

## SPACE, TIME, SPACE-TIME AND ARCHITECTURE (1)

Sinan Cem KIZIL\*

**Received:** 04.07.2024; **Final Text:** 16.12.2024

**Keywords:** Space; time; space-time; architectural theory; territory

1. This paper is based on author's doctoral thesis *Architecture as Territory: Politico-Aesthetic Constructions and Representations of Space-Time* supervised by Prof. Dr. Ayşen Savaş, completed in METU in 2024, and partially presented at the IFLA World Congress in İstanbul in 2024.

Space plays a very peculiar role in architectural history. The term has attained different roles and meanings, from a secondary concept to the part of protagonist. The expansion of the discourse in the 20<sup>th</sup> century provided a fruitful milieu for space to be elaborated within many fields. However, this also led to multiple discourses on space only partly overlapping in their explanations of the concept. The foremost reason for that is the invention of space-time as a scientific datum. Within the contemporary discourse on space, achieving a notion of the concept that can reflect all aspects of disciplines like geography, political and cultural sciences, or physics is a complex and maybe even unnecessary task. On the other hand, architecture tends to overuse the term recklessly, referencing different notions of it in an interchangeable manner.

This paper will elaborate on architectural and non-architectural spaces to present the irreducibility and irrelevancy of the term space in architectural theory. The scientific invention of space and time as communicating categories has been elaborated in architectural theory. Scholars such as Sigfried Gideon, Bruno Zevi, and Christian Norberg-Schulz have widely discussed under different lenses the temporal dimensions of spaces. However, these discussions do not reach the complexity of non-architectural definitions of space discussed in other disciplines under the term spatiality. On the contrary, those efforts only deepened the artificial distinction between theory and practice of architecture without providing a theory of space-time. This in the end, creates a rift between production and reception as the "protagonist of architecture" cannot answer the questions posed by emerging, social, environmental and urban challenges. The reason for us to choose the words production and reception is to escape object-subject duality and to examine encounters that signify anything "architectural". Production and reception center architecture and directly refer to its potential to affect and be affected within the broadest perspective possible. What I suggest is to replace the understanding of space that is prioritizing the construction of volume with the construction

\* Department of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, TÜRKİYE

2. The tripartite distinction has been made by Felix Guattari in his book *The Three Ecologies* (2000). I will use that nomenclature to signify a larger discourse of relational and environmental philosophies that is also shared by his collaborator Gilles Deleuze on multiple works. *A Thousand Plateaus* (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987) is the most important one for this paper as it elaborates territory and territorialization as philosophical concepts.

3. Here, we need to locate this paper in a larger research project Architecture as Territory that I discussed multiple theories of territory to propose an architectural theory. Territory, in that sense, refers to the construction of individual, social and environmental ecologies in multiple domains, whether human or non-human. Multiple theories of territory, including territoriality (Sack, 1986; Raffestin and Butler, 2012) and territorialization, (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Cache, 1995; Grosz, 2008) are all concerned with the different aspects of human-earth relationship. Aforementioned doctoral thesis has put those theories as tools to question what the architect constructs and represents.

of territories, which can comprehend the affectuality of manipulated environment and consequently, heterogeneous space-times along multiple ecologies: social, individual and environmental (2).

Overall, this paper claims that once the conception of “architecture as territory” replaces the “architecture as space”, the “problem of space and time” in architecture can be properly addressed (3). The analysis elaborates on the following question: what is the problem of space? In that sense, the paper commences with the discussion of the term “space” in its historical status; then, it locates the problems that arose from the difference between architectural and various other conceptualizations of space; and lastly, it proposes the full integration of space and time to overcome those problems.

### THE EMERGENCE OF SPACE AS AN ANALYTICAL TERM

Space has always been a significant issue for the architect since the ancient times, but conceptual tools to articulate spatiality were limited and sometimes nonexistent. The term “space” became one of the most influential architectural concepts at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. As Kenneth Frampton indicates, the term, in its modern sense, was not used in Viollet-le-Duc’s magnum opus of 1872 even once (1996, 1). So, what is the modern sense of the word that Frampton mentions?

The Latin root *spatium* conveys a similar meaning to the modern one. Conversely, the ancient use of the term does not form a discourse around space in which “a new thing” can be said (Foucault, 1972). As it appears in historical architectural writings, space is just an auxiliary concept. The author of the oldest available writing on architecture in the Western world, Vitruvius, focuses on the elements of architecture, like columns and walls, as well as static categories such as beauty and convenience. Architectural space is mentioned only in reference to those categories and elements without questioning the space itself. Articulations of the classical orders can be initial examples whereby space emerges as a byproduct of the interplay between the column and the wall. Subsequent Western architectural writing -stretching from Alberti to Semper- followed a similar path and prioritized other terms like symmetry, geometry, perspective, texture, technology, and so on. Here, space was just an outcome.

There is an evident difference between the 20<sup>th</sup>-century articulations of space and its previous appearances in Western architecture. The fundamental change between modern and earlier understandings of space is its role in the conceptualization of architecture. As Adrian Forty (2000) and Łukasz Stanek (2012) pointed out, space has started to occupy a privileged role after the late 19<sup>th</sup> century in German art and architecture history -August Schmarsow, Alois Riegl-, aesthetics -Theodor Lipps, Herman Sörgel-, and art criticism -Adolf Hildebrand. Among these, Schmarsow’s theory of *Raumgestaltung* is one of the first to conceptualize space independently from the architectural elements that are creating it. Schmarsow sees space as a pure enclosed volume that is abstract and perceived only through movement. While reviewing Schmarsow’s theoretical implications, Mitchell Schwarzer (1991) indicates how “[s]uch awareness of space provided a source of imagery and expressive concerns, emphasizing abstract geometries and smooth surfaces.” With the traditional architectural elements questioned and the volumetric regime established, modern discourse on space started to form. Schwarzer also

points out that the perceptual empiricism adopted by Schmarsow was a reaction to a philosophical tradition that sees architecture as a “stepchild of fine arts.” Schmarsow’s attempt was deeply aware of the scientific explanations of his time. Psychological and physiological explanations of the visual perception of depth affected Schmarsow’s conceptualization of space as three-dimensional and dynamic in vision. (Schwarzer, 1991) With theories as such, the perception of space became the main category for the reception of architecture. Architecture found its specificity with the invention of the modern notion of space. In Nancy Stieber’s (2006, 173) words, space became “an analytical term ... [that] became central to the way modernists defined architecture and the way the historians of modernism defined architectural history.” From that point on, abstract space -previously the field of physics and geometry- has been rapidly appropriated in the architectural discourse of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This discourse widely relied on the movement of bodies, psychology, and depth perception. The abstract notion of space as an enclosed volume has become so foundational for architectural theory that Bruno Zevi (1993) declared space the “protagonist of architecture” in 1948.

Two major interpretations of space by Sigfried Giedion and Bruno Zevi, respectively, took center stage in the architectural theory of the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Sigfried Giedion’s seminal book *Space, Time and Architecture* (1941) proposes a progressive history revolving around a successive series of different understandings of space. Aligned with his teacher, Heinrich Wölfflin, Giedion offers a linear understanding of historiography based on epochal characteristics that consistently expressed themselves in all areas of cultural production. This Hegelian effort portrays a World History of space. Giedion (1941, 480-1) argues that the modern conception of space had clear implications for architectural form. Modernist architecture interpreted space as an abstract volume created by hovering planes.

Bruno Zevi (1993) is another figure trying to construct a history of architecture emphasizing space. He proposes that space has multiple meanings and, accordingly, entails numerous interpretations. Political, philosophical-religious, scientific, economic-social, materialist, technical, physio-psychological, and formalist interpretations are possible for the space through which the body moves. (Zevi, 1993) Even though Zevi did not refer to Schmarsow, their focus on bodily experience is in proximity, as Johanna Gullberg (2016) and Nancy Stieber (2006) highlighted. As Stieber (2006, 174) suggests, Giedion’s definition of modern architecture based on the abstract volumes is formalist in contrast to Zevi’s notion of space “as concretely experienced” and “as abstractly imagined.” The second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century produced no theoretical writings on space and architecture, except Norberg-Schulz’s *Existence, Space and Architecture* (1971). For Norberg-Schulz (1971, 11), bodily movement in itself is not enough to define space, so he proposes multiple spaces within which bodies are located simultaneously: “pragmatic space of physical action, perceptual space of immediate orientation, the existential space which forms man’s stable image of his environment, cognitive space of physical world and the abstract space of pure relations. Superficial categorizations start to haunt space in architecture.

Such dominant space conceptualizations of the age shaped the architect’s understanding of space rendering it passive, as Stieber (2006) argues in reference to Zevi and Giedion. Although the mainstream

conceptualizations are nuanced in their detailing and structuration of the experience, they all put space as a volume that is experienced by an individual body. Issues of race, gender, power, or environment remain extrinsic to and mostly neglected in that conception. Addressing such shortcomings of these discourses on space, geographers like David Harvey and Edward Soja and social theorists like Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, and Pierre Bourdieu started to talk about a space that is reciprocal to manifold social relations. The articulations of space in disciplines other than architecture and architectural history, especially social theory and geography, dramatically expand its definition.

### THE SPATIAL TURN

The emergence of theories on space that take social relations into account occasioned a sudden rift between the theory of space and the theory of architecture. The discursive expansion of the term in other fields challenged the notion of space as architecture's privileged medium. Henri Lefebvre's *Production of Space*, (1991) Doreen Massey's *Spatial Divisions of Labor: Social Structures and Geography of Production*, (1995) Edward Soja's *Postmodern Geographies: Reassertion of Space in Critical Theory* (1989) and David Harvey's *The Condition of Post-Modernity* (1989) all reframe space as a condition of social relations and a product of them. As Stanek (2012, 51) asserts, those ideas also challenged the disciplinary integrity of architecture by reducing the architect to one of the many agents that construct the space. Thus, the modern assumption of "architecture as a space" becomes incommensurable in the face of space produced by and productive of heterogeneous social practices.

Even though architectural theory has generated limited responses toward those new conceptualizations, the dramatic change in the theorization of space still affected the self-definition of architecture at least to some extent. "The spatial turn" in other disciplines has influenced the production and reception of architecture from various angles. Yet, according to Stieber (2006, 178), architectural theory engaged with space primarily through secondary topics like gender, class, post-colonialism, and race in the wake of the spatial turn in social sciences. Critical literature on the subject extensively discusses different spaces in various scales constructed by complex social patterns like gendered spaces and colonial spaces.

Hilde Heynen (2013) roughly categorizes the academic perspectives on space as "receptor, instrument, and stage." without proposing a chronological order between them. Yet, while "receptor" and "instrument" have appeared heterogeneously in the 19<sup>th</sup> and the early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the conceptualization of space as a stage coincides with the complex understanding of social relations paralleling the "spatial turn" in social sciences. Both space as receptor and instrument indicate deterministic relationships between social life and built environment, whereas space as a stage elaborates on their differential relationship. As a receptor, space is a passive background determined by its environment. In its manifestation as instrument, space is understood as the determiner whereby the social processes are pacified. In contrast, stage assumes a dynamic relationship between social phenomena and space. Heynen's (2013, 349-54) analysis of this dynamic relationship in reference to Lefebvre and social theorists articulates clearly what lacked in architectural theory that came before the "spatial turn".

Referring to Lefebvre, Stanek (2012, 51) uncovers three foundational aspects that are crucial in this new conceptualization of space. The first one is the shift from space to various processes producing it in multiple scales. The second one is the acceptance of the manifold nature of those processes. Lastly, the third aspect is the focus on the contradictory and political character of the production of space. If we follow Stanek in taking Lefebvre's foundational assumptions central to the new debates on space, it can be said that Schmarsow's, and after him, Zevi, Giedion, and Norberg-Schulz's frameworks are reductionist in multiple ways. For example, Schwarzer (1991) underlines Schmarsow's neglect of the construction of individual psychology in different cultures. He points out how Schmarsow "never engaged considerations of the impact of religious, social, and economic conditions on architectural space or the position of spatial perception within a greater social process of signification." (Schwarzer 1991, 58) On the other side, Giedion proposes a grand narrative around the social meaning of space and its echoes in all cultural production. Lefebvre's spatial triad of "representational space," "representation of space" and "practice of space" in which social and space construct each other complicates such a narrative. This triad of categories crosscut the grand history of Giedion by creating oblique categories for understanding space. For example, Giedion's example of perspective in the Renaissance was not a dominant form of conceptualization in a bounded epoch as he suggested but instead it was a representation of space that co-produces social space.

Stanek highlights how Zevi's and Norberg-Schulz's points of view can imagine multiple and simultaneous readings of space, but he adds that none of those theories can produce a convincing idea of architecture as space. The contemporary understanding of the "spatial turn" parallels this argument. For instance, Robert Tally's book *Spatiality* (2013), while reviewing different discourses that deal with space, does not put much interest in architecture and architectural theory. In other words, the discourse on space has become able to conceptualize space without recourse to architecture.

For the most part, architectural theory remained stagnant in relation to this multiplicity of the interpretations of space. After the spatial turn, architectural discourse has articulated social spaces only through secondary literature. Stieber (2006, 176) explicitly states that the field's engagement with such literature remains theoretical and mostly empirically untested. Furthermore, insistence on volumetric space turned from mode of neglect to mode of oppression as Catherine Ingraham stated: "[...] by casting space as neutral, architecture is able to avoid the specificity of difference that is the very structure of sexuality, insofar as sexuality is paradigmatically about the specificity of, identity through, and competition between gender differences" (1992, 262). There is no comprehensive response to expanding the definition of space in architectural practice, and architectural theory and writing retains an ambivalent position to it.

### SPACE-TIME OR SPACE AND TIME

The modern notion of space that Frampton mentions sees time as a component of perception. Precisely, the dimension of time -in the form of a moving body, walking, touching, and even muscular movement controlling the eyes- was the center of Schmarsow's *Raumgestaltung*. However, as put in the spatial turn, the experience of space depends on

much more than individuals and time. Besides body and time -volumetric space-, societies and time -histories-, geography and time -ecologies-, life and time -evolution-, matter and time -entropy- and many other couplings are already informing spatiality. Of course, as those who know Thales of Miletus, we cannot say that this particular emphasis on time and temporality was conceptualized for the first time in history in the 20th century. Yet, with the philosophical explorations on time like Henri Bergson's *Time and Free Will* (2001), and with the theory of space-time developed in physics in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a more fertile ground has been laid for new ideas to flourish. The social theorists were aware of this new perspective. Aimed at critiquing volumetric, cartesian, and controlled spaces, Lefebvre's *Production of Space* was an inquiry into these temporal processes. His *Rhythmanalysis* (2004) was devoted to incorporating divisions of time into the production of social space. All the topics informing architecture from outside, such as gender, post-colonialism, or race, were different articulations of time in space.

Inserting the extended notion of time -histories, cultures, geographies, ecologies, and so on- into space beyond the moving body paradigm is complicated. Moreover, it may not be a task that is worth pursuing. Because through such inclusions, architectural theory tends to stay under the hegemony of volumetric space rather than a full-hearted recognition of space-time. Furthermore, as it tries to preserve space as the discipline first invented in the modern sense, it produces some theoretical glitches, which we may call: 1-regrounding on anthropocentrism, 2-prioritizing capitalist drives, and 3-intensifying the theory/practice distinction

The first glitch, fall to anthropocentrism, is evident in phenomenology. The term place was its immediate reflection in architectural theory. The discourse on place has flourished with a critique of the volumetric space. In two significant publications *Getting Back into Place* (1993) and *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History* (1998), Edward S. Casey proposes an extended theory of place and its relation to space. Edward Relph's *Place and Placelessness* (1976) and Marc Augé's influential work, *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity* (2009) are major texts that emphasize the loss of sensory values in the modern condition that neglects the complexity of rich environmental relations in favor of volumes. Directly related to architecture, Norberg-Schulz's seminal work *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture* (1979), eight years after his *Existence, Space and Architecture*, shed more light on the relation of architecture and place.

Phenomenology presents a form of anthropocentrism with its biases about experience. In *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze (1997, 52) argues that "[t]he whole of Phenomenology is an epiphenomenology" to point out a domain beyond the experiencing "subject" -pre-individual, pre-subjective, and even pre-human and nonhuman. Andrew Conio (2009) distinguishes Deleuze's view of senses from its phenomenological counterpart in the "Phenomenological Turn" in architecture after the 1980s. He says that Edmund Husserl's initial proposal suffered from a fundamental bias concerning the Cartesian transcendental subject at the center of experience and sense. However, Conio (2009) also finds links between subsequent phenomenologist Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Deleuze's thinking. Merleau-Ponty presents a way of dehumanizing senses and eliminating dualities like subject-object, self-other, and nature-culture (Conio, 2009). Andrej Radman (2012), who proposes an ecological mindset for architecture concerning the environmental psychology of James

Jerome Gibson, indicates that ecology is ready to replace an all-too-human phenomenology. Radman (2012) repeats the Gibsonian mantra: "Ask not what's inside your head, but what your head is inside of." Phenomena that phenomenology pursued have limited definitions. Phenomenon, encounter, or event connects everything, so why look at only human? Radman emphasizes the construction of senses in a pre-subjective realm within a complex feedback mechanism with the environment in history:

The purpose of perception is not to convert or translate the physical world into a meaningful environment (fallacy of access), but to keep life forms in touch with the world. There is no 'subjective' contribution to perception, only the degree to which a life form can successfully perceive. Nor can there be an 'objective' contribution to perception, only a more or less organised environment replete with information capable of supporting perception (2012, 104).

One of the most impactful critiques of space fueled by the counter-term place has been elaborated by Kenneth Frampton, who borrowed the term "critical regionalism" from Alexander Tzonis and Liane Lefaivre. Frampton (1983) situates critical regionalism as a cultural project to resist global forces dominating architectural production. He argues that such practices do not create places but reify the global architectural culture (Frampton, 1983). Even though touching upon important topics on cultural resistance, Frampton does not display much interest in the abuse of the Earth. He recites the duality of nature and culture and finds the midpoint not in some kind of dialogue in search of cohabitation but in the tectonic expression between material, craftwork, and gravity. This issue is also grounded in the notion of volumetric space onto which Frampton still holds. Historicism sometimes manifests itself as naïve conservatism. In *Studies in Tectonic Culture* (1996), Frampton touches upon the issue of space to underline the importance of tectonic expression. Directly referring to Schmarsow, he understands space as an enclosed volume to be individually traversed and perceived. The conceptualization of space is still limited to a volume, but here it is seen as an outcome of the interplay between structure and form, the tectonic expression. (Frampton, 1996) Critical regionalism's call for action is directly related to the notion of space. Time is partly integrated as a denominator of some kind of change and limits. With "critical," time is introduced into the space of culture, and with "regionalism," into the space of geography. Yet even the introduction of time, in some way, does not provide an extensive and inclusive set of concepts to deal with human and nonhuman reticularity.

The second glitch produced by the volumetric notion of space is the domination of market forces, which is present in Patrick Schumacher's *Autopoiesis of Architecture* along with the exclusively architectural notion of space. The complex social relations that participate in the production of architecture are the main focus of the Schumacher's (2011) theory of architecture. Referring to Heynen, we can say that Schumacher resorts to the understanding of "space as a stage", as he places the architect in an autonomous network of communicating agents and accepts the indeterminacy of architecture's usage. Schumacher (2011, 177-87) proposes an ontological standpoint that sees architecture's production and reception as a social interplay, vis-a-vis connectivist theories, like Niklas Luhmann's theory of Modern Society. In Schumacher's terms, architecture is a self-organizing *-autopoietic-* system consisting of various relations and agents. The autopoietic system decides the needs that architecture tries to satisfy within the free market. He says that: "[...] Relevant here are the real

demands actually posed by contemporary society via clients knocking on architects' doors rather than demands as formulated within high-flying academic theories." (Schumacher, 2012, 458) This way, Schumacher dodges most of the problems posed by the spatial turn in social sciences. The new definition of the architect resolves the problems of the criticality of architecture and the architect's agency by declaring the architect a mere mediator between distinct autonomous agents in the society. The political, economic, and sociological dimensions of architectural production are excluded from the architect's definition of space. Moreover, Schumacher's call for integration of differential geometry and emphasis on the concept of autopoiesis are biased and limited appropriations from process philosophies, which, paradoxically reintroduces polished and enhanced version of market obedient and reified duality, architect as subject and the architecture as the object.

Besides reintroducing evidently Cartesian object-subject distinction, his engagement with differential geometry cannot fully conceptualize the time for architecture and falls into another Cartesian trap: neutral space. Like Frampton, Schumacher follows Schmarsow and emphasizes body, movement, depth, and so on. Sticking with that definition to remove sociological, economic, and political dimensions from the production and reception of architecture has evident drawbacks that Schumacher has also come to realize. With the increasing density of habitations worldwide, new phenomena emerge from the movement of the masses. Volumetric space becomes insufficient for understanding such multiplicity of movement. Here, Schumacher (2012) proposes using "field" to conceptualize that new condition. But the field, as depicted by Schumacher, continues to externalize socio-temporal dimensions of experience by handing specific architectural decisions -like infrastructural availability, security, visibility, accessibility, and sometimes even formal characteristics- to different actors in the design and construction process. In the end, the field theory's only genuine contribution to architecture is providing a set of concepts to extend formal vocabulary (4).

In close contact with the previous two, the last glitch, is increasing gap between seemingly what is falsely distinguished as theory and practice. The main reason for that is mismatch of theories between production and the reception of architecture. In other words, our analysis on how architecture participates to life (reception or experience and all material encounters of architecture) and furthermore how it should be practiced (production or, design, representation or construction of it). Stieber (2006) pointed out a kindred problem when she underlined how the implementation of spatiality "remain at the level of theorizing" while feminist, decolonial and racial discourses are treated only to reflect on reception of architecture. Production still depends on advantageous and operational conception of volumetric space. The term place, notion of critical regionalism and the notion of field present cases where Schmarsow's space configuration is taken as the essence of the architectural perception with the urge to incorporate some dimensions of time to space. This problem is also at the core of Zevi's and Norberg-Schulz's arbitrary categories of space. As the glitches outlined above suggest, those introductions provide only partial solutions to the deeper space and time problem. Consequent incompatibility between reception and production, undermines the role of theory by rendering it unreal, or in Schumacher's words, "high-flying" academic talk. Here, we can point out to theoretical agendas free from corporate and hegemonic impulses and not "flying

4. Here we should also recognize the advantages of field theory that are allowing geometric mastery on heterogeneous two-dimensional distributions (Allen, 1997; 2013).



5. Kwinter, provides an extensive account of the scientific invention of space-time in reference to thermodynamics and electromagnetism that starting to challenge Newtonian physics. The famous but under-elaborated discussion between Bergson and Einstein have been acknowledged but not fully resolved in Kwinter. However, in *Bergsonism* Deleuze addresses Bergson's objection and perceives it as not directed specifically to special relativity but rather to the underlying mathematical model. He places the discussion in-between Riemannian and Bergsonian interpretations of continuous multiplicities (Deleuze, 1991, 39-40).

6. Ales Erjavec, presents a spectrum for both "classical" and "neo" treatments of avant-garde movements. He distinguishes aesthetic avant-garde from artistic avant-garde by their urge to make "aesthetic revolutions" that transforms our ways of sensing (Erjavec, 2015). Consequently, like in futurists, efforts to problematize new conceptions of movement in relation to individual and social sensations may present early introductions to space-time problem in architectural domain. Constructivist, Bauhaus master, László Moholy-Nagy and his *Vision in Motion* is a peculiar example (Moholy-Nagy, 1947; Kirkpatrick, 1988; Myburgh, 2022).

7. Which should be elliptical, if the observer does not choose to neglect the deviation of each cycle.

8. Initial ideas were in introduction of a book on Kant. Later, Deleuze elaborated the same issue of time in series of interviews he made with Claire Parnet, directed by Pierre-André Boutang named *Deleuze's ABC Primer*, under 'K for Kant' (Deleuze, 1984; Boutang, 1996).

high" at all. By examining a specific period of housing crisis in Turkey, Bülent Batuman points out how technocrats of the period had turned into "agents of radical urban politics" with a historical analysis of the politics of "Gecekondu." Batuman's review highlights the convergence of production and reception of architecture. Far from taking the problem in technical and theoretical terms and distancing it from the public sphere, urban professionals of the period provided new -but still technical and theoretical- vocabulary that directly resonated within everyday politics of squatters. (Batuman, 2006)

Ole. W. Fischer discusses the role of criticality, which are, discursive practices searching for lost dimension of time under homogenizing processes of capitalist urbanism. Very similarly he points out to stages of academic machine that generates, "critical," "post-critical," and lastly "post-theoretical" stances that get rid of the theory and define architecture in terms of individual performative agendas (Fischer, 2012). Unsurprisingly, those agendas are mostly corporate financial and extractivist, operating under greenwashed and/or symbolic volumetric compositions.

## CONSTRUCTION OF SPACE-TIME

Sanford Kwinter, in his doctoral thesis (1989) that also published as a book under the name of *Architectures of Time* (2001), specifically discusses the issue of space-time drawing on Einstein and Bergson in reflection to cultural productions of sculptor Umberto Boccioni, architect Antonio Sant'Elia and Franz Kafka (5). Even though the idea, in various forms, can be found in many philosophical discussions in different cultures, geographies and histories, the scientific invention of space-time is decisively marked by events in the 20<sup>th</sup> century physics. Albert Einstein's special and general relativity theories challenged the Newtonian neutral time / absolute space by converging the two and proposed a plastic space-time that deforms under relative speed, acceleration and mass. Mathematical basis for such physics was not Euclidian like in Newton, but Riemannian, relating to manifolds and differential surfaces. Hermann Minkowski's implementation of time as operable vector to dimensions of space (as x, y, z, t) to formalize special relativity, provided a nested conception of space-time, that radically differs from three-dimensional Euclidian space that treats time as a secondary element that emerges from successions of frozen moments.

Taking Bergson's metaphysical abolishment of possible-real in the name of virtual-actual and positioning of time as the creative motor that introduces novelty and invention to the world, Kwinter explores the notion of "event" in afore-mentioned figures. He (2001, ix) states: "In physics, the demise of absolute time is shown to give way to a theory of the 'field,' effectively superseding the classical notion of space as a substratum against which things occur, and consequently giving rise to a physics of the event". Clearly, besides futurists Boccioni and Sant'Elia that challenge the aesthetic paradigm by emphasizing movement and speed, there are more allies of space-time or event in the cultural and architectural production of early twentieth century, specially considering other "aesthetic avant-garde" movements (6).

Throughout human history, the concept of time has been intricately intertwined with space in diverse ways. Different from the time of a clock

that is passing, Byung-Chul Han (2017) talks about a Chinese time-keeping equipment, an incense that is prepared with multiple types of wood arranged consecutively. As fire moves through different woods, the smell changes, but time does not pass; it fills the space. Western conceptions were radically different. While reviewing Kant's time conception, as one of his most ferocious critics, Gilles Deleuze delineates where the invention of Kant resides. According to him, before Kant, movement preceded time. As the movement gave birth to time, the most indicative movement of all, that of planets and stars, was thought to represent time; as a result, time was considered circular (7). Deleuze says that, Kant philosophically reconfigured the movement-time relation so that time freed from celestial movement. Thus, linear time was invented (8). This is the Newtonian configuration in which space exist neutrally, and time passes through it in one direction, creating snapshots of instances connected by a deterministic succession. However, physics reconfigured space and time once more, with relativity, differential manifolds and potentials. Now we conceptualize time at variable velocities; mass and speed distorts space and time and intermingles them. Distances are never meters or kilometers, and durations are never seconds or minutes; the difference is always in both space and time.

Such shift in configuration of space and time has been elaborated by many immanent and materialist philosophies recently. Karen Barad's "agential realism" (2007) and Levi R. Bryant's "onto-cartography" (2014) are two examples that space-time is constructed by means of material interactions. Barad's Bohr and quantum inspired proposal focuses on performativity of material universe and "intra-actions" that is the dynamism and agency at the same time. She says that "Agency is not an attribute but the ongoing reconfigurings of the world. The universe is agential intra-activity in its becoming" (2007, 141). Bryant, on the other hand, drawing heavily from Deleuze and Guattari's machinic production and assemblage concepts, proposes a framework that treats all material processes as operations of machines that deteriorate and inexact in their production. "In the same way that spaces arise from machines rather than containing them, times arise from machines as well" (2014, 157).

Space-time is always constructed with movements and interaction but strict scientism can only display a small portion of the consequences of such revelation. We cannot confine these phenomena to quantum and astrophysical realms. Because, space-time is constructed, simultaneously and multiscalarly, also in individual and social and environmental levels, where the movement of sun and moon and tectonic plates of the earth as well as traffic lights and networked information participate in construction of psyches, cultures, societies and their environment. Rhythms of movements gave rise to forms and dissolves them to chaos, unformed material universe. About the genesis of individual, social and environmental ecologies from unformed matter, Felix Guattari says that:

In fact, there isn't really any exteriority: collective territorialised subjectivity is hegemonic; it folds one Universe of value into another in a general movement of folding over on itself. It gives rhythm to times and spaces at the pleasure of its interior tempo, its ritual refrains. The events of the macrocosm are assimilated to those of the microcosm -to which they are also accountable. Space and time are thus never neutral receptacles; they must be accomplished, engendered by productions of subjectivity involving chants, dances, stories about ancestors and gods (1995, 102-3).

So, a crucial question appears, if space-time is heterogeneous and constructed, in what extend architecture participates in it? Does it have to be defined volume, an enclosure which fixates on the Western myth of primitive hut? What about beating drums and fire pit, which are encouraging geometric order for human bodies, gathering and dancing, and discouraging other clans and wild animals by drawing a volatile boundary?

Such radical constructionism, or intra-actionism, brings architectural production and reception into the same terms. The hegemony of volumetric space, however, fails to present a consistent definition of reception of architecture, how it perceived and experienced. Simply, we design spaces but live in space-times while constructing and constructed by them, simultaneously, in manifold ways. On the contrary, in constructionist view, both cycles of architectural mediation, namely production and reception, construct space-times.

Hegemony of volume over space-time are most evident when representation takes hold of expression. First example is a technique used widely by the popular science. The aim is to illustrate the magnitude of something like the age of the universe. However, the linear projection of the differential history mostly results in a monstrosity. Now imagine the history of human life on Earth with a line representing a single year. We all sense that the number of valuable encounters, events, in the last hour of the last day contains much more encounters than rest of the year. Writing would be invented only a few weeks earlier and control of fire is many months ago. The absurdity of such an effort comes from its neglect of space-time, created at different rates by different events in history. Representation with linear distribution fails to provide a realist expression of time that is heterogeneous. Another, and more architectural, example is present in the cases where lived spaces are turned into didactic, representationalist museums. Especially instances related to public traumas are very illustrative. Any prison, concentration camp or battlefield-cum-landscape repurposed for education has a danger of falling into the representational trap. No museum display or spatial modification reconstructs the space-time as once it was. The rhythms of working, fighting, eating, sleeping, fear, and anger construct those space-times. There is no correspondence between the human activity in a prison and a museum it is converted to, there is only representation. They do not differ in terms of coordinates, but they differ due to the space-time they construct through encounters of human and nonhuman agents. Rules, guardians, locks, guns, and strategies of abuse all partake in this construction. The museum lacks the terror; the public trauma is only represented. On the other hand, movies that are composed of blocs of space-time (Deleuze 1986) mostly present a better portrayal of such traumas without a need for volumetric space. The rhythm of blocs, cuts and pans, presents a space-time, in which sensation emerges beyond representation. Speed and slowness constitute the crux of sensation.

Maybe the clearest opposition to the dullness of volumetric space comes from Robin Evans (1995). From an architect's standpoint involving both production -design, representation and construction- and reception -all the encounters with the production- of architecture, he places imagination not in one's mind but in the interactions between people, objects, and pictures. He maps out the interfaces between the architect and the designed object. From the orthographic drawing to perspective to observer

9. In *Grundrisse*, Marx proposes a movement that arises from abstraction to reach the concrete understandings contra to Hegel's "concrete to abstract" movement, which interprets the construction of life and unfolding of history as natural order of things (Marx, 1973),

10. Following Alfred North Whitehead, Deleuze states: "Abstract does not explain, but must itself be explained; and the aim is not to rediscover the eternal or the universal, but to find the conditions under which something new is produced (creativity)" (Deleuze and Parnet, 1977, vii).

and to the designed object, architectural production -like drawing- informs the reception, and reception informs production back. Between drawing, object, and the observer, there exist spaces as zones of instability. Creativity and invention occur within these zones (Evans, 1995). Evans' discussion has a distinct feature concerning its elaboration of space. From an architect's perspective, and beyond the moving body paradigm, he defines space within encounters between human and nonhuman agents in projections and quasi-projections. There is a construction of space-time each time an encounter occurs.

The ambivalence between space, time, and space-time fuels more disciplinary inquiries. Adrian Forty's (2000, 256–275) comprehensive analysis of the intricate nuances of architectural discourse on space highlights the ambiguity surrounding the definition. He points out the confusion concerning the architectural and philosophical conceptualizations of space referring to Lefebvre and Heidegger. Eventually, "space of architects" reaffirms itself and the dominant discourses of power. Stanek (2012, 51) criticizes the architectural discourse because of its approach to space and says that the professional self-consciousness of architects recently problematized the issue of space not being a specific medium of architecture. He adds that:

[...]would it not be better to abandon the discourse on "space" and restrict architectural discourse to "buildings", "streets", "squares", "neighborhoods", "parks" and "landscapes"? There is nothing wrong with this, provided that they are not understood as reified architectural typologies but, rather, as constructed in collective processes operating on various scales and on various facets, including their materiality, representation, use, experience and imagination – that is to say as part of the social production of "space" in the sense put forward by the "spatial turn" (2012, 52).

Following this proposal to its full extent poses a danger of reification, as Stanek also stated. However, we have the power of abstraction to resist reification (9) and obligation to explain those abstractions as they do not reveal anything by themselves; rather, they need an explanation. (10) So instead of replacing space with lower-level abstractions, such as neighborhoods and parks or streets, I propose the use of the more inclusive and operative term, territory, to overcome the schism between production and reception of architecture.

A territory can encompass heterogeneous space-times and relationalities along multiple ecologies: social, individual, and environmental. An insight on how space-time is being constructed in the political domain provides the most direct definition of territory, when the history of the term, which is mostly related to geography and power, is considered. (Elden, 2013) All the actors -human or nonhuman- that are participating in the construction of space-time come to be part of the state territory. That relation cannot be reduced to the state space marked only by national boundaries. Like the issue of prosthetics, which extends the capacity of individual body to interact with its environment, technology, tools and built environment become a part of everyday rhythms and power mechanisms, human-earth relationality. They distribute time and space and create heterogeneous space-times; they mediate labor and manipulate environment. Consequently, they are inseparable elements of territories, their definition, and their control.

Territories are always marked by the technology and resources available to those who hold them. The limits of the technology condition the

political forces by specifying the rules of space-time and thus its construction. Territorialization of power, its disruptions and reach cannot be conceptualized without the tools that help power to operate. History provides an example through the colonization of the New World, when the mainland and colonies communicate only at the speed of ships. So, central authority's capacity to intervene time-sensitive matters like revolts, conflicts and any other disturbances, is limited. This led to the eventual fragmentation and collapse of some colonial territories. The production and reproduction of territories depend on the ability of tools to create new space-times by connecting distant places in differential rates. What is the rate of communication, how does law is deployed, how does materials and humans are transported?

Stuart Elden underlines how territory is a "political technology" itself. Harvey points out a new phenomenon under the name of "time-space compression" created by the increased speed of transportation and telecommunication. Time and space are compressed because "space appears to shrink into global village" (1989, 240). Paul Virilio (2007, 119) asks related questions regarding the political decision and territory: "The speed of the political decision depends on the sophistication of the vectors: How to transport the bomb? How fast?"

Territory initially presents a political and geographical image, but the multiple "theories of territory" that spans to economic, sociological, psychological, physiological and philosophical domains provide a rich milieu for architecture to reflect on its productions. I will briefly state key-points that territory is diverging from space, roughly in reference to Deleuze and Guattari's geophilosophical concepts "(de)(re) territorialization" that allow for engagements with the construction of space-times, of desires, individuals, cultures, species, environments and many more. Firstly, territory presents an immanent way of contemplating on genesis of forms. Meaning, everything exists in differentiation and their relationship with others. Secondly, it is multiscalar. The forms may be geological plates, urban centers and peripheries or simple tents and even airborne spread of a viral diseases. Third, it is ecological. (Radman, 2012) Meaning, all scales of territories, whether human or non-human, participate in individuation of the other. Territories are existential to human habitation on Earth (or in space-station or on Mars) and evolution of humanity cannot be separated from the environment it has thrown in and acted upon. Lastly, the territory is political and aesthetic organization of environment, construction of space-times through manipulation and marking of the Earth, which constructs and distributes senses. Therefore, it is the domain that new ways of cohabitation are invented. Deleuze and Guattari say that:

The territory-house system transforms a number of organic functions -sexuality, procreation, aggression, feeding. But this transformation does not explain the appearance of the territory and the house; rather it is the other way around: the territory implies the emergence of pure sensory qualities, of sensibilia that cease to be merely functional and become expressive features, making possible a transformation of functions (1994, 183).

Distinguishing heterogenous space-times, like in two identical rooms housing novel encounters, are the instances where the abstract notion of territory is concretized. In all scales of built environment, territories are marked by their boundaries and rhythms simultaneously (Kızıl, 2022). It is evident that the rate of encounters -whether between masses in public

space or between waterbeds and dams, or individuals and cell doors—are not comprehensible only by the volumetric properties of the built environment to which theories of spatiality have more-or-less succumbed. Territory, on the other hand, directly brings together diverse elements of the human-earth relationality together. How is a boundary to be drawn? Is it a room, or is it a mall? Or is it a boundary at all? Isn't there a territoriality of a stick on the ground? Is it marking a significant place, or is it one of the many that create a rhythm of a trail? Where does the stick come from? From which tree? What is the size and how it is attached to the earth? Does it stand against winds of different seasons, or is it seasonal, restored again and again?

What rhythms govern the experience, are they rhythms of bricks and tectonic elements providing shelter, or are they traffic lights or border gates? The Earth, humanity, and multiple, and sometimes contradicting, space-times they coproduce cannot be reduced to any notion of volume. So why do we still design spaces? The abundant emphasis on the change in position of a body through a volume is limiting, first because it creates a rift between material reality and the theory of architecture. There are also virtual dimensions that temporally differentiate through the movement of social and environmental flows. The human habitation on Earth cannot be conceptualized or sustained without non-human agents like soil, water or weather. Furthermore, once we consider the existence of other bodies and complex urban interactions between individuals, institutions, and the environment, the emphasis on the material dimension of the human movement seems inadequate. Here, the concept of territory, with its political, and aesthetic articulations, can cover ecological dimensions neglected in the conception of "architecture as space". Infrastructures, logistic flows, military operations, migrations, minerals and faunas present space-times in which time and space is intertwined because of the rate and degree of encounters between various entities. "Architecture as territory" presents a variety that "architecture as space" could not make intelligible.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLEN, S. (1997) From Object to Field, *AD Profile*, 24–31.
- ALLEN, S. (2013) Field Conditions, *The Digital Turn in Architecture 1992–2012*, 62–79.
- AUGÉ, M. (2009) *Non-Places: An Introduction to Supermodernity*, London: Verso.
- BARAD, K. (2007) *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, London: Duke University Press.
- BATUMAN, B. (2006) Turkish Urban Professionals and Politics of Housing, 1960-1980, *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture* 23(1): 59-81.
- BERGSON, H. (2001) *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*, Mineola, New York: Dover Publications.
- BOUTANG, P. (1996) 'L'Abécédaire de Gilles Deleuze', France.
- BRYANT, L. R. (2014) *Onto-Cartography: An Ontology of Machines and Media*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- CACHE, B. (1995) *Earth Moves: Furnishing of Territories*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- CASEY, E. S. (1993) *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World*, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- CASEY, E. S. (1998) *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. London: University of California Press.
- CONIO, A. (2009) From Flesh to House, *Architectural Theory Review* 14 (2): 131–41.
- DELEUZE, G. (1984) *Kant's Critical Philosophy*, Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. London: The Athlone Press.
- DELEUZE, G. (1986) *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- DELEUZE, G. (1991) *Bergsonism*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam, New York, NY: Zone Books
- DELEUZE, G. (1997) *Difference and Repetition*, Translated by Paul Atton, New York: Continuum.
- DELEUZE, G., GUATTARI, F. (1987) *Capitalism and Schizophrenia 2: A Thousand Plateaus*, Translated by Brian Massumi. London: University of Minnesota Press.
- DELEUZE, G., GUATTARI, F. (1994) *What is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell, New York: Columbia University Press.
- DELEUZE, G., PARNET, C. (1977) *Dialogues*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam, New York: Columbia University Press.
- ELDEN, S. (2013) *The Birth of Territory*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ERJAVEC, A. (2015) Introduction, in *Aesthetic Revolutions and Twentieth-Century Avant-Garde Movements*, edited by Aleš Erjavec, 11-18, London: Duke University Press.
- EVANS, R. (1995) *The Projective Cast: Architecture and Its Three Geometries*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- FISCHER, O. W. (2012) Architecture, Capitalism and Criticality, in *The SAGE Handbook of Architectural Theory*, edited by C. Greig Crysler, Stephen Cairns, and Hilde Heynen, 56–60. London: SAGE.
- FORTY, A. (2000) *Words and Buildings: A Vocabulary of Modern Architecture*, New York, NY: Thames & Hudson
- FOUCAULT, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith, New York: Pantheon.
- FRAMPTON, K. (1983) Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance, in *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*, edited by Hal Foster, 16–30.
- FRAMPTON, K. (1996) *Studies in Tectonic Culture: The Poetics of Construction in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Architecture*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- GIEDION, S. (1941) *Space, Time and Architecture*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- GROSZ, E. (2008) *Chaos, Territory, Art: Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- GUATTARI, F. (1995) *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm*. Translated by Paul Bains and Julian Pefanis, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- GUATTARI, F. (2000) *The Three Ecologies*, Translated by Ian Pindar and Paul Sutton. London: The Athlone Press.
- GULLBERG, J. (2016) 'Voids and Bodies: August Schmarsow, Bruno Zevi and Space as a Historiographical Theme', *Journal of Art Historiography*, no. 14.
- HAN, B. (2017) *The Scent of Time: A Philosophical Essay on the Art of Lingerin*g, Germany: Polity Press.
- HARVEY, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- HEYNEN, H. (2013) Space as Receptor, Instrument or Stage: Notes on the Interaction Between Spatial and Social Constellations, *International Planning Studies* 18 (3-4) 342-57.
- INGRAHAM, C. (1992) Initial Proprieties: Architecture and the Space of the Line, *Sexuality and Space*, edited by Beatriz Colomina, 255-271, New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press.
- KIRKPATRICK, D. (1988) Time and Space in the Work of László Moholy-Nagy, *Hungarian Studies Review* 15 (1): 63-76.
- KIZIL, S. C. (2022) Bölgeselliğin Mekanları, Coğrafyası ve Krizleri Üzerine Bir Deneme, *Praksis* 60: 7-60.
- KWINTER, S. N. (1989) *Immanence and Event in early Modernist Culture*, Ph.D. thesis. Columbia University.
- KWINTER, S. N. (2001) *Architectures of Time: Toward a Theory of the Event in Modernist Culture*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- LEFEBVRE, H. (1991) *The Production of Space*, Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith, Oxford: Blackwell.
- LEFEBVRE, H. (2004) *Rhythmanalysis*, Translated by Stuart Elden and Gerald Moore, London: Continuum.
- MARX, K. (1973) *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, Translated by Martin Nicolaus, London: Penguin Books.
- MASSEY, D. (1995) *Spatial Divisions of Labour: Social Structures and the Geography of Production*, London: Red Globe Press.
- MOHOLY-NAGY, L. (1947) *Vision in Motion*, Chicago: Paul Theobald and Company.
- MYBURGH, B. (2022) Space-Time and Utopia: Notes on artistic engagement with physics from Cubism to Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, *Spontaneous Generations: A Journal for the History and Philosophy of Science*, 10 (1): 54-62.
- NORBERG-SCHULZ, C. (1971) *Existence, Space and Architecture*, New York: Paeger.
- NORBERG-SCHULZ, C. (1979) *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*, Rizolli.



- RADMAN, A. (2012) *Gibsonism: Ecologies of Architecture*, Ph.D., TU Delft.
- RAFFESTIN, C., BUTLER, S. A. (2012) *Space, Territory, and Territoriality, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 30 (1): 121–41.
- RELPH, E. (1976) *Place and Placelessness*, London: Pion.
- SACK, R. D. (1986) *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- SCHUMACHER, P. (2011) *The Autopoiesis of Architecture, Volume 1: A New Framework for Architecture*, London: Wiley.
- SCHUMACHER, P. 2012. *The Autopoiesis of Architecture, Volume 2: A New Agenda for Architecture*, London: Wiley.
- SCHWARZER, M. W. (1991) ‘The Emergence of Architectural Space: August Schmarsow’s Theory of “Raumgestaltung”’, *Assemblage*, no. 15, 48–61.
- SOJA, E. W. (1989) *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Theory*, New York: Verso.
- STANEK, Ł. (2012) *Architecture As Space, Again?*, *SpecialeZ* 4:48–53.
- STIEBER, N. (2006) *Space, Time, and Architectural History, Rethinking Architectural Historiography*, edited by Dana Arnold, Elvan Altan Ergut, and Belgin Turan Özkaya, 171–82. New York: Routledge.
- TALLY, R. T. (2013) *Spatiality*, London: Routledge.
- VIRILIO, P. (2007) *Speed and Politics*, Translated by Marc Polizzotti. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).
- ZEVI, B., BARRY J. A. (1993) *Architecture as Space: How to Look at Architecture*, New York: Da Capo Press.

Alındı: 04.07.2024; Son Metin: 16.12.2024

Anahtar Sözcükler: Mekân; zaman; uzay-zaman; mimari kuram; bölge (teritorya)

## UZAY, ZAMAN, UZAY-ZAMAN VE MİMARLIK

Mekân, uzun zamandır mimarlık teorisine hakim olan bir kavramdır. Bu makale, mekânın teorideki konumunu tartışmakta ve zamanın serildiği çoklu alanları kavramakta neden başarısız olduğunu açıklığa kavuşturmayı amaçlamaktadır. “Mekân” teriminin (uzay ve fezaya karşılık gelen) hacimsel kavrayışını ve ardından, sosyal anlamlarını tartıştıktan sonra makale, mimarinin tarihsel olarak bu terimi yanlış kullandığını ve mekânın bu iki yönü arasında bir ayrılık yarattığını belirtmektedir. Dahası, mekânsallık üzerine ortaya çıkan tartışmalara verilen mimari tepkiler, hareket eden bedenün önceliğine dayanan hacimsel mekân kavramı etrafında perspektiflerini yapılandırmaya devam etmektedir. Makale, bu durumu, mimarlığın üretimi ve deneyimi arasındaki uçurumu körükleyen baskın mimari ideolojinin bir göstergesi olarak teşhis etmektedir: mimarlar “mekânlar” tasarlar ancak insanlar karmaşık uzay-zamanlarda yaşarlar. Nötr mekân ve zamana karşı inşa edilmiş uzay-zaman kavramı, toplumsal veya çevresel alanlar yerine hacimlere öncelik vermeden mimarlığı kavramsallaştırma potansiyeline sahiptir. Bu bağlamda, bu makale mimari düşüncede mekânın yerini alabilecek en güçlü adayın bölge (teritorya) olduğu, zira bölgenin mimarinin ve Dünya’nın kapsayıcı bir

şekilde yorumlanmasına olanak tanıdığı ve insan veyahut insan olmayan ekolojileri kavramsallaştırmanın geniş ve bütüncül yollarını sunduğu ifadesiyle sonuçlanmaktadır.

### **SPACE, TIME, SPACE-TIME AND ARCHITECTURE**

Space is a concept that has been dominating architectural theory for a long time. This paper discusses the position of space in architectural theory and aims to clarify its role that fails to comprehend the multiple domains in which time is unfolding. After discussing the volumetric and social notions of the term “space”, the paper states that historically, architecture misuses the term and creates a schism between these two aspects of space. Furthermore, architectural responses to emerging discussions of spatiality continue to structure their perspectives around the volumetric notion of space that is based on the primacy of the moving body. The paper diagnoses this condition as an indicator of dominant architectural ideology that fuels the rift between the production and reception of architecture: architects design “spaces” but people live in complex space-times. The constructed notion of (space) time as opposed to neutral space and time has a potential to conceptualize architecture without prioritizing volumes over social or environmental domains. In that light, this paper concludes with a statement that territory is the strongest candidate to replace space in architectural thinking as it allows inclusive interpretations of architecture and the Earth and offers overarching ways to conceptualize human and nonhuman ecologies.

**SİNAN CEM KIZIL**; B.Arch, M.Arch, Ph.D

Received his degrees in Middle East Technical University, Department of Architecture, in 2014, 2017 and 2024 respectively. Research topics include, territory and territoriality focusing on the political and aesthetic dimensions within the intersection of architecture, philosophy and social geography. sckizil@metu.edu.tr