SPACE AND PLACE as SUBSTRATES OF CULTURE

Anti Randviir

There is probably no argument in the discourse of contemporary humanities about the semiotic, meaningful nature of space and place. Likewise there can be no uncertainty about the place of space among the study material of semiotics. Different are questions about rendering the extent of meaningfulness embedded in miscellaneous spatial structures, just as well as the realms through which individual disciplines, including semiotics, approach the semiotic dimension of space (see, e.g. Tuan 1979; Greimas 1986; Carter *et al.* 1993; Vanneste 1996; Light, Smith 1997). The immanently meaningful nature of space is closely connected with the semiotic essence of a human being, beginning, on the one hand, from the dependence of the physical well-being of an individual on her/his ability to handle the surrounding space, and, on the other hand, from philosophical discussions on the true nature and aim of human existence as connected with movement of semiotic structures in spatial configurations (e.g. the Platonic discourse). Today we witness contemporary searches for further human existence in (and by the help of) spatial dimensions other than the three known so far. Thus the semiotic aspects are not limited to overtly meaningful characteristics of space (e.g. the much discussed structure of settlement space), but also include routine spatial practices (e.g. proxemics, movement), common concepts used in everyday communication (e.g. *cultural space*, *political landscape*), and mythic, philosophical and scientific interpretation of the origin, history, evolution and status of the human species (e.g. shamanism, Platonism, derivations of Einsteinian physics).

Moving onwards from the already mentioned example concerning Platonism, we can see that the relationships between spatial configurations have and can be used to explain the structure of the humane semiotic reality in general. Besides, this can be done both in the everyday semiotic routine of individuals, just as well as on the scientific level. Focusing on the latter aspect, we can see

that the matter does not any more concern space and place as certain categories with definite characteristics, but that they have often been turned into *devices* of describing different phenomena; we are regularly talking about the spatiality of certain artifacts, concepts, semantic fields, just like these phenomena gain their semiotic value though *placement* into an overall system (that, through such procedures, in turn, provides these phenomena with the spatial dimension helping to set them into an integral perspective).

Thus space also serves as a substrate for culture through descriptive techniques. It has become a common habit to talk about cultures in terms of cultural spaces, about cultural units as forming semantic fields and spaces (e.g. the space of a text, painting, etc.).

Spatialisation and placement of culture: the metalevel

It is interesting to take notice of quite extensive uses of *space* and *place* at the description of numerous cultural and environmental phenomena. One can also meet arguments on geographic (see, e.g. Lavie, Swedenburg 1996; Pilkington 1998), religious, ideological (Dorfman, Mattelart 1975), cultural (e.g. Segal 1992; Robertson *et al.* 1994) and other kinds of *displacement*, displacement in the discourse of fiction (e.g. Simpson 1987; Talgeri, Verma 1988) and elsewhere (see also Krupnick 1983). However, it seems to be important to stress that in order to displace a physical or cultural unit, it has to be *placed* firsthand. It is through placement of a semiotic unit into a system that provides it with the necessary distinctive features as compared with other elements of the systems. Only relationships of a semiotic unit with other elements of the system supply it with a value, if reminding of Ferdinand de Saussure's treatment (see Saussure 1959: 111–122), that makes it possible to use it in a representational text or discourse. Thus it is only after such primary placement that a meaningful unit can be displaced, i.e. placed to another (semiotic) system. And apparently the displaced semiotic units, meanings or characteristics function via connections with the original (semiotic) system, even though doing it by the so-called minus device or more or less manifested non-being in the set of the original system. This can probably be observed at different appearances of displacement in miscellaneous fields of human culture, but in the current context an example can be drawn from a common cultural practice explicitly connected with spatial structures. If

we are reminded of the practice of banishment and its history, we can simultaneously witness the mechanism and essence of both sociocultural and territorial identification. Be it a city, city-state or a larger territorial unit, the expulsion of a person from it demonstrates displacement of a person not fitting in a given sociocultural system sharing common norms. Banishment is thus a vivid example of the congeniality of the conceptual reality and spatial structures already on the so-to-speak non-scientific reflective level of society. It also demonstrates, indeed, that the relevant subject or semiotic unit (e.g. Socrates) was first *placed* into a system to test its (his) suitability, then positioned into the sociocultural context, and that banishment as an act of *displacement* served only against the background of the original state of affairs. In addition such an act of expulsion helped to *displace* certain qualities present, but unwanted in the given social sphere. This example concerns spatialisation, placement and displacement as operations common for cultural routine. However, the terms seem to gain even more importance on the metalevel where we can talk about the descriptive techniques of culture (banishment, in an implicit way, also being of course one of them).

When looking into the semiotic use of *space*, *spatiality*, *place*, *location*, *locality*, or comparable notions − regardless of their more precise terminological content − it is immediately possible to notice that besides studies of spatial structures themselves, the evolution of the relevant terms designating these and the similar structures, another way also exists − perhaps even much wider − of exploiting these categories. This manner of treatment is of course the metaphorical one. Perhaps it is almost natural that the metaphorical thinking and appliance of spatial categories to descriptions of cultural and other phenomena has made it possible to launch conceptions like *possible worlds, biosphere* and *noosphere, Umwelt* and many others that are connected with and help to explain aspects pertaining to the topic of construction of the semiotic reality.

Due to the overall relevance of spatial categories the metaphoric use of them in dissimilar phenomena in a way excluded the possibility of uniform definitions of spatial terms. Likewise it is not a complete discrepancy that description of (both physical and conceptual) spatial phenomena has not always had clarity and determination of the relevant terms as an obligatory prerequisite for study. This can lucidly be demonstrated by the example of cultural semiotics, especially studies published by the members of the Tartu-Moscow semiotic school. Within the framework of cultural semiotics space and place have frequently been sub-

jects of investigation. Due to the specific character of the Moscow-Tartuan cultural semiotics, however, space has been very tightly connected with the central notion and conception of approach – the text. Upon closer examination one can observe that text and space share practically the majority of the crucial structural features of identification. The text – be it literal, written, or not – is definable through a more or less stabile construction that is subjected to and ordered by a dominant structural element. This feature is in the relationship of mutual dependence with the bordered nature of the text: in order to be characterisable as an individual entity the text is to be delimited as a distinct entity. It is also the boundaries, regardless of the extent chosen (from the literally syntactic level to boundaries involving dimensions of the evolving cultural context), that switch the text into interaction with other texts and semiotic units. It is not difficult to see how relevant these features are for spatial entities as well. These similarities, of course, have not emerged from the paradigm of cultural semiotics, but have been treated all through modern human geography, areal cultural anthropology (not to talk about structural anthropology). However, within cultural semiotics the categories of space and text became more and more interwoven: description of one of them was often executed through the prism of the other. Interpretation of space in textual terms and analysis of texts in spatial categories was probably made possible by the general paradigmatic bias and foundation of cultural semiotics, the interconnected development of continental semiotics, linguistics and cultural anthropology being the most influential factor for this evolution.

Another fact of importance is the individual specific nature of both text and space. Space, as treated in structural anthropology and in semiotics further on, is the dimension which unites practically all human semiotic systems: space is both the context of all primary, secondary (and tertiary, if preferring the argument presented by Sebeok 1991) modelling systems and also the substrate for them. Semiotic activity is carried on in spatial structures, while the latter provides props for building up meaningful structures beginning from the biosemiotic construction of *Umwelt* up to the creation of very complex semiotic structures like statehood, national and cultural identity, etc. In a similar manner the text serves as a basic unit to format and form the semiotic reality of a social sphere. Texts are manifestations and constituents of cultural tradition, often treated as quite organic cultural phenomena that in a way exist independently of (human) culture bearers (according to T.S. Eliot and trends including many of the post-

modern ones that have essential origins in his ideas). The precondition of fitting with the cultural production already existing turns the emergence of texts into a most organic phenomenon, bringing it close to the natural influence of geographic and other spatial units on the character of each other. Such interrelatedness of space and text both from the aspect of the spatiality of semiotic phenomena (and the semiotic nature of space itself), and on the other hand also in terms concerning the descriptive techniques of the metalevel have given reason to use notions and, in point of fact, thereby also to form objects of study like *the Text of St. Petersburg* and the like, not to talk about *textual space*, *cultural space*, *semiotic space of a text*, *semiosphere*, etc. (see, e.g. Malts 1984; Lotman 1986). However, in spite of the fundamental importance of the two notions, they are far from univocal interpretation or usage even within the Tartu-Moscow semiotic school itself, not to mention a wider paradigm of cultural semiotics. This is vividly demonstrated by the undefined *space* and open-ended *text* in the conceptual dictionary of the Tartu-Moscow school (Levchenko, Salupere 1999).

The opposite to transformation of the content of loose terms, if wanting to clarify the content of concepts designating spatial units, is so-to-speak over-defining the relevant terms, which has been also quite a wide-spread practice in spatial studies including both geographical disciplines and also cultural studies of a more general nature. By over-defining there has to be kept in mind marking time by continuous over-definition of terms at the scale of whole disciplines. As known, one of the most popular pairs of spatial notions involves *space* and *place* that have usually been regarded as explicitly dissimilar and incongruent. Still, from the semiotic viewpoint this seems worth investigating, if space and place are functionally as different as often treated.

The semiotic capacity of space and place

While the semiotic importance of space and place has been recognised practically all throughout history, there have been distinct periods during which these notions have been paid specifically high attention, the last decades of the 20th century being one of them.

Taking into account exactly the physical aspect as the dominant of spatial understanding, it is possible to outline a contemporary view on the hierarchy of spatial structures. Not only from the semiotic or culturological perspective have

spatial units been structured on the basis of their representative power. The fundamental opposition between the spatial sphere void of meaning on the one hand and meaningful space, on the other, is often the basis for such a categorisation. Algirdas J. Greimas has maintained *expanse* vs. *space* as the relevant fundamental opposition. He claims that:

"If it is the case that every knowledge of the world starts by the projection of the discontinuous on the continuous, we may perhaps return to the old opposition: expanse vs. space in order to say that space, taken in its continuity and its plenitude, filled with natural and artificial objects made present to us by all the sensory channels, can be considered as the *substance* which, once informed and transformed by man, becomes *space*, that is, *form*, capable (through the fact of its articulations) of serving the purpose of signification. Space as form is thus a *construction* which in order to signify selects only certain properties of "real" objects, only some of its possible levels of pertinence: it is evident that every construction is an impoverishment and that most of the richness of the expanse disappears with the emergence of space." (Greimas 1986: 27.)

Thus it seems that it should principally be possible to distinguish between the following spatial levels: [expanse] → space → area → region → territory → place (this sequence can be compared to the condensation of semiotic intensity as increasing from the *cultural text* to a concrete individual *text*). Unfortunately one has to admit that partially due to the widespread use of these notions they have achieved a great vagueness in their meaning(s) as proper scientific terms. With variations, these concepts are in use in human geography, in environmental psychology, in philosophy, and many other disciplines, not to talk about semiotics. However, it is probably possible to claim that in different fields the relevant distinctions are made on quite similar grounds, namely on the basis of the ability, power and characteristics of a given spatial structure to represent culture, cultural behaviour, cultural traits. In this line one may postulate *space* to be connected with more general and primarily cultural developments and aspects, while *place* would concern aspects of a more social nature that would just the same be more concrete as historical phenomena and events. The distinction of *space* and *expanse* makes it possible to talk about *space* as similar to the concept of the paradigm of descriptive metacultures. Similarly we can talk about the cosmic expanse and the discovered galaxies in it as more or less delimited spaces in it that are formed of places in the face of concrete celestial bodies already described to a certain extent. The example of cosmological knowledge demon-

strates the evergreen dynamism between the categories and extent of *expanse*, *space* and *place* – the size of *space* as a vaguely delimited area of potentially reachable knowledge grows (the possibility of its reduction also exists) as knowledge of its constitutive *places* becomes more and more refined, and this causes the enlargement of the all-surrounding *expanse*. In a way scientific discoveries like, for example, the Copernican revolution, Einsteinian physics and other groundbreaking corrections to the world-view, make understanding of the universe and semiotic space oscillate, extending and reducing it from time to time. All the more – we can certainly recognise miscellaneous segments of the universe and knowledge of it that human cultures have institutionalised as individual. It is possible to talk about scientific knowledge of the world and the universe, about religious understanding, everyday knowledge and several other dimensions the human mind has divided into distinct categories. Still, although these segments of knowledge of the universe have mostly been separated institutionally (e.g. different scientific disciplines, miscellaneous walks of life and professions, national, public and state institutions, etc.), they are interconnected, and oscillation of the extent and structural features of one sphere of knowledge often depends on the paradigmatic situation of another.

Such segmentation of the semiotic reality and the integral mutual relationships between its segment is brightly illustrated by the evolution of the spatial representation of world-view and during, for instance, the Middle Ages. Due to the religious cultural dominant practically all walks of life were dependent on the canonic interpretation of both the semiotic and physical environment of man. Therefore it is not surprising that knowledge of the physical world as interpretable by scientific means or even as monitored by sailors and travellers was either ignored or altered according to the religious conception of the structure of the world and the universe. Likewise were representations of the world not depictions of the physical reality, but rather those of the semiotic one as shaped by religious dogmas. The famous *T-O map* that lasted for centuries thus demonstrates a most curious dynamism between the physical reality, the semiotic reality and the realm of the reflective knowledge. Furthermore, semiotically this dynamism largely functioned exactly through complex relations between placement and displacement. In order to officially execute coherent interpretation of the physical reality, information on it had to first be placed into the canonic understanding of the world to test the data, correct and eliminate discrepancies with

the integral system of canonic texts. Only after these procedures could textual (both verbal and pictorial) representations of the world be articulated. There is certainly no question about the intellect of the relevant goal-keepers of time, and the knowledge called objective today was definitely not neglected because of ignorance; cultural space was simply organised according to principles different from the contemporary. However, knowledge of the world not fitting to the given *Weltanschauung* was not completely discarded of, but displaced instead. Analogously to the Marxist use of the term, displacement of that (part of) knowledge served as a tool to ideologically construct the adversary of the sociocultural system of the Middle Ages. Yet besides the witch-hunt (that, in fact, was also connected with *another kind of knowledge*), another major class of heresy was connected with the production and handling of the kind of knowledge today labelled as scientific. Thus we can hereby close the circle by noting a similar situation of displacement of knowledge as functioned (and functions) in the case of (physical) banishment.

Spatialisation and placement as cultural practices

Of course, space and place coming into the focus of cultural attention has usually been in very evident and strong connection with the abilities, development and possibilities of man's capacity to **use** space. Such usage can also be split into two, and thus we can make a distinction between the different epochs, keeping in mind which aspects of space have gained importance at the relevant era. The roughly two uses of space are of course physical, material on the one hand, and spiritual on the other. Similarly a distinction can be made between cultural epochs that focus on either spiritual or physical space. For example physical space, or the physical dimension of space, has been important during the era of formation of the cities, during the Age of Discoveries – in a word: during practically all periods of relatively rapid and overall social or sociocultural change (including international wars, world wars, etc.). The spiritual, or conceptual dimension of space was of particular importance during the Middle Ages, and in a curious way it has regained its value in contemporary culture; it has always been important in the so-called primitive societies (see Randviir 2000). It may not be too false to postulate that the spiritual dimension of space is paid attention to during the

relatively calm environment in terms of physical action (like massive travel, dis-coveries, adventure), but at times of intense mental cultural activity.

At the same time it is possible to outline different epochs on the basis of paying attention to spatial structures on the metalevel. It is noteworthy that space has gained higher attention during the present century. While space has practically always been the subject of analysis, it is the 20th century that has dis-covered new aspects of space in the physical dimensions (Einstein) and also ar-ticulated the value of space as a very special and precious subject of anthropology (e.g. research of Claude Lévi-Strauss; see, e.g. Lévi-Strauss 1968). It was pre-cisely the anthropological perspective that declared space to be the mirror of culture (while culture being, in Clyde Kluckhohn's popular formulation from 1961, *Mirror for Man*). When trying to outline concrete persons who advance this understanding, certain obstacles emerge, since in one way or another, an-thropology in its 19th–20th century conceptions has largely treated culture as based on (or even being wholly) the system(s) of adjustment of a biological be-ing, man, to the environment. Culture, man's invented unnecessary luxury, if approaching from such a viewpoint as man as a biological organism whose pri-mary goal is satisfying the needs of physical existence, has been dependent on its ability to adjust to spatial realities. This understanding has been at least partially represented in Ruth F. Benedict's, Clyde Kluckhohn's, Paul Vidal de La Blache's, Halford J. Mackinder's works. However, there was also another level to emerge in the anthropological paradigm. This is the one concentrated in the works of Lévi-Strauss who maintained that the spatial structure is the mirror of man's semiotic universe. In semiotically even stronger expression Lévi-Strauss claimed that the spatial structure is the crystallisation of society's sociocultural reality: in the spatial structure the social, cultural, cosmological, cosmogonic and other often purely semiotic structures have been articulated. The positive corre-lation between mental processes, be it either on the social level or on that of the individual, and the physical environment the given social sphere has shaped, goes both for a settlement's general plan, but also for individual buildings and houses (see Lévi-Strauss 1968: 292, Lagopoulos 1986).

The fervent interconnection between the physical and the semiotic reality takes us back to the foundation stones of contemporary semiotics itself: Ferdi-nand de Saussure, in his *Course in General Linguistics*, claimed the relationship between the signifier and signified to be crystallised (Saussure 1959: 65–74).

Thus, in the mentality of the Tartu-Moscow semiotic school one may conclude that natural language as the so-called primary modelling system and culturally organised space as an instance of secondary modelling (cf., once again, Sebeok 1991) are in a similar semiotic relationship with what they represent. In this line we can again see the point explained above, that space can be understood as the substrate of culture, however this time it already has a very direct sense, rather than going for procedures on which 'culture' depends on the metalevel.

The spatiality of culture

The above argument is strengthened (and complicated) by Kluckhohn's understanding of culture as an abstraction (see Kluckhohn 1961: 24, 25): culture is constructed on the object level, by society, continuously by choosing elements to be or not to be switched into identification and definition of the cultural tradition (e.g. the *Estonian culture*, the *American culture* depend on what the respective society selects to be the constituents of its history), and this also finally determines the *way of life* of the members of the given group. These abstractions, also like theoretical inferences on a culture, are drawn from the cultural traits that have been somehow imprinted in the environment a given culture inhabits. Be these traces of an either material or immaterial nature, they somehow record the cultural patterns characteristic to the given social sphere. Thus culture is dependent on what a society itself, or a describer of it, can register in the physical environment of the social sphere. In metalevel culture, observable cultural traits lead, in the end, to organising the Earth into relatively distinct cultural areas in Mackinder's and Vidal de la Blache's sense. In addition to spatial demarcation cultures according to the net of physical cultural traits, it is also possible to use other features and to outline cultural spaces as realms of certain cultural dominance (e.g. the *French cultural space*, *Russian cultural space*). In this manner demarcation of cultural spaces becomes close to delineation of signifying orders (see Danesi, Perron 1999) as semiotic structures not directly restricted by national, linguistic, geographic or other formal characteristics. Still furthermore, it is probably that the structure of individual cultures can also be described in terms of the semiotic spheres constituting its semiotic reality, i.e. it should be possible to use the spatial account (including the question of what kind of spaces a culture maintains) to clarify the constituents of a social sphere's *semiosphere*.

Kluckhohn's treatments of culture as an abstraction and culture as a theory assume a relevant difference between the object level (including, e.g. individuals' interpretation of "correct" behaviour) and the metalevel (including, e.g. what kind of data is collected by the given researcher). However, just like in a historical perspective (a work classified as scientific comes into a "normal" cultural text to be analysed alongside with other cultural production), similar intricacies also emerge at defining the metalevel of contemporary chronotopes. Namely, if we talk about scientific analysis of space, and even more in the case of investigating the meaning of space, then we usually have to pay attention to how space is represented in the given culture whose understanding of space is under question. The problem is that today interpretation of space has transferred from the "ordinary metalevel" or the scientific interpretation to the level that usually has been taken as the object level. Here we can talk about contemporary arts and problems connected with analysis of conceptual arts in general. (In Estonian cultural space this actually has been a long lasting problem. Maybe due to the cultural history that has always been in very strong connection with the environment, landscape and territory, Estonian culture has practically constantly felt the need, or maybe simply reflected upon its environment and territory as a specific means to conceptualise the cultural development. Instance can be brought by the work of Olev Soans, but such themes (maybe one could even call them cultural themes in the sense Marvin K. Opler used the phrase in cultural anthropology) have also been taken up nowadays by contemporary Estonian artists.)

Hereby it is even not very relevant at what times of cultural development themes of connecting spatial structures and culture become actualised, one can just hypothesise that they probably gain importance during a sort of sociocultural anxiety, "unnatural" social change (too rapid, too big a contrast between two juxtaposed sociocultural states). Currently it rather is important that these appearances are problematic, because it is difficult to categorise them, choosing between the object level and metalevel. From another angle, however, these cases are excellent material for examining the reflective discourse of a culture's and social sphere's self-identification discourse, since it is already on the level ordinarily considered as the object level that landscape, environment and territory are analysed, and this provides the metalevel with already very conscious cultural production to be examined. Needless to assert that it is not only the arts that have the tendency to conceptualise culture in its geographical environment. In

the contemporary cultural and political life associating certain cultures and certain territories, and arranging such units into (often ideological) relationships is a common practice (that sometimes turns into a civilised war).

The tight connection between the geographic and semiotic dimension of a culture shows that not only the *objective content* of space (or place) is important, but representation of a territory must include its cultural substance, too. Hugh of Saint Victor commented on the target and correct structure of spatial representation, specifically that of the Medieval *mappae mundi*:

 "We must collect a brief summary of all things mind, or intellect, can grasp and the memory easily maintain. The mind, or reason, evaluates events on the basis of three main things: people who committed actions, the places where they were committed and the times when they were committed." (quoted from Woodward 1987: 290.)

This understanding is one of the best explanations for the structure of medieval representation of meaningful space, and these principles have evidently lived long up to our times (e.g. the *Map of the United Nations* from 1945). Thus Hugh of Saint Victor touched upon the important questions of how the semiotic order of space is maintained and transmitted in the course of cultural tradition, different epochs and generations. Such documents of cultural tradition as maps were therefore highly complex, including very diverse semiotic systems (e.g. religion, cosmological views, cultural conceptions, etc.) to representation of space (or: cultural space). In the Middle Ages space was thereby turned into a mechanism and dimension to integrate different cultural systems according to a given cultural dominant (religion). This, in turn, made the highly integrative representational system complex in the very aspect of the contents: spatial representations presumed high knowledge of diverse cultural areas, so that upon interpretation of maps information could be distinguished from elements of noise. It is likely that cultural mechanisms of coding and maintaining both the spatial order of cultural environment and the meaningful structure(s) of space are directly connected with the general principles and factors determining cultural development. Thus it's also the use, the ability to handle spatial structures that is vital for cultural survival. Yet the map is not only a description of an area's possessions, but it was, and probably still is, primarily a means for enhancing orientation in both the geographical and conceptual space represented. Examination of a culture's **use** of space allows us to view those specific semiotic structures that are linked to

the identity discourse of a given social sphere. Analysis of space as the substrate of all the cultural semiotic systems is thus in direct connection with the predictability of the development of different cultures. Besides space as the substrate of culture in the sense spatial structures are those within the limits of which all cultural production *takes place*, another important moment is concerned with **what kind** of space or spaces a culture can use, uses and does not use. Here we notice the critical role of space as the substrate of culture in the aspect of providing culture with new, alternative cultural themes and conceptions. Straightforward examples of the conceptual conquest of new spaces that is executed can be drawn from cases in which the utopian consciousness tries to find articulation. We know that it was Thomas More who was probably the first to use a specific semiotic technique which is actually inescapable for enunciation of the utopian or other alternative conceptions of culture and society: it is also necessary to find a new spatial environment for it. This is vital due to both the potential sociocultural, political, physical sanctions, and also for increasing the credibility of discourse. Presentation of a new spatial configuration along with alternative cultural conception(s) is also due to the overload of the "ordinary meaningful space" and that the latter already serves as the substrate and environment of the existing, common semiotic systems. Thus it might be said that (new) conceptual spaces, like new domains of knowledge, are usually a result of a cultural, conceptional conquest which, as in the case of military conquest, always entails re-semiotisation of the existing spatial units as well. As this topic has been treated more thoroughly elsewhere (Randviir 1999), it is not necessary to pause at it in further detail.

When turning back to the hierarchy of spatial units, we may conclude that culture is imprinted in landscape and places, while the nature of their semiotic content depends on the general understanding of spatial reality, or the meaningful dimensions of space in both geographic and semiotic perspective. Space is a substrate for culture that can imbibe new knowledge, new domains of knowledge from it in both physical and purely conceptual terms. Places are shaped within the geographic space and the semiotic reality to be used for organising these structures and for framing both physical and semiotic human activity. By discovering new physical spaces, culture also has to adjust its conceptual realm to the new situation, extending thereby its conceptual space. The advancement of semiospherical knowledge, in turn, often involves at least a conditional enlarge-

ment of knowledge on physical space in order not to replace cultural conceptions, but to enlarge them. Thus culture continuously extends its identification space, conquers new (either physical or conceptual) spaces, also entailing thereby the need for rearranging behavioural patterns in the semiotic sense. Both creative, interactive and purely semiotic behaviour, norms for its structure and other guidelines for both overt and covert behaviour are, in turn, embedded in geographic space and places as cultural traces resulted from enacting what constitutes cultural space.

References

C a r t e r, Erica; D o n a l d, James; S q u i r e s, Judith (Eds.) 1993. *Space and Place: Theories of Identity and Location*. London: Lawrence and Wishart

D a n e s i, Marcel; P e r r o n, Paul 1999. *Analyzing Cultures: An Introduction and Handbook*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press

D o r f m a n, Ariel; M a t t e l a r t, Armand 1975. *How to Read Donald Duck: Imperialist Ideology in the Disney Comic*. New York: International General

G r e i m a s, Algirdas J. 1986. For a Topological Semiotics. – *The City and the Sign: An Introduction to Urban Semiotics*. Eds. Mark Gottdiener, Alexandros Ph. Lagopoulos. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 25–54

K l u c k h o h n, Clyde 1961. *Mirror for Man: A Survey of Human Behavior and Social Attitudes*. Greenwich: Fawcett

K r u p n i c k, Mark (Ed.) 1983. *Displacement: Derrida and After. Theories of Contemporary Culture* 5. Bloomington: Indiana University Press

L a g o p o u l o s, Alexandros Ph. 1986. Semiological Urbanism: An Analysis of the Traditional Western Sudanese Settlement. – *The City and the Sign: An Introduction to Urban Semiotics*. Eds. Mark Gottdiener, Alexandros Ph. Lagopoulos. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 259–287

L a v i e, Smadar; S w e d e n b u r g, Ted (Eds.) 1996. *Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press

L e v c h e n k o, Jan; S a l u p e r e, Silvi (Eds.) 1999. *Conceptual Dictionary of the Tartu-Moscow Semiotic School. Tartu Semiotics Library* 2. Tartu: Tartu University Press

L é v i-S t r a u s s, Claude 1968. *Structural Anthropology*. London: Penguin Books

L i g h t, Andrew; S m i t h, Jonathan M. (Eds.) 1997. *Philosophy and Geography I: Space, Place, and Environmental Ethics*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield

L o t m a n 1986 = Ю. М. Лотман (ред.). *Труды по знаковым системам* 19. *Семиотика пространства и пространство семиотики*. Тарту: ТГУ

M a l t s 1984 = А. Мальц (ред.). *Труды по знаковым системам* 18. *Семиотика города и городской культуры: Петербург*. Тарту: ТГУ

P i l k i n g t o n, Hilary 1998. *Migration, Displacement, and Identity in Post-Soviet Russia*. London, New York: Routledge

R a n d v i i r, Anti 1999. Invasion As An Object Of Semiotics. Representing Invasion – Creating Invasion. – *Snow, Forest, Silence: The Finnish Tradition of Semiotics*. *Acta Semiotica Fennica* VII. Ed. Eero Tarasti. Imatra, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 126–135

R a n d v i i r, Anti 2000. Kaart kui kultuuritekst. – *Kultuuritekst ja traditsioonitekst*. Ed. Ülle Pärli. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, pp. 151–171

R o b e r t s o n, George; M a s h, Melinda; T i c k n e r, Lisa; B i r d, John; C u r t i s, Barry (Eds.) 1994. *Travellers' Tales: Narratives of Home and Displacement*. London: Routledge

S a u s s u r e, Ferdinand de 1959. *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library

S e b e o k, Thomas A. 1991. In What Sense Is Language a 'Primary Modeling System'? – *On Semiotic Modeling*. Eds. Myrdene Anderson, Floyd Merrell. Mouton de Gruyter

S e g a l, Daniel 1992. *Crossing Cultures: Essays in the Displacement of Western Civilization*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press

S i m p s o n, David 1987. *Wordsworth's Historical Imagination: The Poetry of Displacement*. New York: Methuen

T a l g e r i, Pramod; V e r m a, S.B. (Eds.) 1988. *Literature in Translation: From Cultural Transference to Metonymic Displacement*. Bombay: Popular Prakashan

T u a n, Yi-Fu 1979. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. London: Arnold

V a n n e s t e, Dominique 1996. *Space and Place – Mirrors of Social and Cultural Identities: Studies in Historical Geography*. *Acta Geographica Lovaniensia* 35. Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

W o o d w a r d, David 1987. Medieval *Mappaemundi*. – *The History of Cartography*, Vol. 1. *Cartography in Prehistoric, Ancient, and Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean*. Eds. J.B. Harley, David Woodward. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 286–370