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ABSTRACT

Temples, in the past, had a priority over other types of buildings in most ancient cultures. However, in the early ages of monotheistic religions, religious buildings were considered merely as gathering places for people to pray. However, throughout history, sacred meanings were ascribed to ‘monotheistic temples’ and they have now transformed into spaces where religious authority is legitimated. Thus, monotheistic temples were dissociated from other buildings like their ancient counterparts. Likewise, it can be said that religious authority is dissociated from congregation. System’s continuity depends on the potential energy difference between authority and congregation, which is highly undesirable for the profane world. This situation provides some privileges to authority but in return authority has to legitimize its existence continuously. Although the distinction between sacred and profane exists, the situation is a gameplay in today’s rather secular world. Intersection between authority and congregation is mostly visible when rituals take place, and space becomes the field of the game. Sequences of space and sequences of events are normally independent systems. If sequences of events are liable to predefined programs, then components of the space become a ‘decoration’. In fact, religious rituals are strictly defined programs and enforce their existence over space. This way, space becomes an instrument for authority to legitimize their power. Moreover, configuration of the space becomes a component of the power game.

In this paper, the relation between religious authority and congregation is analysed during rituals, grounded on cross readings of syntactic and observation data. Four actively used temples located in Istanbul have been chosen to be observed: a synagogue; an Assyrian church; a mosque; and an Alevi cemevi. Spatial potentials of these temples are compared to each other for religious authority and congregation respectively. The aim is to attempt to understand if monotheistic religions’ understanding of power and authority reflects their space configuration. Indeed, nuances have been observed between temples spatial configuration and the understanding of power which is semantically valuable.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In order for a system based on power to sustain its existence, there should be potential energy differences between the actors in the game. As Foucault asserts, these actors are the subtle techniques that are spread to the whole society and are referred to as ‘dispositif’. Discourses, institutions, architectural regulations, laws, administrative savings, heterogeneous systems which consist of a scientific, philosophical, and ethical propositions and outputs arising from the interaction between these elements are actors in the game (Keskin, 1997). In this sense, religious products can be regarded as ‘dispositif[s]’ as well. Potential differences are visible between sacred and secular spaces, daily life and liturgies, congregation, and authority. The differences are created by free individuals through subtle techniques that enables power games. The authority must constantly justify its presence for the continuity of the game. Likewise, congregation is in, and a part of the game. Due to the skills acquired by remaining in the game for centuries, all the monotheistic religions have been producing and changing these techniques constantly. Although these techniques converge on each other — among monotheistic religions — at many points, there are nuances between them. The differences of intersection characteristics between the congregation and religious authority is analysed by examining temples from each Abrahamic religion, to try to grasp the power attractions that emerge in holy places. In order to understand the divine emerging in space, structure is constructed on three main piers of questions:

1. About Space: How once profane concepts of gathering places have evolved to sacred spaces?
2. About Power: How power is allocated between actors and maintains its existence in sacred spaces?
3. About Intersection: What happens during liturgical ceremonies when all actors are active?

1.1 THE EMERGENCE OF THE SACRED SPACE

Sacred spaces, apart from their intricate meanings, promise a differentiation from ordinary (profane) places. "…for religious man, space is not homogeneous; he experiences interruptions, breaks in it; some parts of space are qualitatively different from others." (Eliade, 1963). Most of the religions have detailed discourses about sacred spaces. Those spaces are indisputably sacred, and divinity is embedded to space itself. In almost every polytheistic religion, temples are the home of the gods and at the same time center of the world, this way they are originally dissociated from profane (Özel, 1998). The same approach exists in Monotheistic religions as well. For example, Yahweh in Judaism, leads Israelites inside a tent throughout Exodus. The tent is sacred. Kaaba is the center of the world for Islamic world and it is sacred.

Although monotheistic religions now have sacred places, when they first arose, tendency was to see temples as a meeting place rather than a sacred space. The root of the word synagogue is derived from the Greek word ‘sunagogé’ which means ‘meeting’. Church has two roots: one is from a Greek word ‘kurios’ which means god or master, and the other is ‘ekklesia’ which means ‘meeting’ and ‘people coming together’. In this sense, church is both a ‘meeting place’ and at the same time ‘house of God’. This dual status makes sense when evolution of what church meant for Christians is considered. For the first generation of Christians, the church is there where the believers are (Özel, 1998). They do not need a specialized space to perform their worship; the congregation becomes the structure itself.
First, worship areas were wide rooms of the houses, and then wealthy people began to donate their houses for the service of religion. Finally, basilicas—which were originally profane meeting halls for Romans—came into use for Christians. This way, over time, churches become dissociated from the mainstream architectural language. They are defined as ‘celesital city’ from the beginning of 4th century CE. In the 7th century CE, churches were begun to be sanctified at groundbreaking ceremonies (Özel, 1998). The same manner of evolution goes for Muslims as well. The word ‘mosque’ is derived from the Arabic word ‘cem [djem]’ which means ‘gathering’. Cemevi, where Alevi worship takes place, comes from the same root and serves for the purpose of gathering. But configuration of mosques also changed fundamentally over time. Doğan Kuban explains this change with the power of the emperor-state image (1993). The most typical indicator of it, is how ‘mihrab’ changed what it represented for the mosque. In the beginning of Islamic architecture, mihrab was an ordinary element for the mosque used only to mark the wall that faces Mecca, because it is essential to know the direction for prayers. But from the beginning of the early periods of hypostyle mosque architecture, mihrab is emphasized using expanded naves or domes, with some special spaces allocated only for the emperor to use. This way mihrab gained its divine value afterwards (Özel, 1998). In fact, "…mihrab is not sacred in contrast to the altar. What is sacred is the worshipping direction which is shown by its own existence.” (Frishman, 1994). In Iraq, the tradition of building the palace of the emperor adjacent to the mihrab wall had started between early 7th late 8th centuries CE and went on for two hundred years. Another example for how space can be manipulated is when caliphs were blessed in a ceremony before they began their service in front of an originally profane element, ‘minbar’. All these situations indicate the close relationship between liturgical elements and architecture itself with state and authority.

In conclusion, "…monotheistic religions, when compared to polytheistic religions, in their early stages in order to prevent worshipping to a structure or an object, didn’t define any special prayer areas. However, over time, to influence the believers and expand the community, temples of monotheistic religions begun to be built majestically and gain sacred status. This process of ascribing sacred quality to an originally initiated to be profane architectural product is usually work of politics.” (Özel, 1998).

Sanctity is ‘emerged’ (hierophany) even if the first vision was quite the opposite. Sacred spaces became dissociated from other types of buildings and mainstream architecture, thus producing a potential energy difference from profane places.

1.2 THE LEGITIMATION OF RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY

It is normal to tend to see the matter of power as ‘the ability to possess potency’. However, authority represents only one side of the power game. "Essentially, power is a matter of ‘management’ rather than a conflict or a connection between two rivals." (Foucault, 1982). As Foucault asserts, ‘management’ means not only political structures, but also technologies that make it possible to lead the behaviour of individuals. "To rule is to structure probable behaviour domain of others.” (Foucault, 1982). When practice of power is defined as "acting on the action of others”, an important element is included in the process—freedom. (Foucault, 1982). Power can only be applicable on ‘free subjects’,
and, as long as they are ‘free’. When freedom is not provided to individuals, the situation turns into a matter of domination rather than practice of power, and all power technologies have the risk of transforming into dominance under certain conditions.

The type of power that Foucault attributed to the Ancient Eastern World (Egypt, Assyria, Palestine…) and later developed by the Hebrews is known as ‘pastoralism’. The word pastor [pasteur] is used in the meaning of shepherd, priest, router, advisor. "The idea of a divine entity, a king or a leader as a shepherd who leads sheep herd is a thing that Greeks and the Romans didn’t know." (Foucault, 1982). In political formations of power —such as governments in Ancient Greece—, the duty of the politician is "to constitute city-states and to guarantee its unity." (Foucault, 1982). However, in individualized forms of power such as in pastoral technology the leader "wants to support the lifetime of a group of individuals"; (he is responsible for ensuring the wellness of each individual). “In short, political issues focus on the relationship between an individual and citizens. Pastoral problem is concerned about the life of individuals.” (Foucault, 1982). In Ancient Greece, the matter of obedience is more like a duty—a life that was sacrificed for the good of the city-state. However, with the invention of pastoralism, obedience itself is considered to be virtuous. Because unarguably the leader wishes whatever is best for everyone in pastoral technology and the leader has all information about each member of the community, and, he is also responsible for their sins and good deeds. Which means religious leader has to legitimize his authority to the extent that he provides well-being to each individual in the community.

Legitimation of power is a fragile process. Legitimation may be necessary for a certain amount of stability in the system. However, overuse of power might transform a legitimate authority into an unquestioned one (Dovey, 2008). Through built form’s symbols, authority can be stabilized and legitimated (Olsen, 1993). After Enlightenment, the world gradually became more secular. Thus, the aforementioned power technologies cannot sustain their assets as they once were. However, legitimation of religious power is a long-lasting practice for religious authorities and ‘pastoral power’ —as Foucault described— can still be found in religious organizations.

An important inverse correlation could be distinguished between distribution of power and the need for legitimation. Legitimation is necessary for both power holders and the rest (Dovey, 2008). “The more absolute the power, the greater the need to believe that the power holder observes self-imposed restraints. (Wrong, 1979). For example, highly legitimate institutional authorities don’t need to have trappings. Legitimation symbols can be observed densely if the authorities’ power is questionable and vulnerable. This is why, compared to democracies, monarchies, dictatorships and military states are eager to build monumental structures and organize parades and ritual strutting (Dovey, 2008). Religious exercise of power is institutional regarding their long-established tradition. However, considering the emergence of sacred space and monumentality in religious architecture and liturgies, it can be said that religious power is in a constant need for legitimation.
1.3 SPATIAL PROJECTIONS ABOUT LITURGIES

Rituals, ceremonies, and symbolic displays, are often a means for authority to reproduce itself and operate undercover—as Foucauldian interpretation of power asserts. In the absence of consensus, symbolic rituals enable disparate meaning to collapse into a form of political solidarity. This form of legitimation is specifically effective, because rituals are inarguable—‘common truth’ and ‘real world’ is constructed at that moment (Dovey, 2008).

Rituals don’t have an evil nature per se; and, as they can be used for performing violence, they can also become useful to enhance solidarity and friendship (Barnes, 1988). Buildings and urban designs are integrated with such rituals and ceremonies (Dovey, 2008). This integration can occur in several ways. As Tschumi asserts, sequences of events and the sequences of space are independent systems. Narrative, enables these two systems to intertwine and identify each other. Narrative, in the sense Tschumi uses it, defines the relationship between the architectural production and its user (Yaxley, 2014). By courtesy of narrative, new relations arise between these two systems; familiar elements of the system become visible and can be experienced differently (Tschumi, 1983). The programme becomes crucial here. If program dictates events and movements in a way that they can only happen in a single order; these two systems of sequences and events begin to contradict each other. Rituals are these kinds of strict programmes, and are predefined sequences over spaces. “A ritual implies a near-frozen relationship between space and event” (Tschumi, 1983). For this reason, the narrative cannot be included in the process of experiencing the space naturally. The possibility of space to provide new and unexpected possibilities to its user under normal circumstances is prevented. Spaces and events turn into mere tools for rituals to be demonstrated. (Tschumi, 1983). Although Tschumi gives different architectural events, religious rituals can easily be adapted to this phenomenon.

Behaviour of the user (in this case it’s both religious leader and congregation) is the key factor while trying to examine the relationship between the space and exercise of power. Under normal circumstances, there is an organic relationship between the user of the space and space itself, and this relationship has possibilities to provide new and undefined various usages of the space. However, if sequences of the events are predefined by a strict program, space becomes a mere decoration for ritual to take place.

In an attempt to conclude the first three main piers of this research, religious spaces dissociated from profane architecture and have now turned into eligible buildings in which authority crystallized, from ordinary gathering spaces. Sacredness is not embedded to spaces from the beginning, but it is imposed afterwards. Power, as monotheistic religions define, is a personal, pastoral technology. Religious authority is dissociated from the community and produces potential energy differences and privileges. Although authority’s power is derived from being in a sacred community, this power is not unlimited. Legitimation is more necessary when authority is less powerful. Monumentality and rituals are considered as useful tools and companions for legitimation processes, and religious power exercise benefits from both of them—which may be interpreted as fragility in the authority. After all, this procedure is a game rather than a case of domination and liturgies are when this game is most visible. If space, elements of space and events that occur in space, are dependent systems on a strictly
predefined program they become instrumentalized. Indeed, the liturgy of monotheistic religions are shaped upon clearly predefined programs. In this sense, and in addition to their many other functions—liturgies can be seen as a field for authority to make its power legitimize, and this is when the configuration of the space gains importance. (Figure 1)

![Figure 1: Three main piers of the theoretical basis.](image)

2. METHODOLOGY

Analysing the intersection of congregation and authority during liturgies is highly important when investigating the legitimation of power. This analysis comprises two main axes. The first is about decomposing the liturgies. That is, defining the thresholds to understand the process. Religious liturgies are not continuous processes, instead they consist of various break points when activities and locations of the users change. In between these changes, relative semantic and syntactic values of authority and congregation is constantly being redefined. Thus, this creates some thresholds in the process.

After defining these thresholds, it is important to analyse the spatial potentialities of both authority and congregation have. Hillier and Hanson defined a range of properties that can be applied to any syntactic structure (1984). Two particular data is immensely related to the exercise of power. One of them is, ‘ringiness’ second one is the ‘depth’ (Dovey, 2008). Ringiness is about the control of the space and characteristics of the interconnections between the spatial segments. ‘Network’ formation of the segments leads to accessible, ‘shallow’ spaces. On the contrary ‘linear’ or ‘branching’ formations are controllable. Segments are organised in a way that in order to reach one point, the user has to traverse other spaces first, which creates ‘depth’ in overall organization (Dovey, 2008). Shallow and ringy buildings are considered more exploratory and informal. Deep and branching buildings tend to be more guided and controlled (Hanson, 1996). But it is not easy to identify the relationship of power and depth as some buildings can use the same formation inversely. As Hillier and Hanson define ‘reversed buildings’ wield the syntactic formation reversely as positioning the powerless in the deepest and power holders in the shallowest cells as the powerless can easily been monitored under surveillance (1984).
Syntax 2D program developed by Michigan University is used to perform syntactic measurements. The average values of where authority, and where congregation has been standing during liturgies and how they change at the breaking points of the liturgies, are calculated according to the area, perimeter, drift, connectivity, mean depth and integration values. Average syntax values for both authority and congregation enables the comparison between the location of the congregation and the authority for four different sacred spaces. The goal is trying to understand the nuances between different religious space configurations and liturgies. This affects the emergence of power in the space comparatively.

Yeniköy Synagogue (1870s), the Syrian Catholic Church (1982), Laleli Mosque (1763) and Şahkulu Sultan Cemevi (1861) are believed to have an idea about the relationship between the authority and the community, and the liturgies of three monotheistic religions (Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Temples selected for the study.](image)

The reasons why these structures are selected to be observed are shown below:

- The structures are medium-sized and do not have monumental features.
- They have been built approximately at the same time period.
- They convergence on their own architectural typology in the history.
- They are still in-use.

In order to have an insight about the liturgies, the temples mentioned above have been visited during special ceremonial days of each.

2.1 DEFINING THE TRESHOLDS

As stated previously, it is essential to shred the processes into pieces where religious leader and congregation located in space, and how they change their positions according to each other by being able to embrace the processes with syntactic values interrelatedly.

SABBATH, YENIKOY TIFERET ISRAEL SYNAGOGUE

It is a small-scale, masonry synagogue which was constructed in 1870’s by the Camondo family, and repaired by architect Jak Pardo in 1957. During a typical Shabbath rite, rabbi is responsible for preaching. Although hazan has a lower status than rabbi, reading the sacred texts is an important part of the Jewish tradition, and hazan is responsible for reading them. In typologically traditional synagogues, there is a special place ascribed both for rabbi and hazan opposite of each other. That is
the reason why traditional synagogues often have two-centered plan configurations. Yeniköy Synagogue has this traditional typology. Two-centered plan reflects on how congregation locates in the temple. There are horizontal sitting elements that faces rabbi as well as some vertical seating that gives opportunity to see both rabbi and hazan. Rite doesn’t occur silently in Judaism like in mosque or a church. Rabbi is often mobile among congregation, hazan is reading the texts loudly, and in the meantime people are talking to each other and accompanying the hymns. “The synagogue is more than just a sanctuary; it is a meeting place for Jewish people.” (Şahin, 1994).

As previously mentioned, the rite is based on reading sacred texts all together. Liturgy basically consists of three main phases: [1] hazan reading sacred texts, [2] silent prayer and the [3] rabbi’s sermon (Figure 3). There is a dress code for men. They have to wear kippa (hat) and tallit (scarf) while entering a synagogue. The place where women stand is on the mezzanine floor and segregated from the main hall in Yeniköy Synagogue. Women are not as isolated as they are in Laleli mosque, but they are not visible as well.

![Figure 3: Phases of Shabbat and the relationship between the congregation and authority during the process.](image-url)
As stated before, there are two platforms for hazan, and rabbi to stand on. They are usually on their platforms, but occasionally rabbi comes close to where hazan stands. The rabbi and congregation accompany hazan while he is reading texts. Congregation is mobile, that is, they walk across the room and talk to each other and accompany hazan with the prayers. The exception being the silent prayer phase. At that point, everybody is reading the texts silently whilst standing. Congregation and rabbi accompany hazan while he is reading sacred texts. Silent prayer phase is completed with the hymn by hazan. Yeniköy has a relatively small congregation so that rabbi recognizes everyone and knows their personal life like in pastoral technologies of power. So, to finish the prayer, with the lead of rabbi, everybody prays for each other individually.

EUCHARIST, SYRIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

This church is a derelict building abandoned by the French Jesuit sect. Syrian Catholics began to use it in exchange for covering repair expenses in 1982. There are rituals held daily whether people are gathered or not. However going to service on Sundays is mandatory. According to the priest of Syrian Catholic Church, Eucharist is an important ritual that requires being attentive as if Easter was being celebrated every Sunday. The Church has a congregation of about 2,000 people. Only religious leaders can conduct the rite — authority is irreplaceable. There is an organic relationship between the religious leader and congregation. The priest himself states that a spiritual leader must recognize the congregation closely. He believes that spiritual leader’s duty is to detect and call people who do not attend the rite that day but normally do. If they are sick, he must go and visit them. This approach is very close to the definition of Foucault’s definition of pastoral power.

The most important liturgical element in the churches is the altar. The nave where the altar is located is important, insomuch that when people first enter the church they cross themselves facing that axis. The altar’s location is a controversial issue, and sects have different approaches regarding liturgy’s requirements. In Catholic churches, the altar’s place is standardized. Before, priests had to conduct the rite with their back to the congregation because the altar was adjacent to the wall. Then the altar was transferred to a more central location — by common consent of the Catholic council — which enabled priests to stand face to face with congregation. Priests believe that through this regulation, the spiritual leader and congregation are bonded in a better way.

The liturgy in the Syrian Catholic Church has four main phases: [1] pray and hymns of priest, with his assistants and congregation together, [2] inter se salutation, [3] blessing of the bread and wine and [4] communion (Figure 4). Mostly the priest conducts the ritual individually from the altar, but there are deacons on both sides of the altar waiting, if they don’t attempt the process actively. Participation of the congregation is desirable for the priest. And the congregation stands up when it is their part to accompany prayer. Chorus supports the whole process, but it is located at the mezzanine floor and not visible for congregation. In the first part, both the religious leader and deacons sanctify the place and congregation using censer. Liturgy continues with a brief salutation. Priest holds hands with deacon, and then deacon holds hands with people sitting on the front row. In turn these people hold hands with people on the second row, this way the greeting which the priest has started expands from the first row to the last. Everyone is in touch with others who are easy to reach while facing the altar. This
The phase of the liturgy is not frequently observed in other Catholic churches. But the same manner of collective salutation is observed in Şahkulu Sultan Cemevi. The religious leader is mobile on the third phase. He sometimes comes near to congregation and turns his back from time to time. Meanwhile, congregation often stands and participates in prayer. At a certain point of the prayer, the senior deacon stands across from the priest — altar in between them — and they pray together. Communion is distributed in the last part. The priest stands in front of the altar and offers wine and bread to his community from the tray which the deacon holds, and liturgy ends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chorus is on the</td>
<td>Chorus is on the mezzanine floor, not visible for liturgy; it accompanies the</td>
<td>The congregation is greeting with each other, starting from the front rows to</td>
<td>Bread and wine is blessed, deacons are mobile and helping the priest.</td>
<td>Communion is the most important phase of the liturgy. Church gets chaotic and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mezzanine floor,</td>
<td>process.</td>
<td>through the back rows.</td>
<td></td>
<td>crowded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not visible for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congregation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest is</td>
<td>Priest is generally standing on the altar. Deacons accompany him when needed.</td>
<td>Priest is standing on the altar, and starts greetings.</td>
<td>Priest is mobile, sometimes he comes in front of the altar to sense the</td>
<td>Priest is serving the Communion in front of the altar and on the same level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally standing</td>
<td>Priest is generally standing on the altar. Deacons accompany him when needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>congregation. Sometimes he is facing his back to the congregation and</td>
<td>with congregation, with the help of the deacons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the altar.</td>
<td>Priest is generally standing on the altar. Deacons accompany him when needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>sometimes prays with his</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although people</td>
<td>Although people sometimes stand up to accompany the prayer, their location is not</td>
<td>People are transmitting the greeting from first rows until the end. They hold</td>
<td>Congregation doesn’t move but sometimes stands up to accompany the prayer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes stand</td>
<td>changing.</td>
<td>each others hands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to accompany the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prayer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Congregation is oriented to the altar.</td>
<td>Congregation is oriented to the altar.</td>
<td>Orientation is not important anymore. People are chatting to each other and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When people first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>waiting their turn to come.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enter the church,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themselves in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axis of altar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Phases of Eucharist Liturgy and the relationship between the congregation and authority during the process.

**FRIDAY PRAYER, LALELI MOSQUE**

Laleli mosque was assigned to architect Mehmet Tahir Ağa by Mustafa III, and gave its name to the province. It’s an important example of Ottoman architecture under Baroque influence. (Düzenli, 2003) Fires and road constructions between 1783 and 1911 destroyed some parts of the mosque.
Friday prayers at the mosque are obligatory for Muslim men but not for women. This way, Muslims come together every Friday. Mosques, because they can be used easily by men, have a potential to create its familiar, loyal congregation, however unfamiliar people can easily join and accompany the liturgy. Therefore, it’s impossible for the preacher to know every individual in the congregation compared to rabbi, priest or ‘dede’ (religious leader of Alevism). It’s important to note that, unlike other leaders, preachers are government officials and they are commissioned by the State, which is a long-established tradition of the Ottoman Empire. The most important liturgical difference of Friday prayer from daily prayers is that the preacher sermonizes to congregation. During the sermon, a significant interaction occurs between religious leader and congregation. Under normal circumstances, sermon has to be a semi-extemporized speech of the religious leader with the intention of informing the congregation about an Islamic rule, regulation, or an event in the history of Islam. Today in Turkey, content of Friday sermons is prepared by the State, so that the religious leader is dependent on a predefined text, and from this aspect becomes a representative of the State.

Friday prayers have four main sections: [1] preach, [2] call for prayer: azan, [3] Friday sermon and [4] Friday prayer (Figure 5). The first part is not mandatory and occasionally happens in every mosque. A different preacher than the mosque’s official preacher — preacher himself stated that it was an exceptional case—, gave a speech from a fixed rostrum to a gradually gathering congregation while waiting for Friday sermon time to come. During the speech, people were coming to the mosque, choosing comfortable positions and rather sheltered places —like around pillars— to sit. Most of the people had chosen to sit close and be oriented to the preacher since the mosque was not crowded yet. As the mosque got more crowded, orientations were changing; while some people continued sitting in front of the preacher, and some had chosen to sit close to mihrab. Mihrab is an essential element for mosques and its function is to mark direction of the prayer. The first part of the prayer is not mandatory —like preparation speech— so that people prayed individually without any leading of an authority. When the time comes, azan is recited inside, from the mezzanine floor. There is a particular area for reciting but it’s not defined by any liturgical item. During the reciting phase, congregation do not orient towards azan, solely hearing the sound seems to be enough. As said before, the most important phase that separates Friday prayer from daily prayers is the sermon. The preacher during the sermon gives a speech from a rostrum-like liturgical element called ‘minbar’. It’s higher than ground level and allows preacher to see every member of the congregation. While sitting, most of the congregation is facing the preacher, some also have chosen to face mihrab —the original direction of the prayer, soon to occur— and listening carefully. Until this point of the whole process, the orientation of the prayer hasn’t been fixed strictly and everybody is sitting on the ground rather comfortably, but it became fairly crowded compared to the beginning of the process. After the sermon ends, preacher comes down to the ground level, and attains his place in front of mihrab facing his back to the congregation. At this final phase, everybody is standing up, forming parallel lines to mihrab and acting simultaneously to finish the process. Orientation and simultaneity are important. In the meantime, women are praying in a completely segregated space without seeing any men or preacher but merely can hear the sounds.
Figure 5: Phases of Friday Prayer and the relationship between the congregation and authority during the process.

CEM RITE, SAHKULU SULTAN CEMEVI

Şahkulu Sultan Cemevi was originally a hunting lodge. In 1329, it was refunctioned by Orhan Gazi as an Ahi monastery (a small Islamic group). In the first quarter of the 16th century the building began to be used by Bektashis. In 1826 it was ceded to Naqshibandi tariqa. From 1826 dismissal of the lodges occurred, until Emperor Abdulaziz acceded to the throne in 1861, monastery was abandoned. A small house — which is now used as cemevi — was built at the center of the complex, in the middle of the 19th century. In 1925 lodge was closed again and restored by the Directorate of Foundations in 1965. However, it deteriorated since then because it was not actively used and had to be restored once again in 1985. Finally, in 1994 the land was given to an educational and cultural foundation. It has functioned as the Şahkulu Sultan Social Complex by this foundation. (Tanman, 1994) The most interesting element is the pillar in the center of the cemevi. The pillar does not have any feature that
contributes to the liturgy. But “In Turkish-Islamic architecture, similar pillars can be found in different type of buildings. It’s inherited most likely from mainmast tent and house architecture. But this genuine design component, interpreted using symbolic values of Alevi tradition in the cemevi. Indeed, rather than being a structural element, it’s accepted as a sacred element of the cemevi’s esoteric content.” (Tanman, 1994).

The date of the visit to cemevi coincided with the anniversary of the Maraş Massacre, so it could be considered that there were more people than a usual day in the lodge. Before cem rite, there was a dinner to commemorate their deaths. Then people were called to cemevi. One of the respected elders gives a speech until the cemevi is full. In this process, there is a chaotic ambience around. Officials show people where to sit, and try to make people comfortable. Although men and women worship together in cemevi, men and women are encouraged to sit separately. In other words, officials seem to direct people in a way that men and women sit separately. After cemevi is full, four religious leaders—dede[s]—come to their own allocated place, and thus the ritual begins. The ritual has mainly four phases: [1] sermon, [2] arrival of the authorities and greeting, [3] whirling and [4] final prayer (Figure 6). One of the biggest complementary elements of the process is the seven stringed lute. Music is extremely important for cem rite and where the lute player sits is defined. Although music mutes during sermons and speeches, the lute is an important element of rite especially in whirling and the last prayer phases.

The congregation stands up with the arrival of the religious leaders. Officials offer water to dedes and wash their hands. Dedes give sermons one by one. If there are people estranged from each other, dede gives advice to make peace, and everyone kisses and shakes hands with people nearby like in the Syrian Catholic Church. The lute player makes music from time to time during sermons and greetings. After that, whirling starts. Whirling is the most essential phase of the rite. In Şahkulu Lodge whirling consists of eight people, this number is increasing or decreasing according to the stage of whirling and almost half of the participants are women. Whirling represents the ascension of the prophet Muhammad, and it consists of three stages. As previously mentioned, the lute is in the forefront during whirling and determines the rhythm. Liturgy is built on the participants to form a circle and turn. The speed and figures change according to music during those three stages. Whirling takes place in front of where dedes are sitting, and while the participants pass in front of dedes, they turn their bodies towards them, and after they pass through, they turn back to their original positions. In the final phase, a representation of an historical event called Battle of Karbala takes place. The whole event is staged by the participants like a theatre. Congregation accompany the music and with the lead of religious leaders. In the end everyone holds hands and prays together. At the end of prayer, they offer water to all congregation in the memory of all religious martyrs who were thirsty during the Karbala event. The water here becomes a part of liturgy rather than a need. Dede accepts the donations and votives just before the process is finished and liturgy is completed.
### 2.2 DATASETS OF SYNTACTIC VALUES

If space syntax data is analysed, Laleli mosque has the highest values regarding connectivity and integration and the lowest values regarding mean depth compared to other temples. Area and perimeter are the highest in mosque and lowest in synagogue. But synagogue has higher integration values compared to mosque and cemevi. Drift values of authority are prominently higher in all temples compared to congregation. Highest difference is in church and lowest is in synagogue (Figure 7).

---

**Figure 6: Phases of Cem Rite and the relationship between the congregation and authority during the process.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOKATION AUTHORITY</td>
<td>People begin to come and sit on the floor. An old and respected elder is preaching. Sometimes music accompanies him.</td>
<td>The worship begins with the arrival of the authorities. Officials offer water to dedes and wash their hands. One of them starts the greeting ceremony.</td>
<td>8 people sitting in the front are whirling in front of dedes. Music accompanies the process.</td>
<td>Everybody stands up and prays together by holding hands. Authorities accept the donations, and end the rite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONGREGATION</td>
<td>Religious leaders haven't arrived yet. Only the late player is there and making music.</td>
<td>Dedes are sitting on the chairs. They shake hands with each other during greeting.</td>
<td>Dedes are sitting and accompany whirling loudly.</td>
<td>Dedes are usually standing. They accompany the aforementioned historical events by gestural movements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATION</td>
<td>There is noise and confusion in the space. Everyone is hoping to find a place because it's almost full inside.</td>
<td>Congregation is sitting silently and listening to dedes in the beginning. But during greetings everyone is talking to each other.</td>
<td>Rest of the congregation is sitting on the floor and accompany whirling loudly.</td>
<td>Congregation is usually standing and accompany the mentioned historical events by gestural movements. Words gain importance here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Orientation is not strictly defined but people are facing the elder's speech. Orientation is to the place authority is sitting at first. After, people are facing each other. The orientation is towards whirling and to the authorities as well. While turning around, people are greeting dedes with a small gesture. Orientation is towards religious authorities.
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Figure 7: Entire data-set of Space Syntax values.
3. RESULTS

There were some limitations of this study while analysing the liturgies:

- Liturgies couldn’t be photographed in temples. Only the processes could be watched. Even the opportunity to take notes was very limited.
- Friday prayer couldn’t be observed because the main hall is allocated for men during liturgy. It is analysed with the help of photos that the preacher and security staff provided.
- It was only possible to have small interviews with the priest of Syrian Church and the preacher of Laleli Mosque. Other leaders couldn’t be reached.
- Each congregation have different numbers of believers related to geography. This research was done in Turkey therefore Laleli Mosque hosts the largest amount of people every day. Relationship between congregation and the religious leader is affected from this situation because congregation of minorities have different bonds than dominant culture. For example, it should be taken into account that there will be qualitative differences between the Syrian Catholic Church and other churches in Catholic countries—although liturgies are almost the same—if they will be analyzed using the same methodology.

3.1 ANALYSIS OF LITURGIES

There are several observational findings regarding all temples:

SITUATION: Liturgy is strictly defined in all temples, space becomes a stage-like domain for liturgies to take place. This means liturgies can be considered as important means for legitimation of power.

LOCATION: The congregation is mobile in the synagogue. After all, Sabbath is not as disciplined as other rituals. The congregation in church, mosque and cemevi—except the phase of whirling in Cemrite—is stable. Sitting places for congregation are fixed in church and synagogue; but in mosque and cemevi there are not any defined areas, everyone sits on the floor randomly. In the synagogue, hazan and rabbi stands on elevated platforms. Although hazan does not change his position because he is busy with reading the texts almost all along the liturgy. The rabbi sometimes goes down to the level of congregation. The priest is located almost always on the elevated platform defined by altar except during distribution of Eucharist. That is when the priest stands on the same level with congregation when he leads facing his back to the congregation. The biggest difference between religious authority and congregation among all temples by the means of level, is observed in mosques when the preacher uses minbar to preach sermon. In Cemevi, congregation sits on the floor and religious leaders sit on a chair almost all the time. Lute players and dedes’ places are fixed, but only by a chair—a portable element—but not by any element that is embedded to the configuration of the space. Except from that minor level difference between chair and ground, there is nothing to separate congregation from religious leaders.

ORIENTATION: As mentioned, typical synagogues have two-centered plan configurations. Even people choose to face rabbi more; sometimes people who sit vertically can choose to turn their faces to rabbi. In church, priest is always in the spot light of congregation. In mosque, direction is strictly
defined during prayer time and the preacher is in the first row. Apart from that, people choose to sit along any direction they want, but mostly they chose to watch the preacher during preaching and the sermon. In cemevi, people are sitting directly to the religious leaders and they can easily see them. Only the pillar in the middle of the space is preventing sight of some members of the congregation and leaders.

3.2 RESULTS OF SYNTACTIC DATA

- **Area**
  Average area values of congregation is higher compared to authority in synagouge and church. In church the difference is very high. In mosque and cemevi authorities’ values are higher, but there are no significant differences compared to congregation values.

- **Perimeter**
  Perimeter values are more or less the same for congregation and authorities in almost every temple. However, in mosque, average perimeter values of where congregation stands (perimeter of congregation’s field of view) is considerably higher.

- **Perimeter/Area**
  The division of perimeter by area provides information about the ‘thickness’ of polygons that isovists create. In cemevi, this rate is close to each other for congregation and authorities. But in synagogue and church, it is significantly higher for authority, on the other hand in mosque it is higher for congregation.

- **Drift**
  Drift-isovist is the distance between the point where isovist is generated and centre of gravity is the isovist. In each temple, drift values of authority are remarkably higher compared to congregation’s values. Since it tends to get its minimum value in the centres, it means that congregation is located close to the centre of the space in every temple. Meanwhile authority is located close to the boundaries.

- **Connectivity**
  Values are significantly higher for congregation in synagogue and church. But there are no significant differences for mosque and cemevi in the areas of connectivity.

- **Mean Depth and Integration**
  In synagogue, position of authority is considerably deeper than congregation, when compared to where authority stands in other temples. In other words, the highest difference of mean depth between the locations of where congregation and authority stands, is found in Yeniköy Synagogue. Thus, congregation’s stand on more integrated points of the space. Likewise, authority stands on deeper points of the church compared to congregation. On the contrary, in cemevi, the difference between the depth of where congregation and authority stands is considerably high, thus, authority is located more shallow, whereas congregation is located on deeper areas of the space. Likewise, integration values of authority is higher than congregation’s in mosque. (Figure 8)
4. CONCLUSIONS

Considering drift-isovist values, it can be said that among all temples congregation is located remarkably central compared to authority. Which appears like a traditional power relation between authority and congregation where power-holder occupies a more isolated segment of the space. But when liturgies and their visual assets are considered, the power relation becomes more complex. (Figure 9)

When the rest of the results are evaluated, it can be said that authorities in synagogue and church are similar to each other qualitatively compared to mosque and cemevi. In both, authorities are in deeper areas of space and alone, however their field of view is wide. Congregation on the other hand, has less visible abilities and located in shallow areas of the space, closer to the center. (Figure 9) In both synagogue and church —especially in church— religious authority is always busy with the continuity of the process. Liturgies are impressive to observe, and congregation are in their rows rather passively watching it. However, when the process is analyzed with syntactic data, it can be said that space provides the opportunity to observe and see for authority, rather than congregation. Congregation is the audience of the whole process but at the same time easily being watched from authority’s point of view. Authority seem to be busy with the liturgical process, and his visible superiority over the space is never reflected on congregation. In churches when it’s time to distribute the Communion, the priest renounces his superiority, and everybody become equal in terms of visibility abilities. Both deep and visibly superior position of authority reminds one of the Dovey’s term ‘pseudo community’ (2008:146). Within the space a new reality constructed where authority acts as if it is the one being watched during liturgy. In reality it has the visual superiority.
In mosque and cemevi, the congregation is located deeper, and authority is located in more shallow areas. Authority’s deep presence might resemble a more classical form of power which is dependent on control and guidance. However, the field of view of the congregation is significantly larger in mosque compared to authority. Among all temples, the most significant height difference between congregation and authority is observed in mosque, when preacher gives his speech from minbar. It is considered that, in mosque,—except the final phase— authority is always located on higher levels and in visible places. Compared to other temples, in mosques, congregation has control over the space and can follow the liturgy easily. However, congregation’s location is still and passive, and it appears it is expected congregation to watch authority. Authority seems to be legitimizing its existence by being easily seen and heard. During the last phase of liturgy (prayer), position of preacher and congregation is equal like in Communion phase of Eucharist. But even at that point, preacher goes to the front row to lead the prayer and turns his back to the congregation. Authority demands to be followed and watched by the congregation. It can be said that authority’s priority is to be ‘seen’ rather than to ‘see’. In cemevi, almost all the liturgy takes place in front of authority even the most essential phase,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>AUTHORITY</th>
<th>CONGREGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yeniköy Synagogue</td>
<td>281628,60</td>
<td>242361,35</td>
<td>296353,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Catholic Church</td>
<td>1027260,78</td>
<td>920936,24</td>
<td>1062702,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laleli Mosque</td>
<td>2195414,33</td>
<td>2229165,22</td>
<td>2186414,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahkulu Sultan Cemevi</td>
<td>957566,71</td>
<td>991359,47</td>
<td>936446,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIMETER</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CONGREGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeniköy Synagogue</td>
<td>2517,81</td>
<td>2435,88</td>
<td>2548,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Catholic Church</td>
<td>10476,09</td>
<td>10602,65</td>
<td>10433,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laleli Mosque</td>
<td>14191,70</td>
<td>12353,12</td>
<td>14681,99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahkulu Sultan Cemevi</td>
<td>6008,33</td>
<td>6183,72</td>
<td>5808,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIFT</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CONGREGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeniköy Synagogue</td>
<td>0,0089</td>
<td>0,0101</td>
<td>0,0086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Catholic Church</td>
<td>0,0102</td>
<td>0,0115</td>
<td>0,0098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laleli Mosque</td>
<td>0,0065</td>
<td>0,0055</td>
<td>0,0067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahkulu Sultan Cemevi</td>
<td>0,0063</td>
<td>0,0062</td>
<td>0,0063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTIVITY</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CONGREGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeniköy Synagogue</td>
<td>312,55</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Catholic Church</td>
<td>409,81</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laleli Mosque</td>
<td>890,68</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahkulu Sultan Cemevi</td>
<td>384,23</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN DEPTH</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CONGREGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeniköy Synagogue</td>
<td>1,14</td>
<td>1,27</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Catholic Church</td>
<td>1,47</td>
<td>1,52</td>
<td>1,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laleli Mosque</td>
<td>1,30</td>
<td>1,29</td>
<td>1,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahkulu Sultan Cemevi</td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td>1,32</td>
<td>1,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATION</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>AUTHORITY</td>
<td>CONGREGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeniköy Synagogue</td>
<td>632935,45</td>
<td>535917,21</td>
<td>669317,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Catholic Church</td>
<td>404385,32</td>
<td>364248,95</td>
<td>417764,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laleli Mosque</td>
<td>2225325,94</td>
<td>2321111,94</td>
<td>2199783,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahkulu Sultan Cemevi</td>
<td>318481,88</td>
<td>331848,40</td>
<td>310127,80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: The comparison of average syntactic values for congregation and authority.
It seems all liturgy takes place for authority to watch rather than congregation. When authority first enters to cemevi, people show significantly higher interest and respect compared to other temples. Therefore, it is assumed that the authority is passive and the ability to control over space is higher. However, when syntactic values are evaluated, authority seems to be located in a much central and more visible place than congregation like in mosque. Position of the congregation remains isolated, but configuration of space allows congregation to have better visible control over the space. For this reason, it can be said that, ability to see is rather more important for congregation than authority. Authority is a respected subject, but it seems that authorities are under the control of congregation in cemevi. (Figure 10)
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