

TIME AND THE PRODUCTION OF SPACE IN SOCIOLOGY¹

Nearly fifty years ago, in 1974, Henri Lefebvre (2000a) became a forerunner for drawing sociologists' attention to the theoretical possibilities implicit in the simultaneous inquiry of the macro- and micro-social processes involved in (re-) generating space, which he defined as a "set of relations" between "things (objects and products)" (Lefebvre, 2000a: xx) inseparable from social practice – which he defined as activity, as use, as necessity, as "social being" (Lefebvre, 2000a:100).² Since then, the issue has remained a lively topic of theoretical debate in sociology. Discussion has mainly been concerned with how to conceptualize the elements involved in the social dynamics through which space is brought about.

Authors have, for example, focused on positions in social space (Bourdieu, 2003, 2013), on social connections between the production, usage, and appropriation of the spatial material "substrate" (Läpple, 1991), and more recently on actions (Löw, 2001, 2005; Baur, 2005; Schuster, 2010; Weidenhaus, 2015; Steets, 2015), especially communicative actions (Christmann, 2013, 2015; Knoblauch, 2017; Knoblauch & Löw, 2017). Other research objects include temporal structures (Rosa, 2005), social practices (Reckwitz, 2003, 2012), emotions and corporality (Lindón, 2009, 2012), along with historical time (Frehse, 2017). Within this debate, the production of space has been named "social construction" (Bourdieu, 2003, 2013; Lindón, 2009), "formation and structuration" (Läpple, 1991), or "constitution" (Löw, 2001, 2005; Baur, 2005; Schuster, 2010; Weidenhaus, 2015), and

“temporal structuration” (Rosa, 2005), as well as “communicative (re-)construction” (Christmann, 2013, 2015; Knoblauch, 2017), “meaningful construction” (Steets, 2015) or “re-figuration” (Knoblauch & Löw, 2017), not to mention the bonding of space and time in the social world (Reckwitz, 2003: 289), “spatiality” (Lindón, 2009, 2012; Reckwitz, 2012: 254), “social spatializing” (Reckwitz, 2012: 252), and the “production of space” as such (Frehse, 2017).

To put it briefly, the academic debate encompasses diverse theoretical accounts for conceptualizing the spatialization of particular social phenomena. In this way they have contributed to the sociological exploration of the theoretical issue of the production of space – a rubric that has found a place of its own in sociology, even among authors who do not address the phenomenon in Lefebvre’s dialectical terms (see for example Löw, 2001).

Taking this discussion as a point of departure, this paper addresses a different and so far mostly overlooked dimension of the issue: What is the production of space in *temporal* terms? Recalling Gottfried W. Leibniz’s (1966: 134) influential proposition on the difference between time and space – the first follows the logic of succession whereas the latter is an “order” of “the existences together”³ – we can note the tendency for the suffix “-tion” to be present in conceptualizations of the production of space. This suffix signals a *process*, a social phenomenon that is first and foremost *temporally* marked, regardless of the relative vagueness that impregnates the term “process” (Schützeichel & Jordan, 2015: 2). Hence, it is my intention to answer the question of what time in particular discloses about the sociospatial process under investigation.

Recognizing that the relations between time and space have been explored conceptually by Anglo-American geography since the 2000s (May & Thrift, 2001; Crang, 2005; Harvey, 2006) and that interdisciplinary research initiatives on the issue currently enliven the German-speaking context (Frehse, 2020: 5, 3n), my own epistemic standpoint to it is sociological – in other words, my “point of reference” is the “web of social interactions and relations” (Fernandes, 1959: 20-21). Therefore, my focus on time concerns the process rather than the space produced. Secondly, my assessment is that recent sociology only sparsely addresses this issue through a theoretically abstract sense of time. Indeed, my relative conceptual vagueness regarding time allows me to analyze the diverse theoretical approaches to time that have been employed to conceptualize the production of space. By contrast, the latest sociological debates on this issue examine the role of specific cultural expressions of time (memory, biography, and communication) within the sociospatial phenomenon (Christmann, 2013, 2015; Knoblauch, 2017: 189-215; Weidenhaus, 2015), along with the patterns of temporal change “in” space (Baur, 2005), or the impact of temporal structures “on” it (Rosa, 2005: 60-62).

In order to provide an empirical demonstration of what such an abstract phenomenon like time reveals about the equally abstract phenomenon of space

production, this paper's argumentative structure follows four steps. Recognizing (In search of the role of time in the spatialization of social life) that sociological approaches from the 1950s on have addressed the temporalities of their respective research objects by means of definite spatialities, one particular history of sociology comes to the forefront. This history (A methodological temporal-spatial history in the sociology of relational space) comprises four original ways of tackling the spatialization of social phenomena methodologically which were formulated by Erving Goffman, Henri Lefebvre, Pierre Bourdieu, and Martina Löw. The seven *temporal-spatial scales* implicit in these accounts (A simultaneously poly-temporal and poly-spatial process) suggest that the production of space is a simultaneously poly-temporal and poly-spatial social phenomenon. The temporalities and spatialities of the production of space contain (Conclusion) two methodological contributions to the recent sociological debate on the issue.

IN SEARCH OF THE ROLE OF TIME IN THE SPATIALIZATION OF SOCIAL LIFE

A first clue stems from a more or less tacit consensus that became established in the history of sociology between the 1930s and 1950s: the finding that social life encompasses the coexistence of socially produced orderings of time. In one way or another this discovery permeates theoretical frameworks as diverse as Alfred Schütz's (2016: 62-70) pioneering claim for the social "construction" of sense by means of various "inner durations" that he further located within the "temporal structure of the everyday lifeworld" (Schütz & Luckmann, 2003: 81-97); Robert Merton and Piritim Sorokin's (1937) emphasis on "social time" as a qualitative variable of a social group's beliefs and customs; Georges Gurvitch's (1969) focus on socially coexisting "multiple social times"; Edward E. Evans-Pritchard's (1940) statement about the coexistence of culturally multiple concepts and practices of time; as well as Lefebvre's 1953 approach to the "historical dates" of social relations (Lefebvre, 2001: 65-66; see also Frehse, 2014).

This bibliographic array shows that sociology has empirically demonstrated that social life is underpinned by various *temporalities*, i.e., by socially produced orderings of cyclic and linear repetitions that, once measured, make up time (Lefebvre, 1992: 17, 99).⁴ Hence, my issue question becomes more straightforward: what do the temporalities of social life conceptually reveal about the production of space?

In order to select the social temporalities to be analytically addressed, a second trait in the history of sociology becomes relevant. Since the 1950s, a specific range of works has expanded the discussion about the role of space in social life (Frehse, 2013: 9). These texts have focused on the spatialization of social phenomena and, hence, developed theoretical contributions to the social phenomenon of space production. Indeed, these accounts more or less explicitly conceive space in relational terms – as a product of the relations that hu-

man beings nurture with one another and with material/symbolic goods in places through their bodies (Löw, 2001).

Based on this criterion, my referential set of accounts here ranges from Lefebvre's ponderings on everyday life and the production of space (1958, 1961, 1968, 1970a, 1970b, 1974, 1992, 2000a, 2000b, 2001, 2009) to the aforementioned and recent sociological debate on this issue, as well as Erving Goffman's reflections on social interaction (1959, 1961, 1963, 1967, 1971, 1983a, 1983b). Methodologically speaking, these studies form part of a corpus of sociological documentary material that I submitted to "record linkage" analysis, a primary methodological device for historical research (Winchester, 1973: 40).

From this point onwards, I present the results of a documentary investigation of common patterns in how the aforementioned authors have methodologically addressed temporal categories when theorizing about the spatialization of their respective research objects. These temporalities are part of the conceptual makeup of each author's methodology.⁵

One first crucial finding concerns the fact that the set of studies analyzed here use three different kinds of social temporalities in order to conceptualize the spatial dimension of their objects. First, there is what I call *immediacy*, a condensed term for the "now" that underpins most of the corpus (Goffman, Lefebvre, Löw, Baur, Rosa, Lindón, Schuster, Reckwitz, Christmann, Weidenhaus, Steets, Knoblauch, Frehse). Second, albeit more sparsely, there is *historicity* in the sense of an entanglement between categories related to the past, present and future (Lefebvre, Frehse). Finally, some studies explicitly use *history* as a diachronic sequence of social transformations brought about by powerful social forces (Bourdieu, Läßle, Rosa).

By considering these three temporalities, the conceptual challenge put forth by this paper is to identify what *they* disclose about the production of space.

The answer lies in combining these temporalities with a second thought-provoking feature of the corpus: space. Regardless of their diverse theoretical frameworks, whether consciously or not, all the selected authors address the social elements implicit in the production of space by coupling specific temporal categories from the aforementioned threefold set with definite spatialities. These spatial categories can also be ordered into a threefold set, but now one comprising spatial-sociological abstractions. I refer here, respectively, to the *situation* as a term that encompasses the spatial boundaries of social interaction (Goffman, Lefebvre, Löw, Rosa, Lindón, Schuster, Reckwitz, Christmann, Weidenhaus, Steets, Knoblauch, Frehse); to the *everyday* as a spatial level of social reality which implies repetitive, socially taken-for-granted uses of cyclic and linear temporal rhythms (Lefebvre, Löw, Baur, Rosa, Lindón, Schuster, Reckwitz, Christmann, Weidenhaus, Steets, Knoblauch, Frehse); and, finally, to the equally diversely defined *social space* (all of the authors), a sociological abstrac-

tion that throughout the discipline's history has been associated with what socially separates and unites individuals in groups (Frehse, 2016: 4).

In light of this common methodological denominator, we are not just reminded of the relatively long-standing philosophical assertion that time is inseparable from space (Lefebvre, 2000a: 204; May & Thrift, 2001; Crang, 2005; Weidenhaus, 2015): more importantly, we can concretely proceed to explore what the sociological temporalities at stake conceptually reveal about the production of space. Therefore, we only have to re-analyze the corpus chronologically in search of accounts that, at the time of their publication, may be considered original in terms of their methodologies of *how* to combine temporalities and spatialities when it comes to conceptualizing the spatialization of social life.

A METHODOLOGICAL TEMPORAL-SPATIAL HISTORY IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF RELATIONAL SPACE

Based on this selection criterion, I arrived at four approaches. These are Goffman's considerations of the spatial dimension of face-to-face interaction; Lefebvre's theoretical project on the production of space; Pierre Bourdieu's focus on the relationship between social and physical space; and Martina Löw's theory of the constitution of space.

As we shall see below, the differences between these approaches are inseparable from their authors' theoretical ambitions. After all, theories "aim" at a coherent and consistent connection between concepts, which results in "a theoretical explanation" (Knoblauch, 2017: 10); or, to put it briefly, they exist on behalf of a knowledge that may be generalized (Fernandes, 1959: 32). From this epistemic standpoint, Goffman and Lefebvre have two things in common, while the approaches of Bourdieu and Löw share one definite aspect. The first two are equally based on a rather unsystematic approach to their respective research issues (see Smith, 2006, and Frehse, 2017: 515, respectively); moreover, each one's aim is to develop an empirically grounded conceptualization – rather than a full-fledged theory. In comparison, the works of Bourdieu and Löw explicitly set out to provide "theories" (Bourdieu, 1972; Löw, 2001).

The immediacy of both the situation and social space

By conceiving social interaction as reciprocal influences and hence communicative sequences of behaviors by individuals who are physically co-present (Goffman, 1959: 23; 1961: 28; 1963: 8; 1967: 1; 1971: x; 1983b: 2), both "body idiom" (Goffman, 1963: 34) and materiality play a crucial role in Goffman's conceptualization of the socially established and morally loaded symbolic patterns implicit precisely in social interaction. In his early writing, the author assumed the "conventionalized discourse" implicit in human "physical appearance" and "personal acts" (Goffman, 1963: 34) to function as a sign that helps us define the

spatial environment circumscribed by interaction. A similar role is assigned to artefacts and objects either employed or involved therein (Goffman, 1959: 29-31; 1963: 18).

Against this background, my initial interest lies in the temporal framework that underpins Goffman's explanation of social interaction: the now-and-then of "immediacy" (see for example Goffman, 1959: 23; 1961: 19; 1963: 8; 1967: 1; 1971: xi; 1983b: 2). In this way, he developed a singular approach to a social phenomenon that had already begun to be investigated by his predecessors at Chicago, Charles Cooley and George H. Mead (Goffman, 1963: 16). They, in turn, owed much to the pragmatist roots of Chicago sociology and (therefore) to its receptivity to phenomenology (Dennis, Philburn & Smith, 2013: 8-62).

I thus arrive at my second point of interest: Goffman soon recognized the need for a referential spatial setting in order to gain an analytical comprehension of the social order implicit in the "rules of conduct" that intermediate temporally instantaneous contacts (Goffman, 1967: 48; 1963: 3). Therefore, he uniquely adapted William I. and Dorothy S. Thomas's influential Chicago theorem that "[i]f men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (Thomas & Thomas, 1928: 521-522). Initially conceived as the set of information and actions conveyed by individual to others "when in co-presence" (Goffman, 1959: 15), the situation soon became defined as a "projective field" (Goffman, 1961: 102) and, two years later, as "the full spatial environment anywhere within which an entering member becomes a member of the gathering that is (or does then become present)" (Goffman, 1963: 18; 1971: 28; 1983b: 2). The influence of the environmental psychologist Roger Barker and his concept of "behavior setting" is clear (Frehse, 2016: 9). This approach renders a spatial quality to the concept of situation rather than its subjective and temporal dimensions, which are commonly explored in phenomenological sociology (Schütz & Luckmann, 2003: 86-87; Knoblauch, 2017: 302).

However, it is important to point out that although Goffman focused on the immediacy of the situation, he sometimes emphasized that an adequate conceptualization of face-to-face interaction would be impossible without addressing the normative order implicit in the "mere-situated aspect of situated activity" – that is, what happens "in situations without being of situations" (Goffman, 1963: 22; 1983b: 2). And what would this be? A more precise answer can be found in two posthumous texts in which the author argues that, although he himself personally moved away from this research area in favor of promoting the "acceptance of this face-to-face domain as an analytical viable one" (Goffman, 1983b: 4; see also 1983a: 200), the connection between the "occasions" of face-to-face interaction and the "macro-order" encompassing "other orders of social, economic, political, etc. life" remains a "problem" (Goffman, 1983a: 201-202). These ponderings are a subliminal indication of Goffman's conceptual sensitivity to the fact that interaction is also spatially attributable to im-

mediacy. Indeed, in spatial terms this immediacy is tied to what I call social space. For the author, social space is inseparable from interactionally unstable social positions (Frehse, 2016: 6).

By simultaneously mobilizing both temporal-spatial pairs, Goffman ultimately develops a peculiar conceptualization of the production of space. He suggests that this process concerns everything that happens among embodied individuals both *here* and *all over the world*, but in temporal terms particularly now. In sum, space is produced within the temporally and spatially restricted boundaries of social interaction.

The historicity of the situation, of the everyday and of social space

Lefebvre, in turn, provides a comprehensive set of three temporal-spatial combinations for empirically addressing the production of space in both phenomenological and historical terms. This theoretical broadness is no random by-product. Rather, the amplitude is inseparable from the author's decade-long association with the regressive-progressive method (Frehse, 2014: 246), which explicitly supports *La production de l'espace* (Lefebvre, 2000a: 79). Including both an operational and an interpretative facet, the approach helps to analytically identify and conceptually explain the historical possibilities of social transformation at the phenomenal level of "the everyday" that is lived in diverse empirically given research locations (Lefebvre, 2001: 63-78; for details see Frehse, 2014).

Indeed, the author's theoretical framework stems from a critical "return" to Marx's dialectical method, which directly implies a special attention to the historical temporalities of "past," "present" and "future," the last of which is conceived by Lefebvre as "the possible" (Lefebvre, 1961: 121). His "transductive" way of thinking is accompanied by theoretical cum empirical inquiries into society's (and simultaneously humankind's) contradictory and more or less alienated relations between the past, the present, and that which is possible (in the future). The historical possibilities of social transformation depend on overcoming social contradictions of a historical nature, whose various temporalities coexist in the referential present time (Lefebvre, 2001: 101).

This helps us understand why, long before addressing the production of space, Lefebvre's main research object had already been the contradictory nature of "praxis," or social practice, in everyday life. This interest formed part of his life-long project of the so-called critique of everyday life and its analytically decisive rhythm analysis (Frehse, 2018: 101-102). In everyday life as the simultaneously most evident and indiscernible "level of social life" (Lefebvre, 1961: 56), every act – that is, "the dialectical relation between nature and human beings" – contains the possibility of either being repeated, mimicking models, or "inventing" discontinuities within the "global socio-historical process" (Lefebvre, 1974: 41, 47). Therefore, both social practice and everyday life are his-

torical products *en acte*. In other words, the immediacy of each and every situational moment bears the possibility of definite entanglements between the past, the present and the possible. To put it briefly: immediacy and historicity coexist within social practice (Lefebvre, 2000a: 74).

In light of this overarching theoretical framework, Lefebvre's detailed focus on the "problematics of space" during the 1970s is unsurprising. It was sparked by the fact that "by involving both the problematics of the urban (the city, its extension) and of the everyday (programmed consumption), the issue of space relocates the problematic of industrialization without abolishing it, given that pre-existing social relations subsist, and the new problem concerns precisely their reproduction" (Lefebvre, 2000a: 107, original emphasis). At that moment the author had already developed what may be summed up as a "diagnosis of society" (Knoblauch, 2017: 17). This diagnosis revolves around the argument that post-war capitalism was strongly mediated by a particular and taken-for-granted "employment of time" within everyday life: "the everyday" (Lefebvre, 1968: 51). This peculiar "space-time" is grounded in the temporally linear "programming" of everyday life by bureaucracy, consumption and the state, and simultaneously shaped by the temporal contradictions that characterize the everyday as such: the cyclic rhythms of "the Feast" (Lefebvre, 1968: 140, 125, 73). For Lefebvre, this historically specific product was an important mediation of alienation in the twentieth century (Lefebvre, 1968: 51). The temporal paroxysm of the everyday is precisely "everydayness," whose characteristic spatial expression is the planned "new city" (Lefebvre, 1968: 116, 115), that is, a definite (urban) space. Subsequently, the city and "the urban" became Lefebvre's specific research objects (Lefebvre, 2009, 1970a, 1970b: 128-129, 2001, 2000b), until space itself received attention as a socially produced mediation of social practice (Lefebvre, 2000a: xx): it implies, contains, and dissimulates social relations (Lefebvre, 2000a: 100), which in turn only exist "in and through" space (Lefebvre, 2000a: 465).

In this way, the temporalities and spatialities involved in Lefebvre's conception of the production of space eventually become transparent. The *historicity of the everyday, of the situation and of social space* appear when we unpack the author's methodological approach to the book's central thesis: "(Social) space is a (social) product" (Lefebvre, 2000a: 35).

One methodologically decisive implication of this statement is the fact that social space "contains" social relations of reproduction and production as well as – especially under capitalism – representations of the same relations (Lefebvre, 2000a: 41-42). Hence, in order to conceptualize the production of space the researcher must empirically focus on relations of reproduction and production, and on representations. But where, in spatial terms, may these be found empirically? They appear in *the everyday*: "Everything ('the everything') puts its weight over the inferior level, the 'micro,' the local and the locatable:

on the everyday. Everything ('the everything') rests on it: the exploration and domination, protection and oppression, inseparably" (Lefebvre, 2000a: 422; original emphasis).

What remains open-ended is how to tackle analytically the production of space in this spatiality. The answer lies in assuming space to be a product of both spatially mediated social practice (hence, "spatial practice," which simultaneously comprises production and reproduction) and representations (or more precisely, under capitalism, "representations of space" and "spaces of representation" – Lefebvre, 2000a: 42-43). This premise makes it possible to recognize that "*the body*" (Lefebvre, 2000a: 50, original emphasis) – which the author later equated with "the everyday lived," or "*le vécu quotidien*" (Lefebvre, 1992: 18) – is the major (methodological) "reference" for "understanding" space in the three (dialectical) moments through which this same space is produced: i.e., in the "perceived – the conceived – the lived" (Lefebvre, 2000a: 50). Indeed, the body is simultaneously underpinned by the dialectical bonds that spatially (re)produced social practices nurture with both rational-scientific conceptions of space (those of experts, planners, urbanists; of "agencing" and "fragmenting" technocrats; and of "some artists close to scientificity") and "images and symbols" of this same space (those of so-called "dwellers" and "users," but also "some artists," writers and philosophers).

Hence, at least under capitalism, the production of space must be methodologically addressed by focusing on the immediacy of the everyday. This is expressed simultaneously in and through the space that is bodily perceived and symbolically lived amid the rationally loaded conceptions that underpin it. However, this immediacy is not the Goffmanian "now." Regardless of "always, nowadays, and formerly" being a "present" space, the latter simultaneously bears traces, inscriptions of the past, "the writing of time" (Lefebvre, 2000a: 47). Therefore, Lefebvre focuses on two specific spatialities: "[l]ived situations" (Lefebvre, 2000a: 42) and the everyday, where these same situations take place. In light of empirically given and thus immediately perceived and lived situations – and hence belonging to the everyday that comprises them – the *historicity of the situation and of the everyday* seems to matter just as much.⁶

In light of all this, Lefebvre's conceptualization of the production of space involves the methodological use of a third crucial temporal-spatial combination – what I have thus far been calling the *historicity of social space*. Yet the author uses these terms differently.

For Lefebvre, "social space" summarizes productive forces and relations of production: the "sensorial-sensual (practical-sensitive) space." In other words, the empirically perceived and lived space is only a "layer" of "social space" (Lefebvre, 2000a: 243-244). In turn, the temporality employed for addressing this implication of the book's main thesis is "history": Lefebvre argues that "[i]f there is a production and a productive process of space, there is *history*," the

history of space, of its production as a “reality” (Lefebvre, 2000a: 57; added emphasis). This notion concerns the dialectical periodization of the “productive process” of space based on the analytic identification of social contradictions that, being implicit in historically former spaces, intervene in the possibilities for the historical transformation of spaces generated by subsequent modes of production. Thus, nature-loaded “absolute space” may be dialectically present in the communal “historical space,” and both of these may again appear in the functionalistic and quantified “abstract space.” The latter, in turn, though dominant in capitalism, is not without contradictions and itself contains the possibility of “differential space.” Its contradictions, for their part, stem from historically both new *and* old conflictual relations of production (contradictions “of” and “in” space – Lefebvre, 2000a: 384-385).

In a nutshell, this dialectical history of space should not be equated with a causal enchainment of so-called historical (dated) facts (Lefebvre, 2000a: 57), since it dialectically combines the past, the present and the possible. Therefore, I consider it heuristically more precise to propose that we continue to explore a methodological use of historicity as a temporality. But now historicity is connected to social space.

The immediacy and the history of social space

A third original set of temporal-spatial combinations underlies two papers by Bourdieu of the early 1990s: a posthumously published manuscript and a chapter containing a modified version of this manuscript (Bourdieu 2013, 2003). These texts address an issue hitherto a blind spot in the sociologist’s theory of practice (Bourdieu, 1972, 1980, 1989): the (material) spatialization of social space. In this way, they also convey a singular approach to the production of space, which becomes evident in the tense relationship between social space and physical space in Bourdieu’s singular definition.

Social space is again conceived as “fields,” that is, as a set of symbolically impregnated social relations that ultimately define social positions. They do so by means of the economic, social and cultural capital that individual “agents” accumulate in their trajectory throughout social space and express in their “habitus” – that is, in the simultaneously structured and structuring dimension of cognition and motivation implicit in practices and representations (Bourdieu, 2013: 133; see also Bourdieu 1972, 1989).

But social space may become spatially more precise. One only has to pair it with physical space, which is defined by the “reciprocal exteriority of the parts,” since agents and things are “bodies and biological individuals” and, as such, are located in places in a physically non-ubiquitous manner. Conversely, social space concerns the “mutual exclusion (or distinction) of the positions that constitute it” (Bourdieu, 2013: 133).

I am aware that the author's equation between physical and social space lies within a conceptual debate as to whether Bourdieu's "physical space" contradicts the relational framework that underpins his approach to social space (Löw, 2001: 179-183; Ruhne, 2003: 175). Somewhat differently, my interest here lies in the temporalities and spatialities employed by the author when he argues that social space "tends to translate itself in more or less rigorous terms into physical space by means of a definite distributive arrangement both of the agents and properties," that is, of appropriated things (Bourdieu, 2013: 133). Returning to Leibniz, Bourdieu (2013: 133) proposes a "correspondence" between a definite order of coexistences of the agents and a definite order of coexistences between the properties, later referring to physical space as "a social construction and a projection of social space" (Bourdieu, 2013: 136).

Both synonyms for the production of space evoke the processual character of this phenomenon. But what is its temporality? Like Goffman, whose work Bourdieu (1982) admired, the French sociologist focuses on *immediacy*. And this is accompanied by *history*. After all, the methodologically decisive spatiality is *social space*. According to Bourdieu, the "transformation of social space into physically appropriated space" is an "effect of the structure of spatial distribution of public and private resources and goods," which in turn is "a crystallization of all the history of the units in the considered local basis (region, departments [i.e., French territorial-administrative divisions]) at a given moment in time" (Bourdieu, 2013: 141). We are thus faced with two simultaneous temporal layers concerning social space. The first relates to the agents' immediate position in social space, which translates into "spatial structures" through arrangements of the agents' "*body movements, poses and postures*" (Bourdieu, 2013: 134; original emphasis; Bourdieu, 2003). This is how social space becomes the "physically appropriated space." The second temporal layer, in turn, concerns the previous history of social space *en acte*, i.e., the trajectory of all preceding conflicts, which, by being intermediated by symbolic power, are implicit in social space ("units") at a definite temporal moment ("in time").

What therefore comes to the methodological forefront is precisely a set of two temporal-spatial articulations. The immediacy and history of social space make it easier to understand Bourdieu's main thesis regarding the production of space: places have synchronic effects on social positions; or, in other words, there are "effects of place," as announced in the title of the modified version of the manuscript published by the author (Bourdieu, 2003). These effects are due to both the immediate and historical ways through which the habitus as "embodied history" (Bourdieu, 1989: 82) contributes to "making" the habitat (Bourdieu, 2013: 139). The decisive aspect here concerns the synchronic correspondences between positions in both the historically constructed and the immediately given social space (Bourdieu, 2013: 141), as well as in places that exist in "the reified social space or appropriated physical space" (Bourdieu, 2013: 137).

The immediacy of the situation, the everyday and social space

In search of a uniquely broad combination of spatialities concerning *immediacy* – namely, the *situation*, the *everyday* and *social space* – we must turn to Löw's (2001, 2005) approach to the “constitution” of space as a relationally social product resulting from the order(-ing) of human (living) beings and social goods of both material and symbolic natures in places. In fact, the author's actor-oriented concept of space also aims to establish a dialogue between the way in which Bourdieu links habitus action and structures (Löw, 2001: 132) and his concept of “field,” which proposes to pay analytic attention simultaneously to the relations between human beings and between them and social goods (Löw, 2001: 156). However, given that Löw adopts a “dual” methodological perspective regarding the relationship between action and social structures (Löw, 2001: 171-172), she mainly relies on the structuration theory of Anthony Giddens when it comes to addressing the production of space.

For Löw, this process implies that two particular kinds of actions produce space through the specific way in which they recursively reproduce social structures (in other words, institutional rules and resources) via a mainly “practical conscience” of humans (a non-reflexive knowledge that is also bodily and emotionally based). It does not matter that a discursive (reflexive) conscience may also enter the scene (Löw, 2001: 158-172). If actions are practices of spacing – which concern locating human beings and/or material/symbolic goods (Löw, 2001: 158) – and synthesis – that is, the symbolic connection of these beings and goods in respectively their perception, memory, and abstract representations (Löw, 2001: 199) – then what remains an open question is *how* space is constituted by the recursive reproduction of social structures by action through human practical and discursive consciences.

At this point the argument concerning immediacy becomes methodologically significant. Löw's approach is explicitly grounded on an essentially Giddensian assumption regarding the understanding of social processes: “Routines are integral both to the continuity of the personality of the agent, [...] and to the institutions of society” (Giddens, 1984: 60; Löw, 2001: 163). In Löw's words, “[a]s a general rule, human beings act repetitively” (Löw, 2001: 161). This implies the simultaneous “development of a set of habitual actions” (Löw, 2001: 161) and the reproduction of institutions in routines (Löw, 2001: 163), which underlie an essentially “repetitive everyday” (Löw, 2001: 161). If the recurrent everyday is conceptually decisive for understanding how actions simultaneously constitute institutions (Giddens) and space (Löw), my interest here resides in how this temporal reference regarding the everyday interferes with the constitution of space in Löw's approach. Although Löw does not explicitly address the issue, she demonstrates a strong analytical sensitivity to the bodily dimension of spacing and synthesis, as well as to the ways in which bodies reproduce spatial structures (Löw, 2001: 153-157, 173-218). This emphasis indirectly suggests that,

for Löw, the sociospatial process arises from the instantaneous effect of the practices of spacing and synthesis on institutions. This happens by means of the *institutional* rules and resources of which these practices are, in turn, an instantaneous effect. In brief, immediacy is the determinant temporality.

However, as in the three aforementioned cases, this temporality is mobilized together with singular spatialities. Based on everything said thus far, it should come as no surprise that, first, there is conceptual space left for the everyday. Although not defined as such, Löw's explicit reference to German phenomenological conceptions about "taken-for-granted everyday life" (Löw, 2001: 19) suggests that the everyday is a decisive spatial realm where practices of spacing and synthesis are immediately repeated/routinized and, in so doing, constitute space as a conceptual abstraction (Löw, 2001: 131).

Given the phenomenologically sensitive nature of Löw's approach, one could ask whether she somehow addresses the micro-sociology involved in the immediate bodily routinization of action that brings about space. Indeed, the answer may be found in a second spatiality: the situation. Inspired by sociologist Reinhard Kreckel's thoughts on both the material and symbolic dimension of action, Löw (2001: 192) conceives the situation as "situation of action." She thereby proposes that "the possibilities" of constituting space also depend on symbolic and material "factors" found in a given situation of action. After all, actions always depend on the situation, which, in turn, encompasses both material and symbolic "components" (Löw, 2001: 191-192).

The third and final spatiality becomes evident when we remember that the process at stake follows the logic of the "duality of space" (Löw, 2001: 171). We have already seen that the immediacy of the practices of spacing and synthesis that bring about space takes place in the actor's everyday, which comprises various situations of action. But it also simultaneously takes place in what I have been terming social space. By adapting Giddens's theory to her theoretical needs, Löw assumes that the term "structure" is "an isolable set of recursively institutionalized rules and resources (Löw, 2001: 178). This allows her to synthesize what she conceives as the abstract outcome of a "coaction" of diverse "structures": the social structure, which, in turn, comprises spatial, economic, legal and those social structures based on "structural principles" such as class and gender (Löw, 2001: 168, 179), as well as ethnicity (Löw, 2005: 266). This characterization enables us to deduce that the abstraction in question possesses a specific spatial nature. Indeed, it concerns the structural dimension of social space, although this also possesses a processual dimension, one that both Giddens and Löw interrogate through the concept of "constitution."

Based on this temporally and spatially far-reaching, albeit concise, inquiry into the history of sociology across three different national-academic settings,

it becomes clear that over the last seven decades the discipline has been underpinned by at least four original conceptualizations regarding the production of space. Although their influence extends to other theoretical developments related to this issue, it would be impossible to explore these ramifications within the limits of this paper.⁷

Instead, what matters most here is the temporal-spatial singularity of the respective methods of interpretation. The diversity of theoretical frameworks did not prevent their authors from using sets of temporalities and spatialities that uniquely reveal the sociospatial process at stake.

A SIMULTANEOUSLY POLY-TEMPORAL AND POLY-SPATIAL PROCESS

A synoptic table of the seven aforementioned temporal-spatial combinations helps us reach the core of the argument:

Temporality	Spatiality		
	situation	the everyday	social space
immediacy	Goffman Löw	Löw	Goffman Bourdieu Löw
historicity	Lefebvre	Lefebvre	Lefebvre
history			Bourdieu

Firstly, the scheme indicates why Goffman, towards the end of his life, concluded that “the majority of my works do not offer concepts for the study of everyday life,” addressing instead “forms of interaction,” while “all that we know about the macro world, [...] the class and cast relations, etc. happens and is produced during face-to-face interactions” (Goffman, 1983a: 200-201). Given that this phenomenon is empirically approachable via morally laden rules of conduct, the immediacy of the situation and social space may be seen as two temporal-spatial assortments, suggesting that the production of space is a process of temporal reproduction of both situations and social space, here and now. Goffman’s approach does not afford much conceptual leeway when it comes to situational or social-spatial inventions regarding the unpredictable.

A very similar impression emerges with respect to Bourdieu’s two temporal-spatial combinations. If the author’s oeuvre is underpinned by a concep-

tual focus on social reproduction, the same applies to the relationship between social and physical space: the “object” of “struggles for space” is “*the construction of spatially-based homogeneous groups*”; in other words, “the reproduction of these groups” (Bourdieu, 2013: 138, original emphasis). Indeed, the sociospatially reproductive character of the production of space becomes empirically evident when social space is approached from the methodological standpoint of two different temporalities: not only Goffmanian immediacy, but also its diachronic trajectory, namely the history of the same social space at a given temporal moment. Although the habitus simultaneously comprises “structured” and “structuring” dispositions, for Bourdieu social space materializes in physical space through the immediate ways in which the habitus converts one empirically given structure and history of social positions into the specific, mainly reproductive, bodily-mediated cognitions and motivations that underpin the structure of the appropriated physical space.

Social reproduction also manifests itself as an essential trait of Löw’s constitution of space. Although the author emphasizes that “structural changes” – which include spatial structures – are “thinkable,” she also stresses that these same structures are “mostly durable,” given their institutional embeddedness (Löw, 2001: 188). From an action-theoretical standpoint, “social change” with its spatial implications – literally a *production* of space – presupposes an “organized reflexivity” embedded in “collective practices.” Or, put more precisely, “a recourse both to relevant rules and resources and to collective action” (Löw, 2001: 188).

Nevertheless, it is important to add that this reproductive state of – social – affairs is accompanied by a conceptually singular receptivity to possible spatial invention, hence production. As the table shows, Löw’s approach is uniquely comprehensive in methodological terms when it comes to adopting immediacy in order to address spatialities ranging from the situation to social space, as well as the everyday, which, following this author, is underpinned by situations. This rather phenomenological, actor-oriented perspective informs Löw’s understanding that although individual structures tend to reproduce themselves, there is always a possibility of “*individual changes in relation to the initial position*” (Löw, 2001: 189, emphasis added).

In search of a less unilateral view of the production of space as an essentially reproductive process, Lefebvre offers a bodily-mediated dialectic between social production and reproduction – (*re*)production. Indeed, the table indicates that the simultaneous possibility of these processes is spatially embedded in the situation, in the everyday – which, according to this author, comprises lived situations – and in social space. But why? We should not forget the author’s dialectical epistemic “reference framework” for addressing human reality in both theoretical and practical terms: an open-ended and contradictory “totality” (Lefebvre, 1961: 181). If all of this seems too philosophical, we also need

to remember that this standpoint implies a unique receptiveness to historicity, as demonstrated by the scheme. Lefebvre is methodologically highly sensitive to the question of what the empirically given (contradictory) relations between the past and the present of various spatialities can reveal about future possibilities regarding the production of space. This methodological sensitivity surely plays a role in this author's conceptual emphasis on the open-endedness of the process. His approach suggests that the temporal traits of the sociospatial phenomenon depend on how the historicities of the different spatialities are empirically combined within the spatial practice. Of course, this is not to deny that the production of space in neocapitalism is predominantly reproductive. The crucial conceptual aspect is that due to its own (theoretical-practical) nature, the process is simultaneously full of contradictions – of and in space.

In light of all these partial ponderings, the seven temporal-spatial combinations summarized in the synoptic table may finally be considered altogether. From this standpoint, they first become components of a methodological toolset for coping especially with two temporalities implicit in the production of space as a social phenomenon. Depending on the theoretical lenses under which the process is methodologically addressed, it either *mostly* or *simultaneously* reproduces itself in temporal terms.

Hence, in relation to the research question explored here, the seven temporal-spatial articulations first signal that, in conceptual terms, the production of space is bi-temporal. As the processual logics of linearity implicit in the suffix “-ion” seem to imply, things *either* change or not, or they *simultaneously* transform themselves *and* do not.

However, the seven temporal-spatial articulations also suggest that there are more temporalities – alongside spatialities – at play. Hence, we finally arrive at this paper's key statement. Each combination is a methodological tool through which the aforementioned sociologists either explicitly or implicitly address specific temporal-spatial dimensions of the social phenomenon at stake: the immediacy or the historicity of the situation, the everyday, and social space, as well as the history of this same social space. By considering this aspect, we are led to a methodological standpoint of a disciplinary nature regarding the conceptualization of the production of space. Each tool is a *temporal-spatial scale* mobilized within the relational-spatial sociological debate theorizing this process. I freely borrow the term temporal-spatial scale from biology as it heuristically helps me underline that sociology, as a disciplinary field, seems especially receptive to the fact that the bi-temporality, which at first glance characterizes the production of space, may be conceptually approached by means of seven temporal-spatial sets that entirely contradict the temporal linearity suggested by the suffix “-ion” in Western common sense.

Underpinned by these methodological procedures, sociology offers a specific conception about the production of space to the scientific debate on

this issue. Not only are space and time multiple, but the same applies to the social phenomenon that brings about space (and hence also time, whose production has not been addressed here, however, due to my interest precisely in space). The production of space is underlain by *at least* seven simultaneous couples of temporalities-spatialities. In principle the methods of interpretation of the four aforementioned approaches coexist with the possibility of other temporal-spatial couplings, which only future research on still unexplored conceptual frameworks may disclose. Indeed, the production of space is both a poly-temporal and poly-spatial social phenomenon.

CONCLUSION

Against the backdrop of the present findings, this paper and its argumentative structure appear in a different light. This study presents the step-by-step procedures of a singular methodological approach to empirically identifying the poly-temporality cum poly-spatiality implicit in this social phenomenon with the aid of sociological explorations of this issue. To this end, I turned these approaches into sociological documentary sources. Within this broad corpus, I focused on four approaches to the process. I subsequently examined their methodological use of temporalities of social life while explaining the interference of their respective research objects in the production of space. What hence came to the conceptual forefront was a common analytical sensitivity to specific spatialities. Furthermore, these temporal-spatial combinations were especially revealing in methodological terms. From this standpoint, they may be conceived as sociological temporal-spatial scales for theoretically addressing the production of space.

I now arrive at the issue of the usefulness of all these temporalities and spatialities – and hence at a first contribution of my own temporal-spatial-scales approach to the recent sociological discussion on the production of space. My claim is that identifying the diverse temporal-spatial scales used by authors provides a unique way of assessing the empirical reach of their corresponding conceptualizations of the production of space.

As I have demonstrated elsewhere (Frehse, 2017), Lefebvre's singular sensitivity to the historicity of the situation, the everyday, and social space has proven to be especially revealing for recent studies of mine (2007-2014) of the relations that socially marginalized pedestrians of São Paulo (re)establish daily with each other and with material/symbolic goods in the city's downtown streets and squares by means of their bodies. In light of this empirical case, in which space is produced within the spatial framework of an essentially non-repetitive and random everyday, an approach that methodologically addresses the historical temporalities of this (non-)everyday is able to both conceptually and empirically reveal a *different* sociocultural logic for producing urban space *amid* capitalist economic globalization (Frehse, 2017: 527). We merely have to

assume “difference” as both a (logical) concept and as a (factual) content historically produced in the wake of the “reciprocal, conflictive, and appeased relationships” between the “qualities” of the “particularities” that “survived” these encounters (Lefebvre, 1970b: 65). From this theoretical standpoint, the urban space produced in downtown São Paulo is, on the one hand, empirically different. The historicity of the rules of body conducted by the socially marginalized pedestrians of São Paulo’s central public places insinuates bodies who, by daily not passing-by amid the frenetic to and fro of passers-by, are historically multiple. The recurrently non-everyday body relations implicit in their periodic physical permanence in the streets and squares signal the active presence of various pre-capitalist temporalities implicit in Brazil’s slaveholding past. Hence, these patterns of body conduct contribute to empirically distancing the recent production of space in Latin America’s largest city from Western European and North-American modernity. Indeed, even today this modernity underpins the increasingly accelerated and individualized mobility of passers-by, urban types who vigorously prevail in the streets and public squares of twenty-first-century European and North American countries. On the other hand, the space produced in recent São Paulo differs not only empirically but also conceptually from the notions of public space that currently inspire the sociological debate (see, among others, Klamt, 2012; Harding & Blokland, 2014: 186-214).

While Lefebvre’s temporal-spatial approach favors this kind of interpretation, there are surely other prospects. In fact, in terms of the possibilities and limitations implicit in these alternative temporal-spatial scales of analysis, only future specific research may provide answers.

Hence, I reach the second and final methodological contribution of the temporalities and spatialities of the production of space to the recent sociological debate on this issue. As we have seen extensively here, the discussion vividly focuses on the spatialization of definite research objects. However, it still does not sufficiently address, in either methodological or conceptual terms, the fact that this spatialization implies a temporalization, and vice-versa. To put it more precisely: this spatialization comprises various coexisting spatialities and temporalities. These were exactly the ones that have mattered here. However, they may only be depicted in analytic terms with the aid of a method – and thus it becomes possible to finally sum up the second methodological contribution of the temporal-spatial-scales approach to sociology. Based on everything elucidated so far, the method not only makes evident the empirical complexity of the production of space. It also indicates that the poly-temporal-spatial character of this sociospatial process remains a notable challenge for sociology.

Received on 17-Sep-2020 | Approved on 01-Feb-2021

Fraya Frehse is Professor of Sociology at the University of São Paulo (USP), alumna of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Productivity Research fellow of the Brazilian Research Council (CNPq), and Life Member of Clare Hall College (University of Cambridge). She coordinates the Centre for Studies and Research on the Sociology of Space and Time (NEPSESTE-USP), and is the lead partner of the Global Center of Spatial Methods for Urban Sustainability (GCSMUS/TU Berlin) at USP. Besides authoring *Ô da Rua!* and *O tempo das ruas na São Paulo de fins do Império* and papers in peer-reviewed international journals and in books, she edited *A sociologia enraizada de José de Souza Martins* alongside co-editing three books and six special issues on the relationship between time and (urban) space.

NOTES

- 1 I thank, on the one hand, the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, which sponsored the six-month-long research (Frehse, 2019) that underpins this paper. On the other hand, I am grateful to the Collaborative Research Centre (CRC) 1265 “Re-Figuration of Spaces” of Technische Universität Berlin in the person of its speaker, Prof. Dr. Martina Löw, who hosted me as a Visiting Fellow during this period (February-August 2019). Hence, I had the opportunity to engage in inspiring intellectual exchanges on the topic addressed here not only with the CRC members, but with researchers from both the Leibniz Institute for Research on Society and Space (IRS) in Erkner and the CRC 1199 “Processes of Spatialization under the Global Condition” at Universität Leipzig, whom I also thank. Last but not least, I acknowledge the encouraging appraisals of the *Sociologia & Antropologia* reviewers.
- 2 All translations from languages other than English are my own.
- 3 For recent analogous predicaments, see Lefebvre (2000a: 87), and Löw (2001: 27).
- 4 Using an alternative theoretical framework, Hartmut Rosa (2005: 27) more recently also argued that cyclic and linear conceptions of time coexist in almost all cultures.
- 5 I here recall a rather old but still helpful methodological distinction regarding sociological research first proposed by Florestan Fernandes (1959: 14): due to the empirical basis of sociological “explanations,” sociological research inevitably comprises theoretically loaded “methods of interpretation” and operational “methods of investigation.”
- 6 Lefebvre’s methodological attention to historicity decreases significantly within the framework of his “rhythman-

alytical project” of the 1980s (Lefebvre & Régulier, 1985). He almost exclusively focuses on the dialectics between cyclic and linear repetitions implicit in the immediacy of the everyday (for an exception, see Lefebvre, 1992: 97-109: 97-109; on rhythm analysis in Lefebvre’s work, see Frehse, 2018).

- 7 For a brief overview regarding Goffman’s impact, see Frehse (2016: 1-2); on Lefebvre, see Schmid (2005), Stanek, Moravánsky & Schmid (2014), and Frehse (2014, 2017); on Bourdieu, see, among others, Löw (2001: 179), Ruhne (2003: 67-70), Schuster (2010: 35-41), and recent studies on urban segregation (among others, Wacquant, 2008). In turn, Löw’s approach has lately become a parameter for alternative conceptual frameworks regarding the influence of social practices (Schuster, 2010; Reckwitz, 2012: 252), communication (Christmann, 2013, 2015; Knoblauch, 2017: 296-300; Knoblauch & Löw, 2017), biographical historicity (Weidenhaus, 2015), or materiality (Steets, 2015) on the production of space.

REFERENCES

- Baur, Nina. (2005). *Verlaufsmusteranalyse*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (2013). Espaço físico, espaço social e espaço físico apropriado. Trad. A. C. Nasser. *Estudos Avançados*, 27/79, p. 133-144.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (2003). Efeitos de lugar. In: *A miséria do mundo*. Trad. M. S. Soares Azevedo et al. Petrópolis: Vozes, p. 159-166.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1989). *O poder simbólico*. Trad. F. Tomaz. Lisboa: Difel.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1982). La mort du sociologue Erving Goffman. Le découvreur de l’infiniment petit. *Le Monde*. Available at: <http://www.homme-moderne.org/societe/socio/bourdieu/varia/mortEGoffman.html>. Access on 18 Aug. 2019.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1980). *Le sens pratique*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1972). *Esquisse d’une théorie de la pratique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Christmann, Gabriela. (2015). Das theoretische Konzept der kommunikativen Raum(re)konstruktion. In: *Zur kommunikativen Konstruktion von Räumen*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, p. 89-117.

Christmann, Gabriela. (2013). Raumpioniere in Stadtquartieren und die kommunikative (Re-)Konstruktion von Räumen. In: Keller, Rainer; Knoblauch, Hubert & Reichertz, Jo (eds.). *Kommunikativer Konstruktivismus*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, p. 153-184.

Crang, Mike. (2005). Time: Space. In: Cloke, Paul J. & Ron Johnston (eds.). *Spaces of Geographical Thought*. London: Sage, p. 199-220.

Dennis, Alex; Philburn, Rob & Smith, Greg. (2013). *Sociologies of interaction*. Cambridge: Polity.

Evans-Pritchard, Edward E. (1940). *The Nuer*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fernandes, Florestan. (1959). *Fundamentos empíricos da explicação sociológica*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional.

Frehse, Fraya. (2020). On the temporalities and spatialities of the production of space. *SFB 1265 Working Paper*, 4. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14279/depositonce-9492>. Access on 27 Jul. 2020.

Frehse, Fraya. (2019). Zur konzeptionellen Rolle der historischen Zeit bei der Erzeugung von Raum: Beiträge der deutschen Soziologie. Projeto de pesquisa apresentado à Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

Frehse, Fraya. (2018). On regressive-progressive rhythmanalysis. In: Bauer, Jenny & Fischer, Robert (eds.). *Perspectives on Henri Lefebvre*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, p. 95-117.

Frehse, Fraya. (2017). Relational space through historically relational time in the bodies of São Paulo's pedestrians. *Current Sociology Monograph*, 65/4, p. 511-532.

Frehse, Fraya. (2016). Erving Goffmans Soziologie des Raums. *Sozialraum.de* [online]. Available at: www.sozialraum.de. Access on 5 Oct. 2016.

Frehse, Fraya. (2014). For difference "in and through" São Paulo: the regressive-progressive method. In: Stanek, Lukasz; Moravánsky, Ákos & Schmid, Christian (eds.). *Urban revolution now*. Farnham: Ashgate, p. 243-262.

- Frehse, Fraya. (2013). Apresentação [do dossiê “As ciências sociais e o espaço”]. *Tempo Social*, 25/2, p. 9-16. Disponível em: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=So103-20702013000200001. Acesso em 18 ago. 2019.
- Giddens, Anthony. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Cambridge/Oxford: Polity.
- Goffman, Erving. (1983a). Microanalyse et histoire. In: Fritsch, Pierre (ed.). *Le sens de l'ordinaire*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS, p. 197-202.
- Goffman, Erving. (1983b). The interaction order. *American Sociological Review*, 48/1, p. 1-17.
- Goffman, Erving. (1971). *Relations in public*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.
- Goffman, Erving. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, Erving. (1963). *Behavior in public places*. New York: The Free Press/Collier-Macmillan.
- Goffman, Erving. (1961). *Encounters*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Goffman, Erving. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Gurvitch, Georges. (1969). *La vocation actuelle de la sociologie*. v. 2. Paris: PUF.
- Harding, Alan & Blokland, Talja. (2014). *Urban theory*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Harvey, David. (2006). Space as a key word. In: *Spaces of global capitalism*. London/New York: Verso, p. 119-148.
- Klamt, Martin. (2012). Öffentliche Räume. In: Eckardt, Frank (ed.). *Handbuch Stadtsoziologie*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, p. 775-804.
- Knoblauch, Hubert. (2017). *Die kommunikative Konstruktion der sozialen Welt*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Knoblauch, Hubert & Löw, Martina. (2017). On the spatial re-figuration of the social world. *Sociologica* [online], 2. doi: 10.2383/88197. Access on 22 Aug. 2019.
- Läpple, Dieter. (1991). Essay über den Raum. Für ein gesellschaftswissenschaftliches Raumkonzept. In: Häußermann, Hartmut et al. (eds.). *Stadt und Raum*. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, p. 157-207.

- Lefebvre, Henri. (2009). *Le droit à la ville*. 2 ed. Paris: Anthropos.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (2001). *Du rural à l'urbain*. 2 ed. Paris: Anthropos.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (2000a). *La production de l'espace*. 2 ed. Paris: Anthropos.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (2000b). *Espace et politique*. 2 ed. Paris: Anthropos.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (1992). *Éléments de rythmanalyse*. Paris: Syllepse.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (1974). *La sociologie de Marx*. 2 ed. Paris: PUF.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (1970a). *La révolution urbaine*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (1970b). *Le manifeste différentialiste*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (1968). *La vie quotidienne dans le monde moderne*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (1961). *Critique de la vie quotidienne*. v. 2. Paris: L'Arche Éditeur.
- Lefebvre, Henri. (1958). *Critique de la vie quotidienne*. v. 1. 2 ed. Paris: L'Arche Éditeur.
- Lefebvre, Henri & Régulier, Cathérine. (1985). Le projet rythmanalytique. *Communications*, 41, p. 191-199.
- Leibniz, Gottfried W. (1966). Streitschriften zwischen Leibniz und Clark. In: Cassirer, Ernst (ed.). *G. W. Leibniz: Hauptschriften zur Grundlegung der Philosophie*. v. 1. Hamburg: Meiner, p. 120-241.
- Lindón, Alicia. (2012). Corporalidades, emociones y espacialidades: hacia un renovado betweenness. *Revista Brasileira de Sociologia da Emoção*, 11/33, p. 698-723.
- Lindón, Alicia. (2009). La construcción socioespacial de la ciudad: el sujeto cuerpo y el sujeto sentimiento. *Cuerpos, Emociones & Sociedad*, 1/1, p. 6-20.
- Löw, Martina. (2005). Die Rache des Körpers über den Raum? Über Henri Lefébvres Utopie und Geschlechterverhältnisse am Strand. In: Schroer, Markus (ed.). *Soziologie des Körpers*. Frankfurt a. M. L Suhrkamp, p. 241-270.
- Löw, Martina. (2001). *Raumsoziologie*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

- May, Jon & Thrift, Nigel (eds.). (2001). *Timespace*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Merton, Robert & Sorokin, Pitirim. (1937). Social time: a methodological and functional analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 42/5, p. 615-629.
- Reckwitz, Andreas. (2012). Affective spaces: a praxeological outlook. *Rethinking History*, 16/20, p. 241-258.
- Reckwitz, Andreas. (2003). Grundelemente einer Theorie sozialer Praktiken. Eine sozialtheoretische Perspektive. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 32/4, p. 282-301.
- Rosa, Hartmut. (2005). *Beschleunigung*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Ruhne, Renate. (2003). *Raum Macht Geschlecht*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Schmid, Christian. (2005). *Stadt, Raum und Gesellschaft*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Schuster, Nina. (2010). *Andere Räume*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Schütz, Alfred. (2016). *Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Schütz, Alfred & Luckmann, Thomas. (2003). *Strukturen der Lebenswelt*. Konstanz: UVK.
- Schützeichel, Rainer & Jordan, Stefan. (2015). Prozesse – eine interdisziplinäre Bestandsaufnahme. In: Schützeichel, Rainer & Jordan, Stefan (eds.). *Prozesse*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, p. 1-13.
- Smith, Greg. (2006). *Erving Goffman*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Stanek, Lukasz; Moravánsky, Ákos & Schmid, Christian (eds.). (2014). *Urban revolution now*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Steets, Silke. (2015). *Der sinnhafte Aufbau der gebauten Welt*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Thomas, William I. & Thomas, Dorothy S. (1928). *The child in America*. New York: Knopf.
- Wacquant, Loïc. (2008). *Urban outcasts*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Weidenhaus, Gunter. (2015). *Soziale Raumzeit*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Winchester, Ian. (1973). On referring to ordinary historical persons. In: Wrigley, Edward Anthony (ed.). *Identifying people in the past*. London: E. Arnold, p. 17-40.

Palavras-chave

Tempo & espaço;
 produção do espaço
 (espacialização);
 sociologia (do espaço);
 espaço relacional;
 escala temporal-espacial.

O TEMPO E A PRODUÇÃO DO ESPAÇO NA SOCIOLOGIA**Resumo**

O que a categoria “tempo” desvela conceitualmente sobre a espacialização de fenômenos sociais, a assim chamada produção do espaço? Este artigo responde tal questão em quatro passos analíticos, reconhecendo que a sociologia desde os anos 1950 abriga perspectivas teóricas diversas acerca do processo socioespacial em foco. Partindo da constatação de que (seção 1) essas abordagens enfrentam as temporalidades dos respectivos objetos de pesquisa recorrendo, em termos metodológicos, a espacialidades definidas, vem para o primeiro plano uma história peculiar da sociologia. Tal história compreende (seção 2) quatro abordagens metodológicas originais acerca da espacialização de fenômenos sociais cujos autores são, respectivamente, Erving Goffman, Henri Lefebvre, Pierre Bourdieu e Martina Löw. As sete *escalas temporal-espaciais* implícitas nessas abordagens sugerem (seção 3) que a produção do espaço é um fenômeno social simultaneamente politemporal e poliespacial. Suas temporalidades e espacialidades contêm (seção 4) duas contribuições metodológicas para o debate sociológico recente sobre o tema.

TIME AND THE PRODUCTION OF SPACE IN SOCIOLOGY**Abstract**

Keywords
 Time & space;
 production of space
 (spatialization);
 sociology (of space);
 relational space;
 temporal-spatial scale.

What does the category “time” disclose in conceptual terms about the spatialization of social phenomena, the so-called production of space? By considering that since the 1950s sociology has embraced various theoretical frameworks for tackling the sociospatial process at hand, the paper answers this question in four analytic steps. Based on the ascertainment that (Section 1) these approaches address the temporalities of the respective research objects by means of definite spatialities, one peculiar history of sociology comes to the forefront. This history comprises (Section 2) four original ways of addressing the spatialization of social phenomena methodologically which were developed by Erving Goffman, Henri Lefebvre, Pierre Bourdieu, and Martina Löw. The seven *temporal-spatial scales* implicit in these accounts suggest (Section 3) that the production of space is a simultaneously poly-temporal and poly-spatial social phenomenon. Its temporalities and spatialities contain (Section 4) two methodological contributions to the recent sociological debate on the issue.

414 Erratum

In the manuscript “Time and the Production of Space in Sociology”, DOI: 10.1590/2238-38752021V1I22, published in *Sociologia & Antropologia*, 11(2):389-414 (according to the SciELO guidelines, the following mistakes are absent from the present version – and the corresponding pdf file),

On pages 389, 395, 396, 397 and 398,

For:

“Lefebvre (2000b)”

Read:

“Lefebvre (2000a)”

On page 408, note 3, lines 1-2,

For:

“Lefebvre (2000[a ou b?]: 87)”

Read:

“Lefebvre (2000a: 87)”

On page 408, note 6, line 3,

For:

of the 1980s.”

Read:

of the 1980s (Lefebvre & Régulier, 1985).”

On page 408, note 6, lines 6-7,

For:

“Lefebvre & Régulier, 1992 [favor confirmar; nas ref. só aparece 1985]: 97-109; on”

Read:

“Lefebvre, 1992: 97-109; on”

On page 409,

For:

“Bourdieu, Pierre. (1972).

Esquisse d’une théorie de la pratique. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1982). La mort du sociologue Erving Goffman. Le découvreur de l’infiniment petit. *Le Monde*. Available at: <http://www.homme-moderne.org/societe/socio/bourdieu/varia/mortEGoffman.html>. Access on 18 Aug. »

Read:

“Bourdieu, Pierre. (1972).

Esquisse d’une théorie de la pratique. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1980). *Le sens pratique*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1982). La mort du sociologue Erving Goffman. Le découvreur de l’infiniment petit. *Le Monde*. Available at: <http://www.homme-moderne.org/societe/socio/bourdieu/varia/mortEGoffman.html>. Access on 18 Aug.”

On page 411,

For:

“Lefebvre, Henri. (2000a).

Espace et politique. 2 ed.

Paris : Anthropos.

Lefebvre, Henri. (2000b). *La production de l’espace*. 2. ed. Paris: Anthropos. »

Read:

“Lefebvre, Henri. (2000a). *La production de l’espace*. 2. ed.

Paris: Anthropos. »

Lefebvre, Henri. (2000b).

Espace et politique. 2 ed.

Paris : Anthropos.”

On page 412,

For:

“Lefebvre, Henri. (1958).

Critique de la vie quotidienne. v. 1. Paris: L’Arche Éditeur. »

Read:

“Lefebvre, Henri. (1958).

Critique de la vie quotidienne.

v. 1. 2. ed. Paris: L’Arche

Éditeur. »

On page 414,

For:

“TEMPO E PRODUÇÃO DO ESPAÇO EM SOCIOLOGIA”

Read:

“O TEMPO E A PRODUÇÃO DO ESPAÇO NA SOCIOLOGIA”

On page 414,

For:

“TIME, AND THE PRODUCTION OF SPACE IN SOCIOLOGY”

Read:

“TIME AND THE PRODUCTION OF SPACE IN SOCIOLOGY”