in recent Anglo-American scholarship. *Antipode* 33, 809–25.
Elder, G. S. 1998: The South African body politic: space, race and heterosexuality. In H. Nast and S. Pile, eds., *Places Through the Body.* London: Routledge, 153–64.
Gathorne-Hardy, F. 1999: Accommodating difference: social justice, disability and the design of affordable housing. In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 240–55.
Gibson-Graham, J. K. 1998: Queer(y)ing globalization. In H. Nast and S. Pile, eds., *Places Through the Body*. London: Routledge, 23–41.
Gleeson, B. 1996: A geography for disabled people. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21, 387–96.
Gleeson, B. 1997: Community care and disability: the limits to justice. *Progress in Human Geography* 21, 199–224.
Gleeson, B. 1999a: *Geographies of Disability*. London: Routledge.
Gleeson, B. 1999b: Can technology overcome the disabling city? In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 98–118.
Goffman, I. 1963: *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. New York: The Free Press.
Golledge, R. G. 1993: Geography and the disabled: a survey with special reference to vision impaired and blind populations. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 18, 63–85.
Golledge, R. G. 1996: A response to Imrie and Gleeson. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21, 404–11.
Golledge, R. G. 1997: On reassembling one's life: overcoming disability in the academic environment. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15, 391–409.
Gregory, D. 1994: *Geographical Imaginations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Gregory, D. 1997: Lacan and geography: the production of space revisited. In G. Benko and U. Strohmayer, eds., *Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 203–31.
Gregson, N. and Rose, G. 2000: Taking Butler elsewhere: performativities, spatialities and subjectivities. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18, 433–52.
Grosz, E. 1994: *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Hägerstrand, T. 1967: *Innovation as a Spatial Process*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Hägerstrand, T. 1970: What about people in regional science? *Papers of the Regional Science Association* 24, 7–21.
Haraway, D. 1991: *Simians, Cyborgs and Women*. London: Free Association Books.
Harrison, P. 2000: Making sense: embodiment and the sensibilities of the everyday. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18, 497–517.
Harvey, D. 1989: *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Harvey, D. 1998: The body as an accumulation strategy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16, 401–21.
Harvey, D. 2000: *Spaces of Hope*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Hinchliffe, S. 2000: Performance and experimental knowledge: outdoor management training and the end of epistemology. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18, 575–95.

Imrie, R. 1996a: *Disability and the City: International Perspectives*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Imrie, R. 1996b: Ableist geographies, disableist spaces: towards a reconstruction of Golledge's 'Geography and the disabled.' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21, 397–403.

Imrie, R. 1999: The body, disability and Le Corbusier's conception of the radiant environment. In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 25–45.

Imrie, R. 2000: Disability and discourses of mobility and movement. *Environment and Planning A* 32, 1641–56.

Imrie, R. and Hall, P. 2001: *Inclusive Design: Designing and Developing Accessible Environments*. London: Routledge.

Ingham, J., Purvis, M., and Clarke D. B. 1999: Hearing places, making spaces: sonorous geographies, ephemeral rhythms, and the Blackburn warehouse parties. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 17, 283–305.

Johnson, L. C. 1994: What future for feminist geography? *Gender, Place and Culture* 1, 103–14.

Keith, M. and Pile, S. 1993: Introduction part 2: the place of politics. In M. Keith and S. Pile, eds., *Place and the Politics of Identity.* London: Routledge, 22–40.

Kesby, M. 1999: Locating and dislocating gender in rural Zimbabwe: the making of space and the texturing of bodies. *Gender, Place and Culture* 6, 27–47.

Knopp, L. 1992: Sexuality and the spatial dynamics of capitalism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10, 651–69.

Kobayashi, A. 1994: Coloring the field: gender, 'race,' and the politics of fieldwork. *Professional Geographer* 46, 73–80.

Landzelius, M. 2001: Contested representations: signification in the built environment. *The American Journal of Semiotics* 17, 139–99.

Latham, A. 1999: The power of distraction: distraction, tactility, and habit in the work of Walter Benjamin. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 17, 451–73.

Law, L. 2001: Home cooking: Filipino women and geographies of the senses in Hong Kong. *Ecumene* 8, 264–83.

Lefebvre, H. 1976: *The Survival of Capitalism*. London: Allison and Busby.

Lefebvre, H. 1991: *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ley, D. and Samuels, M., eds. 1978: *Humanistic Geography: Prospects and Problems*. Chicago: Maaroufa Press.

Leyshon, A., Matless, D., and Revill, G., eds. 1998: *The Place of Music*. New York: Guilford.

Longhurst, R. 1995: The body in geography. *Gender, Place and Culture* 2, 97–106.

Longhurst, R. 1997: (Dis)embodied geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 21, 486–501.

Longhurst, R. 1999: Pregnant bodies, public scrutiny: 'giving' advice to pregnant women. In E. K. Teather, ed., *Embodied Geographies: Spaces, Bodies and Rites of Passage*. London: Routledge, 78–90.

Longhurst, R. 2000: 'Corpogeographies' of pregnancy: 'bikini babes.' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18, 453–72.

Longhurst, R. 2001: *Bodies: Exploring Fluid Boundaries*. London: Routledge.

Massey, D. 1994: *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

McDowell, L. 1992: Doing gender: feminism, feminists and research methods in human geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 17, 399–416.

McDowell, L. 1995: Body work: heterosexual gender performances in city workplaces. In. D. Bell and G. Valentine, eds., *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. London: Routledge, 75–95.

McDowell, L. 1999: *Gender, Identity and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

McDowell, L. and Court, G. 1994: Performing work: bodily representations in merchant banks. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12, 727–50.

Merleau-Ponty, M. 1962: *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Merrifield, A. 1993: Place and space: a Lefebvrian reconciliation. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 18, 516–31.

Merrifield, A. 1995: Lefebvre, Anti-Logos and Nietzsche: an alternative reading of *The Production of Space*. *Antipode* 27, 294–303.

Miller, R. 1983: The Hoover in the garden: middle-class women and suburbanization, 1850–1920. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 1, 73–87.

Mills, S. 1996: Gender and colonial space. *Gender, Place and Culture* 3, 125–47.

Moore, G. T. and Golledge, R. G., eds. 1976: *Environmental Knowing: Theories, Research, and Methods*. Stroudsburg: Dowden, Hutchinson & Ross.

Moss, P. 1999: Autobiographical notes on chronic illness. In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 155–66.

Moss, P. and Dyck, I. 1996: Inquiry into environment and body: women, work, and chronic illness. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14, 737–53.

Moss, P. and Dyck, I. 2002: *Women, Body, Illness: Space and Identity in the Everyday Lives of Women with Chronic Illness*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Murdoch, J. 1997a: Inhuman/nonhuman/human: actor-network theory and the prospects for a nondualistic and symmetrical perspective on nature and society. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15, 731–56.

Murdoch, J. 1997b: Towards a geography of heterogeneous associations. *Progress in Human Geography* 21, 321–37.

Nash, C. 1994: Remapping the body/land: new geographies of identity, gender and landscape in Ireland. In A. Blunt and G. Rose, eds., *Writing Women and Space: Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies*. New York: Guilford Press, 227–50.

Nash, C. 1996: Reclaiming vision: looking at landscape and the body. *Gender, Place and Culture* 3, 149–69.

Nash, C. 2000: Performativity in practice: some recent work in cultural geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 24, 653–64.

Nast, H. 1998: The body as place: reflexivity and fieldwork in Kano, Nigeria. In H. Nast and S. Pile, eds., *Places Through the Body*. London: Routledge, 93–116.

Nast, H. and Kobayashi, A. 1996: Re-corporealizing vision. In N. Duncan, ed., *BodySpace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. London: Routledge, 75–93.

Nast, H. and Pile, S. 1998: Everydayplacesbodies. In H. Nast and S. Pile, eds., *Places Through the Body*. London: Routledge, 405–16.

Nelson, L. 1999: Bodies (and spaces) do matter: the limits of performativity. *Gender, Place and Culture 6*, 331–353.

Pain, R., Mowl, G., and Talbot, C. 2000: Difference and the negotiation of 'old age.' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18, 377–93.

Palm, R. and Pred, A. 1978: The status of American women: a time-geographic view. In D. A. Lanegran and R. Palm, eds., *An Invitation to Geography*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 99–109.

Park, D. C., Radford, J. P., and Vickers, M. H. 1998: Disability studies in human geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 22, 208–33.

Parr, H. 1997: Mental health, public space, and the city: questions of individual and collective access. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15, 435–54.

Parr, H. 1999: Bodies and psychiatric medicine: interpreting different geographies of mental health. In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 181–202.

Parr, H. 2002a: Medical geography: diagnosing the body in medical and health geography, 1999–2000. *Progress in Human Geography* 26, 240–51.

Parr, H. 2002b: New body-geographies: the embodied spaces of health and medical information on the Internet. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20, 73–95.

Parr, H. and Butler, R. 1999: New geographies of illness, impairment and disability. In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 1–24.

Pickles, J. 1985: *Phenomenology, Science and Geography: Spatiality and the Human Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pile, S. 1996: *The Body and the City: Psychoanalysis, Space and Subjectivity*. London: Routledge.

Pile, S. 1997: Introduction: opposition, political identities and spaces of resistance. In S. Pile and M. Keith, eds., *Geographies of Resistance*. London: Routledge, 1–32.

Pile, S. and Thrift, N. 1995: Conclusions: spacing and the subject. In S. Pile and N. Thrift, eds., *Mapping the Subject: Geographies of Cultural Transformation*. London: Routledge, 371–80.

Porteous, J. D. 1990: *Landscapes of the Mind: Worlds of Sense and Metaphor*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Pratt, G. 1998: Inscribing domestic work on Filipina bodies. In H. Nast and S. Pile, eds., *Places Through the Body.* London: Routledge, 283–304.

Pred, A. 1981: Social reproduction and the time-geography of everyday life. *Geografiska Annaler* 63B, 5–22.

Pred, A. 1984: Place as historically contingent process: structuration and the time-geography of becoming places. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 74, 279–87.

Pred, A. 1995: Out of bounds and undisciplined: social inquiry and the current moment of danger. *Social Inquiry* 64, 1065–91.

Pred, A. 2004: Scientists without borders, or moments of insight, spaces of re-cognition: situated practice, science, and the navigation of urban everyday life. In O. Kramsch, H. van Houtom, and W. Zierhofer, eds., *Bordering Space*. London: Ashgate.

Radcliffe, S. 1999a: Embodying national identities: *mestizo* men and white women in Ecuadorian racial-national imaginaries. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographer* 24, 213–25.

Radcliffe, S. 1999b: Popular and state discourses of power. In D. Massey, J. Allen, and P. Sarre, eds., *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 219–42.

Relph, E. 1976: *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion.

Revill, G. 2000: Music and the politics of sound: nationalism, citizenship, and auditory space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18, 597–613.

Rodaway, P. 1994: *Sensuous Geographies: Body, Sense and Place*. London: Routledge.

Rose, G. 1992: Geography as a science of observation: the landscape, the gaze and masculinity. In F. Driver and G. Rose, eds., *Nature and Science*. London: IBG, Historical Geography Research Services, 8–18.

Rose, G. 1993: *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rose, G. 1995: Distance, surface, elsewhere: a feminist critique of the space of phallocentric self/knowledge. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 13, 761–81.

Rose, G. 1997: Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivities and other tactics. *Progress in Human Geography* 21, 305–20.
Rose, G. 1999: Performing space. In D. Massey, J. Allen, and P. Sarre, eds., *Human Geography Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 247–59.
Schilder, P. 1935: *The Image and Appearance of the Human Body: Studies in the Constructive Energies of the Psyche*. London: Kegan Paul & Co.
Seager, J. 1997: Reading the morning paper, and on throwing out the body with the bathwater. *Environment and Planning A* 29, 1521–3.
Seamon, D. 1979: *A Geography of the Lifeworld*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Sharp, J. 1996: Gendering nationhood: a feminist engagement with national identity. In N. Duncan, ed., *BodySpace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. London: Routledge, 97–108.
Shields, R. 1989: Social spatialization and the built environment: the West Edmonton Mall. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 7, 147–64.
Shields, R. 1991: *Places on the Margin: Alternative Geographies of Modernity*. London: Routledge.
Shields, R. 1999: *Lefebvre, Love and Struggle: Spatial Dialectics*. London: Routledge.
Shilling, C. 2001: The embodied foundations of social theory. In G. Ritzer and B. Smart, eds., *Handbook of Social Theory.* London: Sage, 439–57.
Sibley, D. 1995: *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West*. London: Routledge.
Sibley, D. 1999: Creating geographies of difference. In D. Massey, J. Allen, and P. Sarre, eds., *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 115–28.
Smith, N. 1993: Homeless/global: scaling places. In J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, and L. Tickner, eds., *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Changes*. London: Routledge, 87–119.
Smith, N. and Katz, C. 1993: Grounding metaphor: towards a spatialized politics. In M. Keith and S. Pile, eds., *Place and the Politics of Identity*. London: Routledge, 67–83.
Smith, S. J. 1997: Beyond geography's visible worlds: a cultural politics of music. *Progress in Human Geography* 21, 502–29.
Smith, S. J. 2000: Performing the (sound)world. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18, 615–37.
Sparke, M. 1998: Mapped bodies and disembodied maps: (dis)placing cartographic struggle in colonial Canada. In H. Nast and S. Pile, eds., *Places Through the Body*. London: Routledge, 305–36.
Stewart, L. 1995a: Bodies, visions, and spatial politics: a review essay on Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space*. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 13, 609–18.
Stewart, L. 1995b: Louisiana subjects: power, space and the slave body. *Ecumene: A Journal of Environment, Culture and Meaning* 2, 227–46.
Sui, D. Z. 2000: Visuality, aurality, and shifting metaphors of geographical thought in the late twentieth century. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90, 322–43.
Thrift, N. 1983: On the determination of social action in space and time. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 1, 23–57.
Thrift, N. 1996: *Spatial Formations*. London: Sage.
Thrift, N. 1997a: Cities without modernity, cities with magic. *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 113, 138–49.
Thrift, N. 1997b: The still point: resistance, expressive embodiment and dance. In S. Pile and M. Keith, eds., *Geographies of Resistance*. London: Routledge, 124–51.
Thrift, N. 1999: Steps to an ecology of space. In D. Massey, J. Allen, and P. Sarre, eds., *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 295–322.

Thrift, N. 2000: Performing cultures in the new economy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90, 674–92.

Tuan, Y.-F. 1974: *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes and Values*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tuan, Y.-F. 1977: *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Turner, B. S. 2000: An outline of a general sociology of the body. In B. S. Turner, ed., *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell, 481–501.

Valentine, G. 1999a: Imagined geographies: geographical knowledges of self and other in everyday life. In D. Massey, J. Allen, and P. Sarre, eds., *Human Geography Today.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 47–61.

Valentine, G. 1999b: A corporeal geography of consumption. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 17, 329–51.

Valentine, G. 1999c: What it means to be a man: the body, masculinities, disability. In R. Butler and H. Parr, eds., *Mind and Body Spaces: Geographies of Illness, Impairment and Disability*. London: Routledge, 167–80.

Whatmore, S. 1999: Hybrid geographies: rethinking the 'human' in human geography. In D. Massey, J. Allen, and P. Sarre, eds., *Human Geography Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 22–39.

Williams, S. J. and Bendelow, G. 1998: *The Lived Body: Sociological Themes, Embodied Issues*. London: Routledge.

Yeoh, B. S. A. 1999: The body after death: place, tradition, and the nation-state in Singapore. In E. K. Teather, ed., *Embodied Geographies: Spaces, Bodies and Rites of Passage*. London: Routledge, 240–55.

Young, I. M. 1990a: *Throwing Like a Girl and Other Essays in Feminist Philosophy and Social Theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Young, I. M. 1990b: *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.