

Martina Bär

University of Graz | martina.baer@uni-graz.at

KEYWORDS

interreligious buildings; multi-religious houses; religious refiguration of society;
post-secular city; House of One

ABSTRACT

Contemporary societies are increasingly characterised by secularisation, which leads to dechuraching and a pluralisation of religions and worldviews. These dynamics manifest themselves chiefly in post-secular cities. Multi-religious houses of the 21st century reflect these transformation processes. We have seen a growing phenomenon in recent years: multi-religious houses of worship have been opening on a regular basis. In Berlin, for instance, the "House of One" is being set up. These spaces aim to inspire interfaith dialogue while also engaging the public life of the city. Their goal is to dispel xenophobic prejudices against people of other religions and to promote social cohesion within a multicultural and multi-religious urban population. Furthermore, they explicitly seek to engage in dialogue with secular individuals in post-secular cities such as Berlin. The architecture should enable transcendental experiences for secular people, offering space for dialogue and rooms for prayer. One could say that the architecture of post-secular sacred buildings is intended not only to serve self-discovery but, above all, to provide a space for dialogue. This could be a sign of the refiguration of religion in societies of late modernity.

Italian metadata at the end of the file

Multi-religious Houses in Post-secular Cities as Sign of the Refiguration of Religion in Late Modernity

We have seen a growing phenomenon in recent years: new multi-religious houses of worship have been opening on a regular basis. In Berlin, for instance, the “House of One” is being set up, and in Hannover there has been a House of One since as early as 2005. In 2022, a pilot project called “House of Cultures and Religions” launched in Munich. In December 2014 the “House of Religions – Dialogue of Cultures” opened in Bern, Switzerland, and in Sri Lanka, a similar house has been established, modelled on the one in Bern. These multi-religious houses aim to inspire interreligious dialogue through communal events on interreligious topics. More than that, these multi-religious houses intend to involve the public life of the city in their dialogue, as a way of dissipating xenophobic prejudices against people of other religions, and of promoting social cohesion within a multicultural urban population.

An interesting aspect of this relatively new social phenomenon is that this type of house is springing up in major cities. If we analyse this phenomenon together with the new socio-religious approach of the *refiguration of society*¹ in late modernity developed by Berlin sociologists Martina Löw and Hubert Knoblauch, who analysed social

transformation processes, it becomes clear that the emergence of these multi-religious houses is a response to the contemporary religious and cultural situation of late modern societies.

Contemporary societies are increasingly characterised by a pluralisation of religions and worldviews; these manifest themselves chiefly in the larger cities, which is why the latter are described as post-secular cities.² Pluralisation sits within the broader context of globalisation, with its migratory flows, which has caused not simply a refiguration of society – a concept that will shortly be explained – but also a *religious refiguration* in contemporary Western European societies. The emergence of multi-religious houses can be seen as an indicator of this refiguration. They are sometimes being set up against the backdrop of a religious refiguration of contemporary Western European societies, whose progress is not without conflict. Xenophobic agitation has been on the increase, which gives added importance to spaces in which prejudices against people of other cultures and religions can be dissipated. Ideally, they will promote the social cohesion of an urban community.

What follows is intended to develop this thesis. To achieve this, it is necessary to firstly clarify the terms *refiguration* and *post-secular city* which have already been mentioned.³ In conclusion, the thesis put forward will be illustrated using the House of One in Berlin and its architecture as an example.

THE POST-SECULAR CITY

The phrase *post-secular cities* originated from the socio-philosophical theory of the post-secular society. Justin Beaumont and Christopher Baker, urbanists with their roots in the field of geography, were the first to put forward the concept of post-secular cities with their book on *Postsecular Cities. Space, Theory and Practice*. In 2013, the volume *Topographies of Faith, Religion in Urban Spaces*, a joint publication by José Casanova and other sociologists of religion, further supported the reference to the modern city as a post-secular city. The concept of the post-secular city does not assert a radical break with the secular age; rather, drawing on Jürgen Habermas, it draws attention to the boundaries of the secularisation thesis and points to the increasing pluralisation of religion and belief systems prevalent in the major cities of the West. Beaumont and Baker trace pluralisation back to postcolonial immigration, which resulted in Western metropolises being strongly influenced by a hybrid and cosmopolitan urban population. This has led to new forms of religion and spirituality which transcend the private sphere. These individuals have become active in civil society in the field of social engagement, for instance as charity workers, founders of religious schools, or members of religious political pressure groups. The latter are often involved in *faith-based organisations* in the poorer areas of cities. One factor which is relevant to this topic is that it traces the pluralisation of cities back to postcolonial migration flows and establishes that there was a revitalisation of religion in cities experiencing secularisation.

THE CONCEPT OF THE REFIGURATION OF SOCIETY AND RELIGION

The refiguration of society

It was the sociologists Martina Löw and Hubert Knoblauch who developed the concept of the refiguration of society and related it to late modern society. These social scientists understand refiguration as a transformative process which is currently taking place across a wide range of social spheres and is finding a distinct spatial expression.⁴ They have adapted and modified sociologist Norbert Elias's concept of *figuration*. Figuration is a term for the processual character of a society, which Elias described as a relational web of interdependencies with more or less unstable power balances.⁵ By introducing the concept of figuration, he wanted to energise the static structural concept of society then current in sociology and to focus attention on the processual and relational structure of society. In other words, Elias wanted to describe the processual transformation of societies. He intended to draw attention to the dependency relationships between subjects who are, at the same time,

always linked to social institutions. This relational view of society, its institutions and subjects, helps us to understand that it is not only institutions that change as a result of their dependency relationships, but also individual subjects, who change in their knowledge, imagination, and emotions. A process of social transformation results "from the encounter, the tension and the conflict between the logics of differing figurations which are passing through everyday events, emotions and imaginations, in the same way as institutions and objects."⁶

The concept of refiguration now switches the focus to the reconstruction of the social order and hence also to the organising principles of *late modernity*.⁷ The two sociologists see the cause of refiguration in the conflict between two spatial logics: on the one hand, the centralist logic of hierarchically structured organisation of business, government, and culture, which, as differentiated institutional systems, tend towards a *homogenisation* of social space; on the other, the logic of late modern societies, characterised by flat, hierarchical network structures such as *heterogeneous and hybrid spatial arrangements*.⁸ Thus, the refiguration of modernity is described by the two sociologists as the consequence of the conflict between these two spatial logics, each of which can be analysed empirically.⁹ In other words, the refiguration concept is intended to encompass the social tension that exists between contradictory tendencies – a tension-filled conflict that ultimately leads to transformations. On the one hand, there is a discernible social tendency towards flat, interconnected, and egalitarian social relationships, institutions, and institutional orders, which is associated with the opening and transgression of spaces and spatial structures, and the transnationalism of subjects and collectives through communication, tourism, commerce, migration etc. On the other hand, there is "a recognisable tendency towards a revitalisation and accentuated marking of modern territorial spaces, which emphasises local, regional or national boundaries and national identities."¹⁰

The concept of refiguration thus takes into consideration contrary trends in late modern contemporary societies and disassociates itself from the assumption that globalisation leads almost inevitably to an open global society.¹¹ In fact, the refiguration concept stresses that the tension between the different logics is an essential element of many current societies, and that it is precisely from this tension that political, social or cultural conflicts frequently result. ... Instead of assuming a shift from a modern order to a late modern, high modern or postmodern order, refiguration describes and explains what it is that results from these tensions.¹²

The EU is, in my opinion, a particularly clear example of this: on the one hand, we have the trend towards transnationalism, while on the other, countries such as Hungary are insisting on a demarcation of borders. Consequently, at the external borders of the EU, there is a rigorous, inhumane refugee policy targeting people from the Middle East and from Africa.

Hubert Knoblauch has drawn up a comparison of the ideas

Modern figuration	Postmodern or late modern figuration
Rationalisation	New irrationalism
Differentiation	Dissolution of boundaries
Structurisation	Hybridisation
Regulation	Deregulation, interpretation
Individualisation, identity	Subjectivation, singularity
Homogeneity	Heterogeneity
Unity	Hybridity

Tab. 1
Hubert Knoblauch, "Einleitung," 13

typical of these two tendencies found in Western European societies. It illustrates the two *logics* that are currently in tension, even though there are inevitably countless transition points and overlaps between the tendencies.¹³ This comparison is outlined below because it also occupies a place in the religious sphere. **Tab. 1**

As soon as two of these extreme characterisations of figuration come into contact, says Knoblauch, they lead to transformations, syntheses, or conflicts.¹⁴ The German Research Foundation has for some years been supporting research into the implications of encounters between these two contrary figurations in contemporary Western European societies, as part of the special research field "Refiguration of Spaces" at the Technical University of Berlin.

Refiguration of religion

Hubert Knoblauch has created a socio-religious adaptation of the refiguration concept and applied it to the field of religion. He recently published a collection of essays on this subject.¹⁵ He attaches the refiguration tension, outlined in the diagram above, at the socio-religious level to the controversy between secularisation theoreticians and sociologists critical of secularisation theory, who talk of a return of religion. Knoblauch attributes the theory of secularisation to modern figuration, whereas the talk of a return of religion along the lines of the spiritualisation of society is to be attributed to late modern figuration. Empirically spelt out, this means it can be claimed that in Western European societies there is a tendency towards alienation from the church and the loss of any significance of religion in everyday life, while on a global scale a return of religion is emerging – a return of religion insofar as Christianity is being revitalised by the neo-Pentecostal and charismatic churches, whilst fundamentalist movements are bringing new vitality to Islam and Hinduism. There is also a third element. There has been an empirically demonstrable growing interest in spirituality in Western Europe for years – esotericism or Eastern religions such as Buddhism – and this Knoblauch describes as re-sacralisation.¹⁶ It is precisely

in this re-sacralisation that Knoblauch sees an indication of the refiguration of religion in late modern society, since spirituality is a form which has arisen out of the tension between the church and the sects.¹⁷

Given that it is entirely possible to read spiritualisation as an indicator of refiguration, it can no longer be interpreted within the classical categories of the church and sects. While it is true that (according to Troeltsch) it resembles a third fundamentally social form of religion, i.e., mysticism, it is distinctly characterised by highly contemporaneous features: it is more popularist, that is to say, less dependent on the churches and mass media, much more generally accessible and widespread, a part of common knowledge, and it is readily individualised by the (digital) media, so that it leads to new forms of subjectivisation which are then expressed in different forms of spirituality.¹⁸

For Knoblauch, the area of spirituality and esotericism is, however, just *one* conceivable empirical indicator of the refiguration of religion in Western Europe, one with which people who are not religious or are outside the church align themselves. But *within the church* too he notices new forms of religion, "specifically in mediatised forms of religious events, rites of passage and celebrations"¹⁹ such as devotional acts of worship for young people in the Catholic Church. Among the indicators of the refiguration of religion he includes new structures of translocal congregations, coordinated and held together via digital media. Similarly, new forms of participation in and affiliation to the church can be indications of refiguration, one example being a reformed participatory church in Berlin-Moabit.

Furthermore, Knoblauch points out that, in late modernity, not only the polarity between the Church and the sects, but also that within the religions, has intensified. Taking the Roman Catholic Church in Germany as an example, this type of tension – which many fear could lead to

a schism – is plain to see. On the one hand, there are vigorous efforts to democratise and modernise the Roman Catholic Church. The conservative camp, on the other hand, eloquently champions an antimodern Catholicism loyal to Rome: one which retains its traditional structures and antimodern beliefs. The battle between these two poles is currently taking place in the form of a discussion entitled the Synodal Journey, which was launched by the German Bishops' Conference and the Central Committee of German Catholics, following the 2019 abuse scandal.

What is more – and this is particularly important for the subject of this article – Knoblauch refers to the fact that a macro-sociological comparison between religions enables the collection of data showing that, in late modernity, institutionalised religions are less inclined to compete with each other, but tend rather to cooperate, for instance in the area of spiritual care.²⁰ This point holds considerable interest for the theme of this article, since it can be carried over to the field of interreligious dialogue in current society and can explain the emergence of multi-religious houses. In other words: multi-religious houses can be interpreted as an indicator of the refiguration of religion in late modernity. Multi-religious houses have been able to evolve out of the opposition between the modern figuration of secularisation and the late modern figuration of religious pluralisation. The homogenous majority society, previously largely Christian, has been heterogenised in the religious sphere by migration processes, especially within the context of globalisation. But alongside the secularisation process, globalisation – accompanied by its migration processes – has also led to a return of religion. This, in turn, has sparked interreligious dialogue and weakened the Islamophobic tendencies in society – tendencies which had been greatly amplified by the media. Particularly since the terrorist attacks which started with the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center on 11 September 2001, many Western societies have made increasing efforts to promote interreligious dialogue, not least because it encourages social cohesion and hence peaceful coexistence within Western societies characterised by cultural and religious pluralisation – thereby counteracting xenophobia. Globalisation and mediatisation are decisive parameters for the refiguration concept when seeking to explain what drives refiguration in late modern society. They also serve as parameters for the refiguration of religion at the level of interreligious dialogue. Hitherto, Knoblauch's own thinking and the contributions to his collection of essays have lacked the interreligious dimension of late modern societies, which, strictly speaking, is developing in the opposite direction to the exclusivist understanding of religion found in fundamentalist movements. Interreligious dialogue²¹ and the (theological) shift towards inclusivist – and in particular pluralist – religious models stand in opposition to fundamentalist movements and their exclusivist understanding of religion (and society). Against the outlined backdrop of the refiguration of contemporary Western society and its opposite poles in the religious realm, I would categorise the establishment of multi-religious houses in late modernity

as a late modern refiguration of religion. Taking the House of One in Berlin as an example, I would like to demonstrate the extent to which it is possible to reflect upon it as a sign of the religious refiguration of a late modern urban community.

HOUSE OF ONE IN BERLIN.

AN EXAMPLE OF RELIGIOUS REFIGURATION IN LATE MODERN SOCIETIES

Why should we reflect on the House of One as an interesting example of the religious refiguration of late modern societies in the centre of a major city? The main reason is that it was planned as a sacred building, with an explicitly theological intention which makes reference to the multi-religious and secular circumstances pertaining in the city of Berlin, and is intended to establish a fresh "architectural genus," since this sacred building is neither a church, nor a mosque, nor a synagogue, but a *21st century sacred building*, as one member of the planning group put it.²² By this he meant that a sacred building typical of the 21st century is a multi-religious house which accommodates both sacred spaces for the three monotheistic religions mentioned (there are also other multi-religious houses with other religions) as well as a large meeting area in the centre of the building. It is this central area that expresses the central aim of the building, which is to give space for dialogue between the religions, but also for dialogue with the public sphere in the centre of a secular cosmopolitan city. At the same time, this central space should allow architectural transcendence to be experienced, so that it indeed remains a sacred space. Such a holistic architectural composition, which not only provides space for dialogue, encounter and transcendence in the central space, but also makes it possible to celebrate the genuine uniqueness of each religion in the individual sacred spaces, is what sets this new *genre* of sacred buildings for the 21st century apart. For the sociologist Hubert Knoblauch, the fact that, rather than competing with each other, the individual religions strive to create shared spiritual offerings is – as mentioned above – a typical sign of the religious refiguration in late modern societies. In this instance, it is also significant that representatives of the three monotheistic religious communities have agreed upon a shared sacred building.

Like other multi-religious houses, the building is inextricably linked with a social process that inclines towards recognition of religious heterogeneity and networking. There is, however, a tension between this inclination and the opposing social propensity towards the homogenisation of society, which involves distancing oneself from other religions and a drift towards xenophobia, islamophobia or antisemitism. Given this societal tension – which has an influence on the religious realm – this kind of multi-religious house can definitely make a valuable contribution to social cohesion.

And this is precisely the intention of the group responsible for planning the architecture of the House of One. The architecture itself is based on an interreligious theology, briefly outlined below, which offers a particularly clear illustration of the collaborative effort characteristic of religious refiguration.

Theology and architecture

The impetus for the House of One from the perceptive theological thinking of the Evangelische Kirchengemeinde [Protestant congregation] of the Church of St Peter & St Mary, which inherited the area in the centre of Berlin on which the House of One is now under construction, with completion planned in 2025. The site had most recently served as an archaeological excavation, uncovering the remains of a church dating back to the Middle Ages. This delayed the start of construction work. Given the location in the centre of the metropolis of Berlin, with its religious diversity and yet largely secular character (approximately 62% of the urban population of Berlin have no religious affiliation), during the first period of excavation from 2006 to 2009, when the foundation of St Peter and St. Mary's Church was exposed, the congregation was faced with the question of how they could take on responsibility for such a highly dramatic and sensitive place. Highly dramatic, because at the end of World War II, the Waffen-SS blew up the church tower, thereby destroying the church. A further question facing the congregation at the time: what does the city need from us as religious communities? What should a new church foundation look like and how can it win people over? The solution which guided the action taken by those responsible was found in Dietrich Bonhoeffer's dictum, which he wrote in 1944 "The church is a church only if it is there for others."²³ According to the theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the Church must engage with the secular world. Against the backdrop of a multi-religious urban population, the idea of founding a multi-religious house was born. Interestingly, Bonhoeffer's dictum that the church should be there for others was interpreted as a call for hospitality towards other religions and the secular urban community, which led to the creation of an open, shared space for prayer and dialogue. As project partners, the congregation embraced the Jewish Abraham Geiger College and the Islamic association, Forum for Intercultural Dialogue. The planners then launched an architectural competition and in September 2012 a winning design was announced.

The interreligious planning group embarked on a theological process that was to influence the architecture of the House of One. The pastor of the congregation, Gregor Hohberg, explained that the planning group gradually recognised an increasing need to give shape to a shared architectural and symbolic expression of the cultural and religious heritage of the three monotheistic religions, as the prominent religious forces in the centre of the city.

It has become increasingly clear to us that the House of Prayer and Learning [House of One] should be a sacred building, designed and used as a place of contemplation, but one that also embodies a rich variety of metaphors for God's work in and with the building.²⁴

The building is intended to make space, quite literally, for this open, indeed almost humble, attitude to the manifold power of God in the world in disregarding the individual religions' typical image of God, such as the Christian concept of God as Father. The use of such an open concept of God is a typical symbol of the recognition of

the heterogeneity of late modern societies.

And yet this was still not enough. The planning group was eager to take the explicitly courageous step of occupying an empty space in the centre of the secular city of Berlin. Its members asked what it was that the secular city of Berlin might need from the religions as such. They found their answer in the vision "of heaven in the centre of Berlin: one which will enhance the city and honour of God."²⁵ The aim was that in the architectural design idiom this vision should take the forms of dimensions and light, since light (kavod, doxa, etc.) is understood by all three monotheistic religions to be the most direct divine manifestation in the world. In the text of the invitation to enter the architectural competition held in 2012, the theological intention was formulated as follows:

The architecture of the building should be such that anyone approaching or entering the building should immediately be-aware of its sacred, transcendent otherness, and the fact that it has been built by the three monotheistic religions. The quality and perception of space should therefore be a major priority, and infrastructure is a secondary consideration. ... The building (House of One, author's note) should be open and inviting to all, including those of no religion, but the three faiths should also be apparent in the external design. The architecture should give adequate expression to the complex relationship between the religions.²⁶

The ready accessibility of the site in the centre of Berlin makes the House particularly suitable for communicative exchanges with the secular urban community: a place where the new, the visionary, and the alien can be reflected upon. Neither the dialogue with the secular public life of the city, nor the interreligious dialogue should, according to the planning group, be a purely intellectual exchange which sheds light on other points of view. Rather, it may be critical and demanding, with the result that the respective religions can learn to suspend part of their dogmatic underpinning to allow something new to emerge. In other words, the religious representatives of the House are explicitly interested in a process of development and understanding: transformation through religious refiguration. So what I should like to say, from the perspective of the religious refiguration concept, is that the religious communities of this multi-religious House are prepared to enter the place of tension between homogeneity and heterogeneity and to allow themselves, as participating religious communities, to be transformed thereby.

The architectural expression is intended to encourage this. The invitation to enter the architectural competition stated that there should be three separate sacred areas - one for each of the three religions - but that these should be arranged around a shared central space. The readiness for a process of transformation was established by stating that the more effectively the architectural design opened the building to the city and to other religions, the more intensively it would

inspire the process of self-understanding and identity. Since the central space is to function as a spatial symbol of the togetherness of the three religions, it is to be generously proportioned. What is special about the Berlin House of One is that it is to be used as a *sacred space* in which “the high-quality architecture ... will encourage visitors to linger and, because adherents of the different faiths will be compelled to mingle as they enter and leave their own places of worship, promote encounters between them,” according to the description in the invitation to enter the architectural competition.²⁷ The Berlin architectural firm, Kuehn Malvezzi, whose design offered the most compelling realisation of these intentions, was unanimously awarded the competition prize. The fact that the planning group explicitly requested a sacred space for all three religions, that is, an interreligious sacred space aimed to welcoming to the secular population, is a clear indicator of religious refiguration in late modernity.

In conclusion, I would like to pose the question of whether multi-religious houses can contribute to social cohesion. In my introduction, I referred to the time-diagnostic reference framework of a critical analysis of the present, which serves as the basis for understanding the emergence of multi-religious houses against the backdrop of increasing xenophobia.

Multi-religious houses and social cohesion

In my view, multi-religious houses can contribute to social cohesion, provided that their facilities include a centrally located space for dialogue. Allow me to explain how I have arrived at this conclusion. According to Henrik Gast, social cohesion is generated by interaction.²⁸ The more frequent and intensive the interaction, the greater a group's cohesion. If the architecture of the building is designed to create such a space in the centre of a building, this then enables interaction between the religions and a secular urban community. Bourdieu maintained that a physical space has an effect on people's habitus, which in turn influences their social behaviour. Consequently, when an architectural space is explicitly and deliberately provided – a space which facilitates social interaction between religions and world views – it can promote social cohesion right in the heart of a thoroughly heterogeneous city such as Berlin. Admittedly, the mere provision of a space for interreligious and ideological interaction is not sufficient. The physical space must be brought to life by people who engage in frequent and meaningful interaction. A structure alone cannot promote social cohesion, as the spatial urban sociologist Martina Löw points out. So it is important that those who have developed the fundamental concept of the multi-religious house translate their visionary idea into hands-on social activity. They can then initiate dialogue along these lines to stimulate and inspire visitors from other religions and from those who live and work in the city, and indeed tourists. In the best scenarios, this will disrupt patterns of thought that lead to social homogenisation, which are fed by xenophobia, islamophobia and renewed outbreaks of antisemitism. Only in this way can an

architectural design permeate the social life of a city, contribute to its well-being, and perhaps even open a window on transcendence.

CONCLUSION

The spatial coexistence of different religions in multi-religious houses can trigger a process of religious transformation within a religious community or an individual believer. This becomes possible when interreligious and intercultural encounters take place as part of everyday life – one which is supported architecturally by a space designed for dialogue. Such encounters can result in an examination of one's own religion, and of the plurality of religions, which reaches beyond institutionalised theological dialogue into a tangible, spatial dialogue. This kind of architecture allows the participating religious communities a shared place in which they navigate about within the tension between religious homogeneity and heterogeneity. The spatially generated tension between homogeneity and heterogeneity sets in motion processes of religious refiguration. In the best-case scenarios, these processes will, in turn, have repercussions for society in terms of social cohesion, whereby the facilitation of such a multi-religious house in itself represents an indicator for the refiguration of religion in late modern society.

¹ Martina Löw and Hubert Knoblauch, eds., *Am Ende der Globalisierung. Über die Refiguration von Räumen* (Verlag, 2021).

² Justin Beaumont and Christopher Baker, *Postsecular Cities. Space, Theory and Practice* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2011); Irene Becci, Marian Burchardt and José Casanova, eds., *Topographies of Faith. Religion in Urban Spaces* (Brill, 2013).

³ For the following see also: Martina Bär, “Refiguration des Religiösen im Haus der Religionen in Bern,” in *Bauen – Wohnen – Glauben. Lebendige Architektur und religiöse Räume*, eds. Philipp David and others (Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2023), 379–406.

⁴ Martina Löw and Hubert Knoblauch, “Am Ende der Globalisierung. Über die Refiguration von Räumen,” in *Am Ende der Globalisierung*, 9–22.

⁵ Norbert Elias, *Was ist Soziologie?* (Suhrkamp, 1970). Elias associated figuration with a transformation towards a global world state. He reckoned with a transformation from one form to another; cited in Martina Löw and Hubert Knoblauch, “Raumfiguren, Raumkulturen und Refiguration von Räumen,” in *Am Ende der Globalisierung*, 25–57, 31.

⁶ Löw and Knoblauch, “Raumfiguren,” 32.

⁷ Löw and Knoblauch, “Raumfiguren,” 31.

⁸ Löw and Knoblauch, “Raumfiguren,” 34–8.

⁹ The reconfiguration concept also aims to capture those transformation processes in contemporary society that are moving away from heterogenisation and tending towards homogenisation.

¹⁰ Löw and Knoblauch, “Raumfiguren,” 32.

¹¹ Jens Greve and Bettina Heintz, “Die ‘Entdeckung’ der Weltgesellschaft. Entstehung und Grenzen der Weltgesellschaftstheorie,” *Zeitschrift für Soziologie, Sonderausgabe Weltgesellschaft* (2005): 89–119. Cited in Löw and Knoblauch, “Raumfiguren,” 33.

¹² Löw and Knoblauch, “Raumfiguren,” 32f.

¹³ Hubert Knoblauch, “Einleitung: Die Refiguration der Religion,” in *Die Refiguration der Religion. Perspektiven der Religionssoziologie und Religionswissenschaft*, ed. Hubert Knoblauch (Beltz, 2020), 7–28, 13.

¹⁴ Knoblauch, “Einleitung,” 13.

¹⁵ Knoblauch, *Die Refiguration der Religion*.

¹⁶ Knoblauch, “Einleitung,” 18. However, this re-sacralisation already began in the 18th century with occultism and spiritualism and Marian movements due to Marian apparitions.

¹⁷ For the sociology of religion, the tension between sacralisation and secularisation points to the fundamental difference between two patterns of religious organisation that are very similar to the two figurations: If churches as a social form of religion tend to be characterised by hierarchical order and clear structures, the ideal type of

sect is also a rather flat type of organisation that allows for different manifestations; Knoblauch, "Einleitung," 18.

¹⁸ Knoblauch, "Einleitung," 18.

¹⁹ Knoblauch, "Einleitung," 20.

²⁰ Knoblauch, "Einleitung," 19.

²¹ Interreligious dialogue and the interest in interreligiousness can be traced back to the social developments in the 20th century, which focused on peace and dialogue. At the latest after the Second World War and the horrors of the Shoah, peace and interreligious dialogue efforts among the religions were intensified.

²² See Gregor Hohberg, "Come to me all," in *The House of Prayer and Learning, Berlin. Designs for the sacred building of tomorrow*, eds. Gregor Hohberg and Roland Stolte (DOM Publishers, 2013), 18.

²³ Hohberg, "Come to me all," 15.

²⁴ Hohberg, "Come to me all," 16–7.

²⁵ Hohberg, "Come to me all," 18.

²⁶ Marc Jordi, "An unprecedented construction work. The competition's core requirements," in *The House of Prayer and Learning*, 37.

²⁷ Jordi, "Construction work," 38.

²⁸ Henrik Gast, "Sozialpsychologie," in *Handbuch Staat*, ed. Rüdiger Voigt (Springer VS, 2018), 101–10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BÄR, MARTINA. "Refiguration des Religiösen im Haus der Religionen in Bern." In *Bauen – Wohnen – Glauben. Lebendige Architektur und religiöse Räume*, edited by Philipp David and others, 379–406. Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2023.

BEAUMONT, JUSTIN, and CHRISTOPHER BAKER. *Postsecular Cities. Space, Theory and Practice*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2011.

BECCI, IRENE, MARIAN BURCHARDT, and JOSÉ CASANOVA, eds. *Topographies of Faith. Religion in Urban Spaces*. Brill, 2013.

BONHOEFFER, DIETRICH. *Widerstand und Ergebung*. In *Dietrich-Bonhoeffer-Werke (=DBW), Band 8, Briefe und Aufzeichnungen aus der Haft*, edited by Christian Gremmels and others. Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998.

ELIAS, NORBERT. *Was ist Soziologie?*. Suhrkamp, 1970.

GAST, HENRIK. "Sozialpsychologie." In *Handbuch Staat*, edited by Rüdiger Voigt, 101–10. Springer VS, 2018.

GREVE, JENS, and BETTINA HEINTZ. "Die 'Entdeckung' der Weltgesellschaft. Entstehung und Grenzen der Weltgesellschaftstheorie." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie, Sonderausgabe Weltgesellschaft* (2005): 89–119.

HOHBERG, GREGOR. "Come to me all." In *The House of Prayer and Learning, Berlin. Designs for the sacred building of tomorrow*, edited by Gregor Hohberg and Roland Stolte, 14–20. DOM Publishers, 2013.

JORDI, MARC. "An unprecedented construction work. The competition's core requirements." In *The House of Prayer and Learning, Berlin. Designs for the sacred building of tomorrow*, edited by Gregor Hohberg and Roland Stolte, 34–40. DOM Publishers, 2013.

KNOBLAUCH, HUBERT, ed. *Die Refiguration der Religion. Perspektiven der Religionssoziologie und Religionswissenschaft*. Beltz, 2020.

KNOBLAUCH, HUBERT. "Einleitung: Die Refiguration der Religion." In *Die Refiguration der Religion. Perspektiven der Religionssoziologie und Religionswissenschaft*, edited by Hubert Knoblauch. Beltz, 2020.

LÖW, MARTINA, and HUBERT KNOBLAUCH, eds. *Am Ende der Globalisierung. Über die Refiguration von Räumen*. Verlag, 2021.

Luoghi multi-religiosi nelle città post secolari: la House of One di Berlino come esempio

Martina Bär

KEYWORDS

edifici interreligiosi; case multi-religiose; riconfigurazione religiosa della società; città post-secolare; House of One

ABSTRACT

Le società contemporanee sono sempre più caratterizzate dalla secolarizzazione, che provoca un ridimensionamento del valore istituzionale della Chiesa, e da una pluralizzazione delle religioni e delle visioni del mondo, che si manifesta soprattutto nelle città post-secolari. Le case multireligiose del XXI secolo riflettono questi processi di trasformazione. Negli ultimi anni abbiamo assistito a un fenomeno in crescita: la regolare apertura di case di culto multireligiose. A Berlino, ad esempio, è in fase di realizzazione la "House of One" ("casa dell'Uno"). Spazi di questo tipo mirano a ispirare il dialogo interreligioso e a coinvolgere in esso la vita pubblica della città, come modo per dissipare i pregiudizi xenofobi nei confronti di persone di altre religioni, e per promuovere la coesione sociale all'interno di una popolazione urbana multiculturale e multireligiosa. Inoltre, le case di culto multireligiose vogliono esplicitamente entrare in dialogo con la popolazione laica delle città post-secolari come Berlino. L'architettura dovrebbe consentire esperienze trascendentali anche ai laici, fornendo loro uno spazio per il dialogo e sale di preghiera. Si potrebbe dire che l'architettura degli edifici sacri post-secolari non ha lo scopo solo di servire alla scoperta di sé, ma soprattutto di fornire uno spazio per il dialogo. Questo potrebbe essere un segno della riconfigurazione della religione nelle società della tarda modernità.

Martina Bär

University of Graz | martina.baer@uni-graz.at

Martina Bär è Professore Ordinario di Teologia fondamentale presso l'Università di Graz. La sua ricerca si concentra sulla teologia urbana, sul parlare di Dio nelle società postmoderne, sulla svolta iconica in teologia e sull'antropologia teologica. Ha studiato teologia e storia all'Università Eberhard-Karls di Tubinga e all'Università di Comillas a Madrid. Ha conseguito il dottorato presso l'Università di Erfurt ricevendo il Premio Maria-Kassel della Università di Münster.

Dr. Martina Bär is a full-professor for Fundamental Theology at the University of Graz. Her research focuses on urban theology, God-talking in postmodern societies, iconic turn in theology, theological anthropology. She studied Theology and History at the Eberhard-Karls-University of Tübingen and at the Universidad de Comillas in Madrid. She got her doctorate from the University of Erfurt and her thesis received the Maria-Kassel-Prize of the University of Münster.