ROOM FOR OTHERNESS
BODY, SPACE, AND MATERIALITY IN THE INVESTIGATION OF RESPECT WITHIN MULTI–RELIGIOUS CITIES AND SPACES

Valeria Fabretti

Abstract: The article focuses on the notion of mutual respect and proposes an agential, embodied and spatialized reading of this notion. Looking primarily at the case of coexistence between different religious and non–religious identities in the urban context, the article highlights how more or less respectful relationships stem from the complex interplay between individuals' performances and the characteristics of the spaces they cross in everyday life. With the aim of guiding empirical research, the article identifies explorative hypotheses for a possible investigation of respect in multi–religious cities and spaces.

L'articolo si concentra sulla nozione di rispetto reciproco e propone una lettura strettamente legata all'agentività, alla corporeità e alla spazialità di questa nozione. Guardando prima di tutto al caso della coesistenza tra diverse identità religiose e non–religiose nel contesto urbano, l'articolo evidenzia come le relazioni più o meno rispettose originino dall'interazione complessa tra le performance degli individui e le caratteristiche degli spazi che essi attraversano nella vita di tutti i giorni. Con l'obiettivo di guidare la ricerca empirica, l'articolo identifica ipotesi esplorative per una possibile indagine sul rispetto nelle città e negli spazi multi–religiosi.

Keywords: Diversity, Respect, Space, Materiality, Religious places

Parole chiave: Diversità, Rispetto, Spazio, Materialità, Spazi religiosi

1. Introduction

Cultural, religious and ideological confrontations that erupt into the public discourse and social scene seem increasingly incapable of being

grounded in a serious consideration of otherness. They often result, instead, in the strengthening of polarizations and reciprocal offence. In part, this degeneration, which turns criticism into *humiliation* (Mazzone 2014), can be attributed to the tendency to "personalize" social tensions. This occurs when the most subjective, if not moral, aspects of the interlocutor are called into question with derogatory tones and a certain sense of superiority, diverting attention from what his/her alterity truly brings to the table: arguments and convictions, but also choices, practices and life styles. In the face of strong beliefs and the most radical diversities[1], it seems even more evident how personalization and moralization of confrontation recur and represent an obstacle to coexistence. If this involves the level of public discourse, social research has largely shown that such "diversity fatigue" also affects relationships between groups in social space and everyday life.

Evidences on non–recognition and humiliation at the expense of subordinate groups, while questioning any decency of societies (Margalit 1998), bring to the fore the limits of an abstract notion of coexistence and the search for its realistic conditions. In this vein, there is the need to rethink the hermeneutic and empirical validity of the concept of *respect*, as a limitedly demanding form of engagement with diversity. Indeed, the specific agential and emplaced implications of respect seems to position it as a privileged mode for coexistence since it may not inherently involve shared subjective and normative orientations. It is probably not by chance that related concepts as *kindness*, which similarly exhibit a more formal than substantive character, are object of a renewed sociological interest (Brownlie and Anderson 2017; Zaki 2021).

With a particular attention to the multi-religious city, where diverse traces of the sacred shed light on the public performance of different identities (Knott *et al.* 2016), this article intends to contribute to the theoretical and empirical research on the enactment of respect in everyday relationships between individuals and groups that are unfamiliar to each other. It proposes to direct this effort towards the identification of the differentiated ways in which respect is embodied and spatially embedded.

---

(1) For a recent examination of the aspects inherent in religious and non–religious strong beliefs — namely beliefs that people would vehemently defend against any objections and counterarguments — see the materials produced by the EUREGIO Science Fund research project *Resilient Beliefs*: https://resilientbeliefs.fbk.eu/home.

The article begins with a theoretical exploration of the notion of mutual respect. In the first Paragraph, the agential and embodied character of respect is emphasised by recalling the intersection between recognition theories and Goffman's fundamental analysis of respectful interactions performed in public. The second paragraph further refines the frame, drawing on spatial studies and sociomateriality. Through these lenses, understanding respect in social life requires grasping how it results from the complex entanglement of individuals, artefacts and spatial elements, with their sensuous and symbolic components. Introducing the material and spatial dimension into the sociological analysis of respect also allows for reflection on how this performance can be favoured by intentionally design places and settings.

The third paragraph gradually approaches the empirical ground. It turns the theoretical view into research questions and working hypotheses addressing the case of the enactment of respect in spaces where different religious and non-religious forms of life coexist. Overall, the exercise invites delving into those multicultural districts where diverse religious communities, places and practices (events, festivals, etc.) are located and that gradually reshape the urban collective space. The analysis also examines the case of shared religious spaces — used by different faith communities, either over time or synchronically — and that of multi-faith or meditation or silence rooms, which are increasingly arranged in secular spaces to meet different religious and spiritual needs.

2. Not just a matter of mindset: agency and embodiment in mutual respect

Calls for mutual respect[2] are increasingly present in public life. While a broad spectrum of meanings is associated with the folk concept of respect (Reich *et al.* 2009), the notion finds in the philosophical and sociological realms a more defined conceptualization. Upon careful examination to identify its key components, this concept would seem to

---

[2] The argumentation takes into consideration the case of respect towards individuals on a horizontal basis and does not include that of *deference*, which is implied in hierarchical relationships.

be as particularly capable of defining the kind of mutual recognition relationships that can be realistically demanded in highly plural contexts.

Drawing on the classical distinction offered by Darwall (1977), if an evaluative form of respect can be addressed to those who are held in esteem because of certain qualities they possess (*appraisal respect*), social relations widely adopt other forms of mutual acknowledgement; these are compatible with a lack of positive reciprocal consideration or even with the presence of negative moral judgements. The basis of these non–evaluative forms of respect can be found in the consideration of the addressee as holding a legitimate role in society (*recognition respect*) or in the attribution to him/her of an intrinsic moral value, as for the idea of dignity of the person; the latter case has been labelled as *moral recognition respect* (Dillon 2018). Overall, the interpretation of respect as recognition, increasingly explored also in its implications for political order (Galeotti 2010), allows us grasping its "impersonal" logic and behavioral component: respect is a response towards the receiver, which is independent of the interests and feelings of the respecter (Dillon 2022).

Moreover, considering respect a result of negotiation rather than an a-priori allows one to disociate it from the idea of personhood (Testa 2012); thus, it is possible not fall into the trap recalled by Walton (1998) as "ad hominem attacks" (since you are not a person deserving of respect, your argument is not either). To better capture how respectful relationships take shape in specific practices, a valuable contribution is offered precisely by recognition theories.

While in Honneth (1992) respect is a level of recognition primarily provided by laws and other legal norms towards citizens' fundamental rights, Honnethian scholars have approximated it to the level of social *agency*. According to them, recognition is an interpersonal and dialogical attitude that necessarily involves some form of action (Ikäheimo and Laitinen 2007). In this, recognition as respect differs from *tolerance*, which can be directed towards normative entities and expressed in an abstract way[3]. A further key aspect emerging from the reading of respect within recognition theories regards the dual directions of

---

[3] However, as Galeotti (2009) explains, also the idea of tolerance is gradually shifting towards an agential mode, from the negative sense of non–interference to the positive sense of acceptance.

such proactivity: respect not only requires an agency to the person who enacts it; it is also based on the attribution of agency to the receiver (Schirmer *et al.* 2013). In this, respect differs from forms of recognition addressing non-agential properties of the recipient, e.g. his/her needs or feelings.

The agential reading of respect developed within recognition theories smoothly integrates into the conceptual framework of a specific sociological tradition. Reference is made to Goffman's (1963; 1967) disclosing of the unspoken rules of social conduct. Here respectful behaviours are included in individuals' expressive equipment used in public settings where people come together but not necessarily engage in direct communication or even know each other (*unfocused interaction*). In this regard, among the many concepts Goffman uses to identify the articulated set of expressive forms in public life, it is worth recalling that of *civil inattention*, indicating the way individuals demonstrate awareness of each other without intrusiveness. Such amount of indifference to others, while declaring the unwillingness to enter into a sustained interaction with them, allows the individual to support the "face" of interactions from damage and profanation (Jacobsen 2010). In ensuring the absence of hostile intentions, respectful inattention and other *reparatory rituals* assure a certain grade of mutual recognition — in a delicate balance between *deference* and *demeanor* (Goffman 1967) — and contribute to maintaining social order among urban passers–bye.

As for Goffman's perspective, other sociological approaches to respect stress the staging aspect (Sennet 2003) and echo the Durkheimian intuition of the constructive power of ritual for social order. Socially valid scripts, as *courtesy* and *politeness*, allow interactions to proceed peacefully even — as it may frequently occur in normatively plural contexts — in the absence of an intimate subjective and moral commonality or *sincerity* (Seligman and Weller 2008)[4].

With reference to the idea of *embodiment*[5], it should be emphasised

---

(4) According to Seligman and Weller, in the subjunctive universe created by ritual, social illusion differs radically from lie, since the first has no intention to deceive the other: "In this, ritual is much more like play, which is the joint entrance into an illusionary world" (*ivi*, 22). In this regard, see also: Rosati 2009.

(5) In the face of the increased attention towards embodiment in social sciences (Le Breton 1992), it can be underlined how sociological tradition's central concepts have largely evoked

that respectful relationships necessarily involve a certain correspondence between mental states and physical movements. Recalling again Goffman's (1963) meticulous depiction of social life, which emerges as "above all an embodied activity" (Collins 2004, p. 34), people's *manners*, so essential for the smooth functioning of public life, are necessarily expressed by postures, gestures, non–verbal expressions, corporal signs, gaze behaviours and other bodily responses.

Empirical studies investigating the functioning of mutual respect in different social contexts have largely returned its agential, ritualised and bodily texture. This is evident in Stepan's (2012) political analysis of interreligious and state–religion relations in various geographical areas and in some sociological studies on education. The latter have particularly confirmed that respect is strictly relational, negotiated and connected more to bodily expressions than to linguistic intercourses (Anker and Afdal 2018). Thus, the presence or lack of respect in educational relationships seems to be primarily associated to a wide range of signs, "including forms of comportment, prosody, eye gaze, posture, dress, body hexis" (*ivi* p. 51).

In concluding, shared codes, subjective interpretations and body movements intertwine in mutual respect and result in acts which are difficult to interpret univocally (Sennet 2003). Rather than denying the role of inner dispositions in mutual respect, these considerations emphasise the importance of the performative components, which form the basis of coexistence when differences are more radical and the subjective and normative components of individuals and groups in relation have to take a step back.

3. Not just a matter of humans: space and materiality in mutual respect

If the expression of respect implies agentivity and embodiment, no investigation into its enactment can disregard the consideration of space and materiality, which mediate the relationship between individuals and their actions.

---

the individual and societal significance of the body in the interpretation of the multifaceted human experience (Shilling 2001).

In his analysis of face–to–face interactions in public settings, Goffman anticipated crucial themes in the contemporary literature on space and atmospheric properties (de la Fuente and Walsh 2020). Contemporary spatial studies[6] can help us integrating his analysis as they explicitly focus on the complex entanglement of individuals' performances with material and spatial elements. On these accounts — I'm simplifying the vast and diverse production of contributions since the late seventies — space is a *social product*, not only conceived (e.g. by architects and designers) but also symbolically signified and practically perceived — namely (re) produced — by its inhabitants and users on a daily basis (Lefebvre 1991). In turn, space can be conceived as, being itself socially implicative, namely not only expressing but also impressing on social life and enabling certain classes of action and order (Löw 2016; Bartmanski and Füller 2024).

In this light, the investigation on respect in public life can gain important insights from focusing on the city and the multiple places that the individuals inhabit, more or less routinely. While being differently "lived" by them, urban spaces are differently able to construct, or at least affect, their social interactions.

A similar path has been undertaken by Sennett (1970; 2019) in his extended study of cultures and effects of urban living. In the search for the micro–foundations of democracy and social order, Sennett points at the Goffmanian dynamic by which, in the public realm, people cross each other physically without necessarily entering into verbal intercourses and develop, visually and bodily, a sense of familiarity with their reciprocal differences. An idea of proximity which doesn't wink to any nostalgia of communitarism and rather appeals to the concept of *neighbourhood* as formulated by Lévinas (1998). The role of non–discursive encounters is also key and those sensory aspects recently underscored by the concepts of *audio–scapes*, *smell–scapes*, *touch–scapes* and so forth could easily be included in the picture of the lived and atmospheric spatial experience (Degen 2008)[7].

Continuing to follow Sennett's examination of the urban (2019; Sendra and Sennet 2020), some peculiar conditions emerge as particularly

---

(6) For a collection of recent advances in the field: Bartmanski *et al*. 2024.

(7) Recent studies have also framed the particular role of faces ad facial representations in urban life, adding the notion of *facescapes* to the ones mentioned above (Leone 2024).

able to solicit respectful forms of togetherness. Sennett highlights *porosity* and *multi–functionality*, in particular; that is, aspects which cause buildings, streets, and public spaces to lose a fixed form. Consequently, porosity and multi–funcionality train those who inhabit or traverse them to experience constant disruption, questioning, and abandonment of absolutes in their self–images. In this, Sennett (1970) draws on Erikson' pedagogy to remark on how *disorder* is able to stimulate a reorganization of individuals' identity for the sake of «Less Self, More Other».

Specific examples of *open forms* enabling experiences of neighbourhood are the separation of the different places through porous and easily walkable *borders*[8]; the presence of multifunctional spatial formations allowing for different activities (e.g. consumption of goods, cultural enjoyment, conviviality, work, etc.) to be carried out by different social groups simultaneously; and unfinished and incomplete forms, triggering bottom–up developments and participation (Sendra and Sennet 2020).

Sociomateriality further helps refine the view by including non–human figures in the picture. According to these traditions of studies, objects and artefacts, *dispositives* and *assemblages*, despite lacking inherent agency, facilitate the implementation of social actions (Orlikowski 2007) and alter them through their physical presence (*obstinacy*), just like movements are dictated by spatial configuration (Slife 2005). Therefore, recalling Latour (1998, p. 63), "It's to objects that we must now turn if we want to understand what, day after day, keeps life in the big city together: objects despised under the label 'urban setting', yet whose exquisite urbanity holds the key to our life in common". Non–human intermediaries — relays, affordances, props, documents, instruments, signs, etc. — leave *traces* that must be meticulously linked, tracked and followed, from place to place, in order to disclose what the social life consists of.

In this sense, expressions of respect can be related not only to spatial and but also to material assets. Evoking again the provoking role of open forms, we may imagine that mutual respect is more likely to occur where not only places but also artefacts and atmospheres imply

---

(8) Sennet echoes the distinction, used in natural ecology, between *boundary* and *border* to be considered as two kinds of edges: while the fist is an edge where things end, the second is an edge where different groups interact. At the border, organisms become more inter–active due to the meeting of different species or physical conditions.

experiencing a certain discomfort, uncertainty and liminality. An example is constituted by multifunctional and incomplete spaces where people's uses are dynamic, *assemblages* are in constant flux and therefore social relations can take various forms (Sendra and Sennet 2020).

This hypothesis seems to be consistent with the acknowledgement that individuals' spontaneous interpretations of social scripts, previously remarked as constitutive of respect (See Par. 1), always rests on a certain grade of *reflexivity*. As studies on ritual clarify, this element, far from being in contrast with it, is fully internal to the logic of rituality (Rosati 2008). However, the individuals' ordinary and continuous interpretations of performative actions and mutual adaptations between *ease* and *alarm* — to recur once more to Goffman's (1963) vocabulary — could be limited in those cases, increasingly occurring in contemporary globalized cities, in which spaces are excessively overdetermined (Sennett 1970) and in "comfort-oriented societies" where public life and its atmospheres are increasingly, often technologically, controlled (Pavoni and Brighenti 2022). Here the very design of situations — which Goffman described as unfolding in contingent and ephemeral ways — has increasingly become an explictt target of urban policies and the interpersonal space of accounts, apologies and requests gets reduced (*ibidem*).

4. Exercising the theoretical lens: the investigation of mutual respect in multi–religious cities and places

The theoretical interpretation proposed above needs to be tested and redefined through empirical research on respectful practices in specific contexts. The following considerations approach the empirical level, addressing some research questions regarding the case of spaces in which different religious and secular forms of life coexist. The case provides an opportunity to analyse respectful relationships involving a thick form of otherness and the absence of consensus and reciprocal approval. Besides, disrespect and offence towards members of minority religious communities largely affect the public sphere (Fabretti 2023).

Drawing on the extensive set of studies which has applied the spatial lens to religious studies since the early nineties (Chidester and

Linenthal 1995; Knott 2005; Obadia 2015), two broad fields stand out as relevant to an investigation of mutual respect. In the following, they will be briefly recalled as indicat e fields for enquiring respect.

4.1. *Porosity of religious–non–religious boundaries within the city*

A first area of investigation requires navigating within the narrow fabric of urban environment, particularly in multicultural districts, where different religious groups "take place" (Becci *et al.* 2017). If the general reciprocal moulding of the religious and the urban has been largely studied (Rüpke and Rau 2020), the application of the theoretical perspective proposed in this contribution can lead to particularly depicting those modes of interaction that can foster mutual respect between people of diverse religions and between religious and non-religious persons.

Firstly, is the increasing presence of different religious places opening up cities and favouring conditions for respectful coexistence between different individuals, groups and sensibilities? In recent years, many forms of disrespect, sometimes extreme and often accompanied by a clear political significance, have been directed against minority religions' places of worship in European cities. One can think of the episodes of hatred, desecration and offense directed to mosques (Tateo 2019). Are there spatial and material features, both internal and external to religious places, that play a role in hindering this conflictual outcome and instead inducing respect?

In accordance with the interpretative frame developed (see Par. 1 and Par. 2), it appears reasonable to assume that the more porous the borders of religious spaces are in relation to the surrounding public areas, the higher the likelihood of religious and non–religious individuals becoming acquainted with their respective diversities. Porosity can be encouraged by siting places of worship in vibrant areas visited by various social groups for different purposes, ensuring easy accessibility to it, providing explicit information to the local communities about the non–religious activities that may occur within them, or even allowing non–affiliated citizens to integrate those activities with informal and spontaneous initiatives of public interest.

It is worth emphasising that such porosity does not mean dilution and indistinguishability between the religious and the secular. Marking the difference is particularly crucial in contexts like Italian cities, where the recognition of religious diversity through the allocation of adequate places of worship is hindered at a legal and political level and religious minorities are often forced to attend makeshift prayer places, located in commercial buildings or disused premises (Fabretti *et. al.* 2019; Ambrosini *et al.* 2022). Within the proposed framework, visibility is key and should be understood as a set of material elements (plaques, signs, symbols) in a dynamic relation with the surrounding spatial environment.

To explore this working hypothesis, it is not sufficient to map the dislocation of the various places of worship and their visibility/invisibility — aspects which are often affected by States' legal regulation and restrictions on the recognition of minority religions — but it is necessary to deepen the intensity of the interchanges between these places and the surrounding urban fabric.

But religious uses of urban space are not confined to places of worship: non–religious public spaces where religious and secular actors frequently cross each other in their lived experience of the city should also be investigated. We might consider, for instance, the increasing visible presence of religious practices due to festivals, celebrations, rituals and processions which take place in city squares, streets or parks (Bramadat *et al.* 2021); and the less investigated but equally indicative participation of religious leaders or communities in moments of national significance and public remembrance (e.g. celebrations of anniversaries, exhibitions in museums, memorials, etc.). Also in these cases, the degree of openness and the dialogical nature of events and spaces are crucial to allow for participation and exchange between different identities and for a continuous adaptive interpretations of the common goods.

4.2. *Sharing and multi–functionality within religious and multi–faith places*

As historical, sociological and anthropological studies have largely documented (Burchardt and Giorda 2021), a multiplicity of religious sites on different scales have been and are cohabited by different communities

worldwide, either synchronically — e.g. sacred places attracting believers and pilgrims from different religions (Albera *et. al.* 2022) — or over time; it is the case of those sites which have changed their religious identity throughout their history — from the archetypal St. Sophia in Turkey (Rosati 2015) to the many Catholic churches in Western Europe temporarily or permanently converted in Orthodox Christian (Giorda 2023)[9]. Differenlty, the expression multi-faith places refers to iconic buildings including areas for different cults intentionally planned to symbolically and politically represent interreligious dialogue (Griera and Nagel 2018)[10]; or to silence and meditation rooms frequently arranged in institutions (university campuses, hospitals or prisons) and public or private spaces (airports, shopping malls or workplaces) to meet the different religious and spiritual needs of their inhabitants and users (Crompton 2013). These fields of empirical research, extensively traversed through diverse interdisciplinary perspectives, are particularly interesting for the study of respect enactment. In considering these places, far from researching their possible implications in terms of religious syncretism, the attention can be directed towards the spontaneous reciprocal adaptations between religious groups which are mediated by spatial, material and sensory arrangements (Burchardt and Giorda 2021): to what extent and in which cases are they informed by, and soliciting, mutual respect?

Contested and tense forms of cohabitation are obviously possible in shared or mixed religious places (Hayden 2022; Hayden *et al.* 2016) since space is also a political domain. Bodily and sensory living of space creates an active arena (Soja 2000) whereby individuals and groups are positioned with different degrees of power. And contestations around meanings and uses of public space are played out (Degen 2008). Precisely the possibility that shared religious places imply different kinds of social contact — a variability that others tend to explain with appeal to cultural and political factors at a larger societal level (Hayden 2022) — leads, in a proper spatial and material perspective, to detecting how spatiality "makes a difference". Which properties, including symbolic references and atmospheres, allow a

---

(9) For a collection and analysis of recent case–studies worldwide, see the *Shared Sacred Sites* project: www.sharedsacredsites.net.

(10) On the exemplar project House of One in Berlin, see: Burchardt (2021).

proximity as neighbourhood, in the sense of a reciprocal recognition of agency not necessarily implying a subjective and normative adherence? Furthermore, sacred spaces are always populated by objects, sometimes shared and at other times specific to one or more religious groups, that circulate, focus attention and interact with spatial characteristics and with the bodily movements, gestures, and practices of individuals: to what extent and in what ways does the introduction, use, or removal of certain artefacts modify the perception of being or not being respected among individuals who share that particular space?

Attempting once more to outline a research direction through the considerations proposed in the previous paragraphs, I suggest that the more these spaces are conceived as dynamic, incomplete, open to the changing configurations, arrangements and functions and to a variety of artefacts in circulation, the more they can solicit the individuals who inhabit them to a challenging contact, requiring attention to the other's agency, self–regulation and self–decentering.

It seems plausible that similar dynamics are more likely to occur when the spatial sharing results from bottom–up initiatives, as for the use of existing Christian buildings as sites also for other religious purposes, or when the internal configuration is particularly mobile and adaptable, as for the case of silence or meditation rooms.

However, once more, mutual respect appears as the result of a delicate and spatialized balance of identities' preservation and relational openness. Consider, for instance, the possible arrangement of meditation rooms within multi–functional areas, where religious and spiritual uses may coexist with other forms of spatial engagement (recreational activities, medical care, etc.): how can sacralization and desacralization of the space be configured in a way that respects the different individual sensibilities involved?

 Finally, the exploration and development of features that foster respectful relationships can extend to virtual spaces, whose prominence in the current mediascape opens up the prospect of a radical reinterpretation of spatiality and requires investigating traits of continuity and discontinuity with respect to physical space. Virtuality is also an important aspect of pilgrimages, whereby it (re)shapes perceptions, in continuous interactions with materiality (Bria and Giorda 2023).

5. Conclusion

The proposed reflection has revolved around the particular case of respect between strangers and, to a lesser extent, among those of different religious and non–religious backgrounds. Obviously, the issue of mutual respect assumes a multiplicity of facets that are impossible to capture within the scope of this contribution. However, the ongoing search for respectful forms of coexistence in pluralistic societies should abandon the ambition to trace comprehensive and univocal formulas. On the contrary, interdisciplinary research allows us to test, on a case–by–case basis, an account of this complex and fluid social mode. Indeed, similarly to the case of kindness, although perhaps with a less affective nuance, respect is rooted in small acts, embedded in spaces and infrastructures and with an atmospheric quality that risks appearing insignificant or random in everyday life and show, instead, recurrent ingredients at a theoretically oriented examination (Brownlie and Anderson 2017).

I suggested that mutual respect does not solely involve individuals' mindset but is performed bodily and through space and materiality. The article has also attempted to show that the challenge of coexistence between differently religious and nonreligious individuals and groups in today's cities offers a laboratory of interest for the spatial interpretation of the enactment of respectful relationships.

Such inquiry can provide useful elements not only for understanding crucial mechanisms of the complex social fabric but also for inspiring the intentional design of open and inclusive places in the cities we inhabit (Sendra and Sennett 2020). Open spaces would work as proper gyms of encounters, capable of exercising people to approach diversity in respectful ways. Indeed, we might be inclined to recognize that, compared to abstract moral calls for recognition of diversity, experiences of space and materiality can be far more effective in orienting us towards acknowledging the other's *room for manoeuvre*. These exercises, in turn, can perhaps also train us to regulate the tones of our argumentative practices on more respectful frequencies.

Bibliographic references

Albera D., S. Kuehn and M. Pénicaud (2022) *Religious Sharing, Mixing, and Crossing in the Wider Mediterranean*, "Religiographies", 1: 14–21.

Ambrosini M., P. Naso and D. Molli (2022) *Quando gli immigrati vogliono pregare. Comunità, pluralismo, welfare*, il Mulino, Bologna.

Anker T. and G. Afdal (2018) *Relocating Respect and Tolerance: A Practice Approach in Empirical Philosophy,* "Journal of Moral Education", 47: 48–62.

Bartmanski D., H. Füller, J. Hoerning and G. Weidenhaus (eds.) (2024) *Considering Space. A Critical Concept for the Social Sciences*, Routledge, London.

Bramadat P., M. Griera, M. Burchardt and J. Martínez–Ariño (eds.) (2021) *Urban Religious Events: Public Spirituality in Contested Spaces*, Bloomsbury, London–New York.

Bria G. and M.C. Giorda (2023) *Religious Materiality and Virtual Sainthood: The Case of Shna Ndou (St. Anthony) Pilgrimage in Laç*, "Religions", 14(9): 1113. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14091113.

Brighenti A.M. and A. Pavoni (2022) *Goffman Back in Town. On New Relations in Public*, "Etnografia e ricerca qualitativa", 1: 93–114.

Brownlie J. and S. Anderson (2017) *Thinking Sociologically About Kindness: Puncturing the Blasé in the Ordinary City*, "Sociology", 51(6): 1222–1238.

Burchardt M. (2021) "Multi–Religious Places by Design: Space, Materiality, and Media in Berlin's House of One", in M. Burchardt and M.C. Giorda (eds.), *Geography of Encounters: The Making and Unmaking Spaces*, Palgrave, Cham, 231–252.

——. and M.C. Giorda (eds.) (2021) *Geography of Encounters: The Making and Unmaking Spaces*, Cham, Palgrave.

Chidelster D. and E. Linenthal (1995) *American Sacred Spaces*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.

Collins R. (2004) *Interaction Ritual Chains*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Crompton A. (2013) *The Architecture of Multifaith Spaces: Godleaves the Building*, "The Journal of Architecture", 18(4): 474–496.

Darwall S. (1977) *Two Kinds of Respect*, "Ethics", 88: 34–49.

DE LA FUENTE E. and M.J. WALSH (2020) *Framing Atmospheres: Goffman, Space, and Music in Everyday Life*, "Symbolic Interactions", 44(1): 221–234.

DEGEN M. (2008) *Sensing Cities*, Routledge, London.

DILLON R.S. (2018) *Respect*, "The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy", E. N. Zalta (ed.).

FABRETTI V. (2023) "Gli effetti simbolici dello Hate Speech: riflessioni sul caso dell'odio rivolto a minoranze religiose", in M. Leone (ed.), *I discorsi dell'oltre: fascino e pericoli della polarizzazione*, FBK Press, Trento, 23–34.

——., M.C. GIORDA and P. VERENI (2019) "Increasing plurality and neglected pluralism. Religious diversity in the suburbs of Rome", in J.J. Bock, J. Fahy and S. Everett (eds.)*, Emerging Religious Pluralism*, Palgrave Macmillian, London, 167–193.

GALEOTTI A.E. (2010) "Respect as Recognition: Some Political Implications", in M. Seymour (ed.) *The Plural States of Recognition*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, 78–97.

——. (2009) *Toleration as Recognition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

GOFFMAN E. (1963) *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*, Free Press, New York.

——. (1967) *Interaction Ritual: Essay on Face–to–Face Behavior*, Anchor Books, New York.

——. (1989) *On Fieldwork*, "Journal of Contemporary Ethnography", 18(2): 123–132.

GRIERA M. and A.–K. NAGEL (2018) *Interreligious Relations and Governance of Religion in Europe: Introduction*, "Social Compass", 65(3): 301–311.

HAYDEN, R. (2022) "Shared Space, or Mixed?", in J. Halgren Kilde (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Religious Space* (Online), Oxford Academic, 21 June 2022.

——., A. ERDEMIR and T. TANYERI ERDEMIR (2016) *Antagonistic Tolerance: Competitive Sharing of Religious Sites and Spaces*, Routledge, London – New York

HERVIEU–LÉGER D. (2002) *Space and Religion: New Approaches to Religious Spatiality in Modernity*, "International Journal of Urban and Regional Research", 26(1): 99–105.

JACOBSEN M.H (2010) "Recognition as Ritualized Reciprocation. The Interaction Order as a Realm of Recognition", in M.H. Jacobsen (ed.), *The Contemporary Goffman*, Routledge, London, 199–231.

——. (2023) "Introduction: The Living Legacy of Erving Goffman", in M.H. Jacobsen (ed.), *The Anthem Companion to Erving Goffman*, Anthem Press, New York, 1–21.

Kirchner A., M. Freitag and C. Rapp (2011) *Crafting Tolerance: The Role of Political Institutions in a Comparative Perspective*, "European Political Science Review", 3(2): 201–227.

Knott K. (2005), *The Location of Religion*, Equinox, London.

——., K. Volkhard and B. Meyer (2016) *Iconic Religion in Urban Space*, "Material Religion", 12(2): 123–136.

Latour B. and É. Hermant (1998) *Paris, ville invisible*, Les Empêcheurs de penser en rond/La Découverte, Paris.

Le Breton D. (1992) *La sociologie du corps*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.

Löw M. (2016) *The Sociology of Space: Materiality, Social Structures, and Action*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

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

Leone M. (2024) "Envisaging the City: Roadmap for an Interdisciplinary Study of Urban Facescapes", in F. Bellentani and M. Panico (eds.), *Semiotic Approaches to Urban Space*, Elgar, Cheltenham Glos, 210–221.

Lévinas E. (1998) *Otherwise Than Being, Or, Beyond Essence*, Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh.

Margalit A. (1998) *The Decent Society*, Harvard University Press, Harvard.

Obadia L. (2015) *Spatial Turn, Beyond Geography: A New Agenda for Sciences of Religion?*, "International Review of Sociology", 25: 200–217.

Orlikowski W.J. (2007) *Sociomaterial Practices: Exploring Technology at Work*, "Organization Studies", 28:1435–1448.

Reich W., W. Schirmer and L. Hamann (2009) *The Folk Concept of Respect*, working paper presented at the 13th Annual Conference of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies "World Peace through Humiliation–free Global Human Interactions", Honolulu, August 20 to 23.

Rosati M. (2009) *Ritual and the Sacred: A Neo–Durkheimian Analysis of Politics, Religion and the Self*, Routledge, New York–London.

——. (2015) *The Making of a Postsecular Society. A Durkheimian Approach to Memory, Pluralism and Religion in Turkey*, Routledge, New York–London.

Rüpke J. and S. Rau (2020) "Religion and Urbanity: Reciprocal Formations", in J. Rüpke and S. Rau (eds.), *Religion and Urbanity Online*, De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston.

Seligman A.B., R.W. Weller, M.J. Puett and B. Simon (1998) *Ritual and its Consequences. An Essay on the Limits of Sincerity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Sendra P. and R. Sennett (2020) *Designing Disorder. Experiments and Disruptions in the City*, Verso, London

Sennett R. (1970) *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life*, Knopf, New York.

———. (2003) *Respect in a World of Inequality*, Norton & Company, New York.

———. (2019) *Building and Dwelling. Ethics for the City*, Penguin Books, London.

Shilling C. (2001) *Embodiment, Experience and Theory: In Defence of the Sociological Tradition*, "The Sociological Review", 49(3): 327–344.

Shirmer W., L. Weidenstedt and W. Reich (2013) *Respect and Agency: An Empirical Exploration*, "Current Sociology", 61(1): 57–75.

Simmel G. (1903) *Die Großstädte und das Geistesleben* in: Themenportal Europäische Geschichte, 2006, www.europa.clio-online.de/quelle/id/ q63-28252.

Slife B.D. (2005) *Taking practice seriously: Toward a relational ontology*, "Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology", 24(2): 157–178.

Soja E. (2008) "Taking Space Personally", in B. Warf and S. Arias (eds.), *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Routledge, London, 11–35.

Stepan A. (2012) *Rituals of Respect: Sufis and Secularists in Senegal in Comparative Perspective*, "Comparative Politics", 44(4): 379–401.

Tateo G. (2019) *Croci contro la moschea: profanazione e riconversione di uno spazio indivisibile*, in "Annali di studi religiosi", 20: 105–121.

Walton D.N. (1998) *The New Dialectic: Conversational Contexts of Argument*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Zaki J. (2021) *The War for Kindness: Building Empathy in a Fractured World*, Little Brown Book Group, London.