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Notes and Comments

The Molding of Worship — The Impact of Space

A regional conference, jointly sponsored by the Guild for Religious Architecture and the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, Catholic University of America, will be held in Washington, D.C., November 12-14, 1976. The theme of the Conference is: The Molding of Worship — The Impact of Space, to be developed in sessions at the Washington Cathedral, Catholic University, Dahlgren Chapel at Georgetown University.

Speakers include The Rev. Lawrence Madden, Robert Calhoun Smith, AIA, GRA, Robert E. Rambusch, Hon. GRA. Catholic University architectural and theological students will present a program on Saturday evening, November 13. The Rev. Richard Butler, Director of the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, is General Chairman for the Conference. Registration is limited to 100. For further information write:

GRA
1777 Church St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036


F. David Martin, a professor of philosophy, in his book Art and the Religious Experience, is entirely unconcerned with the current controversy as to whether organized religions have rejected modern art or whether artists have rejected religion. Instead, he puts forward the view that religious artists hold the key to a return to meaningful existence in industrial society.

My critical comments are concerned principally with Martin's chapter on religion and visual art. In my view, his approach in this section is so dogmatic and so blinkered by his philosophy that it amounts to censorship. As a result, he deals with only a small fragment of religious experience, expressed in visual art, ancient or modern, and excludes all the rest on grounds unconnected with artistic merit.
Social Values and Religious Architecture*

by
The Rev. Ralph Edward Peterson, D.D.
Pastor, Saint Peter's Church
New York, N.Y.

Our presentation this morning comes in two phases — we begin with the architect for our project, Hugh Stubbins. In this project there have been contributions from numerous professionals. In addition to Mr. Stubbins, gratitude must go to such persons as John White of James D. Landauer & Associates who worked in the area of real estate, John Clarence Nelson of Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy who handled the intricate legal arrangements and the creation of a condominium, Massimo and Lella Vignelli who have been responsible for the interior design of the building as well as the architectural graphics, Robert Newman of Bolt, Beranek & Newman who has been our acoustical consultant, and Bob Brannigan who has been our theatrical consultant. The key person, of course, has been Hugh Stubbins and the coordination which he has provided in enabling this project to emerge as a building expressing the commitment of our congregation in the heart of New York City.

Let me provide a brief introduction to Saint Peter's Church. It was founded in 1862 as a congregation which essentially served a German community. In fact, German was the language used in the liturgy until the middle 1930s. The congregation finds itself today in the heart of mid-Manhattan. Our neighborhood has changed dramatically since World War II. In an area where stockyards and breweries once were dominant, there are now elegant new apartments. The soaring towers of the United Nations and many blocks of new office towers have transformed the neighborhood. Saint Peter's initially was built in an area of brownstones and small family living units. After the war, with the demolition of the Third Avenue El, there was rapid transformation of the east side and the church found itself in an entirely new environment.

Prior to my arrival in 1966, there had been six pastors who served this congregation. These past years many neighborhood churches had been in despair. Saint Peter's Church, an old congregation, suddenly found itself with a new mission. Saint Peter's had been an immigrant church in the 19th century; once again in the middle of the 20th century we were a church serving immigrants. This time we were serving religious and cultural immigrants who were facing a situation quite unlike any they had known before. To the credit of the leaders of the congregation they saw a great opportunity rather than great problems. The problems were there, and still are, but the congregation was committed to finding new ways of serving the city. This meant a commitment to a multiple staff, a commitment to diversified worship services. One might almost call it a commitment to various congregations gathering beneath the same roof. It meant a commitment to experimentation and new forms of ministry in such areas as jazz, theatre, international community and new forms of adult education. It meant a commitment to recovery of the Mass as the center of our life, and daily services were scheduled through the week.

By 1968 the congregation adopted a statement of mission called “Life at the Intersection.” By 1969 they voted unanimously again to authorize the sale of the building, to relocate temporarily, and to plan and build a new Saint Peter's Church. Because they had a clear sense of mission, they were able to address such issues as the demolition of an old building and the preservation of stained glass windows with an open spirit, basically committed to their mission of serving the people of New York, and not merely maintaining a building for themselves.

In 1973, the congregation left their old building for the last time and marched up Park Avenue. For the next three years the place of worship was the Central Presbyterian Church. This June they left that building, and went into the Central Synagogue, located at Lexington Avenue and 55th St. This building, one block away from our new structure, is a national landmark and one of the great historic shrines of Reform Judaism. We are now worshipping there every Sunday. Meanwhile, the parish offices and Center, which were located in a storefront on 56th St. following the sale and demolition of that building, have been relocated on the sixth floor of an office building overlooking the new building site. Today, one year before the completion of the new building, Saint Peter's Church is back on Lexington Avenue for worship and service.

The congregation has continued to grow in membership; there are now approximately 560 confirmed adults. Sunday worship attendance has continued to grow. Three years ago the average attendance at a Sunday service was 280; this past year it was 330. This past year, the stewardship drive more than doubled the pledges. The median age of the congregation is 38; half of them are single, unattached or detached, four out of five have a college education and two-thirds have joined within the past ten years. At the same time, 15% of the congregation has been loyal for more than thirty years. It is a congregation which draws members from four states and has a clear identity as serving the metropolitan area. It is a congregation whose members said, in a recent study, that tradition and innovation are equally impor-

*Edited address at National Interfaith Conference on Religion and Architecture, Boston, Ma., July 1976.

Mr. Peterson shared the platform with Mr. Stubbins who presented slides with a running commentary which unfortunately cannot be reproduced.
tell your son on that day it is because of what the Lord did for me when I came out of Egypt. He brought us forth from slavery to freedom, from sorrow to rejoicing, from mourning to festivity, from darkness to light and from servitude to redemption, let us say before him, Alleluia."

As a community of believers saying Alleluia we celebrate the Christ event and our new covenant in him. It is this covenant which frees us to be a paschal community. Being a community of Christian believers has given us freedom to pass over from death to life. This freedom has enabled us to live and grow in faith as we sold one building, moved through the wilderness of mid-Manhattan, and continue to find our reality as we gather in our paschal living room for the Mass. The center of our life has wider implications than worship. It liberated us to do business.

A remarkable council of lay leaders has emerged. To their leadership, with the assistance of a committed professional staff, the congregation has entrusted the negotiations regarding the sale of the building and the design and building of a multi-million dollar venture. The roof of this freedom to ‘work’ is found in the weekly meeting with the Lord.

Two: A primary reason for being in the heart of New York City is to celebrate the feast. Saint Peter’s primary purpose is to celebrate the Lord’s presence in the midst of our city and to share the power of his presence with others. Because we are called to celebrate the feast, we see ourselves as called to build a house church, a house with a paschal living room at its heart. The living room as we have designed it is one which will house all kinds of feasts, ranging from solemn services with chant and incense to swinging jazz services, to services where little is said. It is a space which has few fixed elements. Only the baptism and pipe organ are immovable. It is a place of dialogue, where the Word can be heard, a place in which the arts can contribute to the feast, where chasubles can be worn or a specially composed Mass can be danced. It is a place where jazz and modern dance and chorale and fuge can share in the enrichment of the feast. God has created us for celebration and jubilation and we serve our society by having a place for feasts in the midst of the city.

Three: We are a community whose life is covenant. Our paschal living room is one which will enable us to gather around the Table of the Lord. An old form has been recovered in developing the shape of our building. It has been noted that the circle or the square reflect architecturally the Judeo-Christian community at their strongest as they live in covenant. We have a church arising from a square. This enables us to gather around the table. The altar is movable and permits a variety of ways to gather. Whatever the arrangement, it will be a place in which there is an intimate relationship between the one who presides and those who share in the celebration. It is a square within which we meet each other. It is in another perspective, a hollow cube. It has direction; the community will face the great eastern window. It is a space which is transcendent and yet intimate; directional and yet free. Most of all it is a space which reflects our covenantal life. The members have a keen sense of the discipline expected in being a part of the Saint Peter’s community. We have now created a space in which we are linked to the Lord and through him to each other as we live out our life in covenant.

Four: We are a community that has discovered our spirituality in the experience of having a home. We have found a deep need for a place in which we can rediscover our humanity. I mean by this a place of meeting; an environment in which we can learn from each other, and be in conversation with each other. A home which will welcome and protect us without enclosing us; a home which provides intimacy and privacy as well as openness and public availability. Our new home has five levels. Each level is distinct and flexible. There will be places for cooking and dining and cleaning — places for reading and resting and meeting. It will be a home in which we can have public events such as concerts, films, lectures. Of course it will be a place for celebrations too. It will also be a place for quiet, intimate meetings and meditation or reflection, but most of all a place in which we can be at home. As a people on the move
Saint Paschal Baylon Roman Catholic Church, Highland Heights, Oh.
Architects: Richard Fleischman Architects, Inc., Cleveland Heights, Oh.

A large building of great simplicity and openness expressing the new spirit abroad in the church since the Ecumenical Council. Its design is strikingly contemporary with excellent use of glass and steel. This interesting building with its large seating capacity appears to remain warm and intimate in feel despite its scale.
Saint Peter's Church, New York, N.Y.

This is the most interesting of the projects submitted. Here is a well-conceived solution to a very difficult problem: the church among skyscrapers, no longer the dominant building itself. This design has strength and seems to achieve a capacity to attract the eye and heart of the worshipper.
Jury:
William Grinderings, AIA
Rabbi Norman Patz
A. Anthony Tappe', AIA, GRA
The Rev. Harold R. Watkins, GRA

The jury reviewed the forty-three entries which had been submitted at the 1976 National Interfaith Conference on Religion and Architecture, Boston, MA. These included new projects, renovations and restorations. Generally, the entries showed a broad diversity of design; all were competent work. However, the jury found no new departures in architectural expression and no striking attempts to make innovative applications of new liturgical expression. It was, therefore, not possible to single out any one outstanding work among the entries. The jury selected four entries for Merit Awards, gave a Special Citation for another, and chose an additional ten for inclusion in the Guild Traveling Exhibit for their special interest.

**New Melleray Abbey,** Dubuque, IA.

A well-done imaginative and sensitive renovation of a conventional 19th century Gothic structure which converts the interior into an exciting space. Submission is of a preliminary design concept.
Saint Matthew Lutheran Church, Moorestown, N.J.

Not architecturally innovative, but a very well-done and well-thought through building, with carefully integrated scale, nice attention to detail, very cleanly and tastefully executed.
Special Citation:

First Church of Christ Congregational,
Wethersfield, Conn.
Architects: Jeter, Cook and Jepson, Hartford, Conn.

A church built in the mid-18th century (1761-64), the interior of which had been totally "modernized" along Victorian lines in 1882, its original interior has been restored with unusually good historical accuracy and meticulous care.
An Introduction to Boston Church Architecture*

by
Walter Muir Whitehill
Historian and Author
No. Andover, Mass.

Visitors to Boston during this bicentennial year will find fewer colonial buildings than they expect; those that have survived are so scattered that one has deliberately to hunt for them. The nineteenth century has lasted better than in most parts of the United States. Beacon Hill for the first half, and the Back Bay for the second, still afford an unrivalled sequence of nineteenth century architecture. In spite of a reputation for conservatism, Boston can offer a richer variety of twentieth century architecture than of colonial.

Of the churches that were standing in 1776 only three survive. Christ Church, Salem Street (nicknamed the Old North Church) built in 1723 for the second Anglican parish in Boston, is still in use as an Episcopal church. It is of red brick with a wooden steeple. Designed by a parishioner, William Price, whose chief occupation was selling prints, maps, picture-frames, looking glasses, and toys, it is a simplified provincial reflection of what Sir Christopher Wren had been building in London half a century before. The interior of Christ Church recalls Wren's St. James, Piccadilly, deprived of its rich classical detail and plaster ornament.

King's Chapel, the second home of the oldest Anglican parish in Boston, was completed and occupied in 1754. It was designed by another amateur, Peter Harrison, a sea captain and merchant, inspired by the London churches of James Gibbs, especially Marylebone Chapel and St. Martin-in-the-Fields. In this church Quincy granite was used for the first time in

Boston, although in the form of surface boulders cut to size rather than quarried stone. King's Chapel is rich in eighteenth century memorial plaques, imported from London, by sculptors who worked in Westminster Abbey and other great English churches. It has kept its box pews and other original details. Although its congregation turned Unitarian after the American Revolution, King's Chapel physically remains a rare specimen of eighteenth century Tory Anglicanism.

The only other colonial survival is the Old South Meeting House, at Washington and Milk Streets, built in 1729 as the second home of the Third Church in Boston. It is a rectangular red brick structure, with the main entrance from Milk Street, on the long side, with a high pulpit on the opposite wall. A gallery ran around the other three sides. It is a typical Puritan meetinghouse in its architectural arrangements, yet at the west end there is an attached square tower surmounted by a graceful wooden spire that causes the building to resemble Christ Church, Salem Street. This contradiction, as William H. Pierson has suggested, doubtless sprang from the unwillingness of South End Congregationalists to be outdone by North End Anglicans. However incongruous, it is an elegant spire, reminiscent of Wren's at St. Mary-le-Bow in London.

As the Old South's seating capacity was the greatest in Boston, it was the scene of many public meetings during the period of revolutionary ferment, including the one that preceded the Boston Tea Party. A hundred and forty-some years later, when the congregation hankered to move to a new church in the fashionable Back Bay, the meetinghouse came within an ace of demolition. But respect for the historical associations of the old building was so strong that in the first great effort of historic preservation in an American city, four hundred thousand dollars was raised to buy it from the congregation and insure its preservation. It has been an historic monument, not a church, for the past century.

When these three colonial churches were built, Boston was a completely English seaport, with narrow wandering streets that might equally have been within the walls of a medieval town. The church towers were conspicuous features of the skyline. Like everything else in the town, they were built in the current English style by local masons and carpenters, relying on books, or upon some gentleman-amateur like Peter Harrison or William Price, for their design. The profession of architecture was still unknown; like music or letters, it could be practiced by any gentleman who had a mind to, who had given himself the trouble to learn what was acceptable in the polite world across the Atlantic through travel or the diligent reading of books.

Such a man was Charles Bulfinch, who completely transformed the face of Boston between 1788 and 1818. A member of the Harvard class of 1781, in comfortable circumstances, Bulfinch made an extended grand tour of Europe where he saw buildings that were a far cry from the Boston of his youth. Returning home he pursued no business other than (in his words) "giving gratuitous advice in architecture" until a sudden loss of fortune made the designing of buildings, and running the town govern-

TRANSITION AS PART OF RELIGIOUS TRADITION*

by

The Rev. George Huntston Williams
Hollis Professor of Divinity
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

As architects and practitioners of allied professions, concerned at this Conference with religious edifices, you have asked me as an historian of Christianity to reflect on transition in religion as this is reflected in architecture and in the other arts. My observations may also include — what is less often the case — the stylistic changes themselves of a period, which of their own inherent dynamic also alter or inhibit religious attitudes. Traditional buildings, for example, and even moveable religious artifacts such as hymnals, seriously outdated in their theology or musicology, sometimes unwittingly perpetuate what participants can no longer feel as fully their own and make worship seem unreal or feigned. Children and young people are particularly critical in their facile perceptions here, not realizing the degree to which that which they scorn may still carry transcendent power for some of their elders.

In any case we know that ours are the “tear-tear” generations, both parents and youths in tears as they are torn from each other by inexorable forces perhaps greater and swifter than at any other moment in human evolution.

I wish to begin my interfaith reflections by citing five major instances of sudden change in religion — with architectural implications — where proponents claimed to be in some measure in continuity with past religion and not wholly innovators. Bear in mind that I am concentrating on great convulsive changes or transitions that claimed some kind of continuity in the history of religions — and not with the numerous examples, around the world and deep in time, of the full repudiation of a religious tradition and the self-conscious conversion to something perceived as utterly new. To be sure, when the natives of Mexico adopted a wholly new religion — that of their Spanish conquerors — they wittingly or unwittingly carried over into their Catholicism something of what they previously believed. There is architectural, artistic and liturgical evidence surviving to the present day! We know too that to some extent the Mexican natives were indulged in this by understanding friar preachers and benign bishops, so long as these carry-overs could be construed as inoffensive to the conquerors or even as appropriate facilitators of the conversion. But in these small ways no claim was being made by Spaniard or Indian (unless by the latter surreptitiously) that the native population was simply undergoing a transition in religion. This was a case of radical conversion; it and its parallels elsewhere are not the topic at hand.

Rather than conversions of a whole people, which to be sure also represent religious transition, I wish to consider the transitions in religion that programmatically claimed to be both new and old — that is, radical transitions still regarded as in line with a given, inherited religion.

About two thousand years ago in India the gods of the Vedic pantheon were offered sacrifices of horses, cattle and other animals under the open sky by members of an hereditary priestly class. At about this time Hinduism may be said to have begun when these sacrifices, here and there, were carried out in temples. These shrines, probably quite simple at first, were understood to be architectural forms of the primordial man, while the once invisible gods were envisaged as sovereigns enthroned in their courts. Worship was understood as primarily an audience with the divine king or queen, depending upon the temple or shrine. It is of interest that the Sanskrit word for this act of homage was not audience, i.e., a collective hearing of the god, but a collective beholding of the god. As Hindu gods had different temples, so Hindus themselves broke up into various schools of religious thought. More and more the Vedic animal sacrifice was replaced by the gifts of flowers and fruits, and many modern Hindus — even their scholars — are reluctant to accept the more probable view that for a time at least the earlier outdoor sacrifices of cows were carried out within the enclosed space of the temple, which represented both the throne room of a particular deity and the stylized body of the primordial divine human being of whom the deity was admittedly but one aspect or manifestation.

Against the polytheism of the pre-temple Vedic system of outdoor sacrifices and a related movement of extreme asceticism, Gautama Buddha (B.C. 563 B.C.) and Buddhism reacted by disavowing polytheism and espousing a nirvanic atheism, by avowing a middle way between asceticism and more external practices, including sacrifices, and by propounding a view of the self and the world to the point of denying its ultimacy or permanence, what is commonly called illusionism or the doctrine of maya. This doctrine of impermanence, flux, the unreality of the individual personality was later taken over precisely from Buddhism by Hinduism, remaining one of the most readily recognized characteristics of Hinduism, even though Buddhism itself finally receded from India to become the principal religion of many adjacent peoples from Tibet to Tokyo. In its differentiation into two main forms, the Greater and the Lesser Vehicle, Buddhism became in some ways much like Hinduism with temples and shrines, sacred writings, severe discipline, and a system of godlike beings called boddhisattvas, seated in these temples in a distinctive posture along with sometimes a huge statue of Buddha himself —

coming closer to our own Western background. I mention first the enormous example of the shift from Hebrew to Judaism, represented by the destruction of the Temple in 70 and definitively in 135 of the Common Era. To be sure, the Jews, by this time living in the diaspora, had become accustomed to services without sacrifice in their synagogues; thus the transition in the conception of worship could be relatively easily negotiated, except that the extensive material on the details of the Temple, the High Priest, and the sacrifices in the Pentateuch alluded to throughout all the rest of the Hebrew Bible could no longer have even that meaning which they did for a Jew, say in Carthage or Corinth, in the year of the Common Era. Although he and his confreres would not be observing all of that ritual, they knew it was being carried out vicariously for all in Jerusalem. After the destruction of the Temple, Jews everywhere were obliged to rethink their worship and even the character of their synagogues in view of the permanent suspension of sacrifices in Jerusalem. It is worth noting that by way of exception, this was a transition in a continuous religious tradition which was brought about by an external event.

The Holocaust and the subsequent establishment of the State of Israel have created an almost comparable amount of crisis and creativity. Judaism today is very much in rapid transition and involved in new kinds of differentiation.

Then there is the example of Christians. The first followers of Jesus were Jews and the New Testament makes it clear that even Jesus, not to say his disciples and apostles, found it hard to think of their movement as anything more than a great innovative movement within Judaism. Not one tittle of the Law was to be changed. The brother of Jesus, James the Just, continued to worship with unusual devotion in the Temple; and Paul, though he broke through and preached Jesus Arisen to non-Jews, collected money for the poor in Jerusalem and — against his own principles with respect to the Law, not as applicable to Gentiles — circumcised one of his own fellow workers, a half-Jew. But equally important was the innovation. It was three-fold: 1) Gentile Christians came to think of themselves as the true or the new Israel; 2) in so doing, they took over the sacred writings of the Jews, claimed them as their own, and as early as the Apostolic Father Pseudo-Barnabas, went so far as to claim that God had never even intended the Hebrews/Jews to understand the words proclaimed by him to them through Moses and the prophets, and that they had no right to them, laying thus the basis for the most acrimonious of interfaith histories; and 3) in claiming that they belonged to this Elect People, by reason of regeneration through baptism, which was the rite of dying with Jesus as the Messiah and rising with him for eventual resurrection. Christians claimed, in another mood, that they represented a prospective new creation, a third race, neither Jew nor Gentile, a royal priesthood, a priestly nation directly under the Risen Christ, King of the Universe. Then followed notable transitions: the recognition of Christianity as the official religion of the universal Empire it had resisted in martyrdom for three centuries; the sudden fall in the first third of the seventh century of three of the five patriarchates of the Empire to Islam; the fall of the second most important patriarchate and the Byzantine capital in 1453; the rise of Moscow as the Third Rome in succession to Old Rome and New Rome on the Bosphorus; the Great Western Schism followed by the split of Western Christendom in the sixteenth century; the interior rationalization of Christianity in the Enlightenment, the revivals of the same eighteenth century and thereafter; the Russian Revolution of 1917; the Vatican II Council — all are representative major transitions of challenging change.

My last example is that of the Muslims, who claimed Abraham as the Father of faith, just as did Jews and Christians, who claimed moreover that Abraham had almost sacrificed their ancestor Ishmael (the Hebrew name for the first pre-Muslim Arab) instead of Isaac. They believed that Muhammad had ascended on a horse to heaven from the site of their second most sacred mosque in Jerusalem (a kind of parallel with Jesus' ascension and Paul's being lifted to the third heaven). Like Jews and Christians they had a weekly holy day and fasting and prayer. Like Jews they circumcised and like Christians of that time, the seventh century, they built increasingly magnificent edifices with a rough counterpart of the Christian baptistery, a place for the washing of feet on entry into the mosque. Like the Jews, they forbid graven images or any form of human representation in their beautiful mosques, heeding indirectly the First Commandment of the Jews. Yet like the Christians, they believed in Jesus as a virgin-born Prophet whom they could revere in line with the last, their Muhammed, whose sacred book had its counterpart in the Hebrew and Christian Bibles, so much so that Muslims called Islam a religion of the book (Koran), and they recognized the other followers of Abraham as constituting one of the three religions of the book. Eventually they accorded the Zoroastrians a similar dignity and spared them — like Jews and Christians — from forced conversion to Islam.

There we have it on a very large canvas — with all the details omitted — in chronological order, five religions that claimed continuity and either proclaimed or adjusted to or theorized about the epoch-making character of their initiatory transition: Hinduism from Vedic religion, eventually absorbing something of Buddhism; Buddhism from proto-Hinduism; Judaism from Hebrewism in adjustment to the destruction of the Temple by the Roman government; the Christian Church, claiming to be the true Israel and as such a new creation by the sacrament of rebirth, baptism; Islam, claiming to be the fulfillment of the faith of Abraham and the true religion of obedience to the One Eternal God of whom Jesus was the last prophet.

Now within each of these five religions in radical transition — three of them so radical as to constitute self-acknowledged new religions: Buddhism, Christianity and Islam — there were subsequently innumerable transitions as well as internal differentiations which have their significance in the context of this Conference for architecture and the related arts, visual and auditory.

Henceforth, I shall limit my observations to Christianity partly because I am an historian of Christianity; partly because my observations on
the special developments in one reli-
gion, as they bear on the Conference
theme, can be readily transferred
mutatis mutandis to non-Christian traditions; and partly be-
cause I wish to reserve time as an
historian to say something of usefulness perhaps about architecture and
the religious arts for today and to-
morrow — even though in the fields
in which you are experts, I am a
layman.

Christians until quite recently
tended to think of diversities, innova-
tions and transitions as almost en-
tirely heretical or schismatic. How-
ever, in our ecumenical age they
have come to rejoice in what would
appear to be the marvelous plenitude, even fecundity of the sem-
inal Word, and now mutually loan
and borrow aspects of other Christ-
tian traditions, past and present. One
could easily think the white-washed
Catholic church in Zurich more au-
thentically Reformed in appearance
than the ornate Gothic, dark and
crowded Reformed church of St. Giles in Edinburgh.

To put Christian history in a nut-
shell in terms of the major interests
of the participants of this Confer-
ence, I would say that Christianity
over a period of almost two millennia
has shaped the space in which its
principal activities have taken place
in many ways. More fundamental is
the recognition that Christianity
has from the start wavered — an over-
simplification — as to whether the
church is a people or an edifice. And
much of Church history can be un-
derstood in terms of the degree to
which one of these two ideas gained
sway over the other, sometimes to
the point of ignoring or repressing
the counterclaim. Hence, schism,
heresies, monastic, sectarian and
denominational fissures and fissions.
This leads to the mention of still a
third concept of the church, less
prominent at the beginning of Chris-
tianity, but surely there from patristic
antiquity, namely that the church is
indeed a people rather than an
edifice, but that it is invisible, and
that in its most mystical form, the
church can be in fact the individual,
participating in the life of the all in
solitary discipline and prayer (even
while outwardly conforming to the
requirements of a particular church,
sect, or denomination). This might
be called individualized spiritual
Christianity without a strong corpo-
rate sense, although such a person
might be sitting next to one in the
pew and work alongside one on the
same committee. Generally he is the
churchless Christian who says he
worships on the golf course, and in-
deed quite possibly does worship in
solitude somewhere and may be well
known for his good works and the
spirit in his home or principal place
of labor. In any case, what I have
been calling the transcendent in reli-
gion can equally apply to the mysti-
cal depth, the primordial abyss
within the mystic.

Insofar as the church is primarily
the fellowship of a people devoted to
the same end, awaiting in some
sense a second advent of Christ
(whether experientially within or mi-
illenially without), it can just as well
meet in a house as in a basilica. And
everybody here knows that the first
Christian churches in the sense of
defices were in fact the larger rooms
of houses, then villas, and then also
the underground of these villas
which became subterranean labyrinths, known as catacombs, and
which were fully as much places for
worship as for burial.

After baptism in rivers and open
water came to take place indoors in
separate structures called bap-
tisteries, for a long time the cupola of
these buildings of the initiatory and
re-creative sacrament had ceilings
with the moon and stars of the night
sky to evoke the memory of a past
practice, while frescoes or mosaics of
Jesus at the Jordan reminded the
baptismands of their great Paradigm
immersed by John the Baptist.

In the ancient era there were also
shrines marking the sites of martyr-
doms, above which eventually great
churches came to be built; and the
custom extended of having under
every altar the relic of some saint,
whether martyred at that spot or not.
As these large edifices developed out
of the Romah architectural form al-
ready mentioned as the basilica —
used originally for secular purposes
— the religious impulse behind the
transformation was to make of the
enclosed space something of a com-
bination of the throne room of God
in heaven and a messianic banquet
hall, in which the cosmic liturgy of a
rational sacrifice was enacted by
means of the transformation of the
elements of the Last Supper of Jesus
into the signs of his presence as King
and High Priest. Much of the liturgy
took on the regal character of the
court protocol of the Roman-
Byzantine Empire. The bishop's
teaching chair was converted into a
throne.

It is not my purpose to run
through Coptic, Armenian,
Byzantine-Slavic developments in the
East, nor through the more familiar
Romanesque, Gothic of varying de-
grees of intensity, Renaissance and
the Baroque phases of religious ar-
tecture, church art, music and
liturgy in the West. Suffice it to say
that Protestantism brought with it a
greater stress on the ear than the
eye, the idea of salvation as salus ex
auditu Verbi Dei (salvation through
justification by hearing the Word); and in the Zwinglian-Calvinist line
outright iconoclasm ravaged the
paintings, statues and stained-glass
windows, a mood that broke out
again in England in the seventeenth
century among the Puritans, the
proponents of the same understand-
ing of the church as primarily the
people of God rather than as the site
of a cosmic liturgy. In the most ex-
treme groups, church edifices were
on principle abandoned; and the
Anabaptists in the sixteenth century
and the Baptists and Quakers in the
seventeenth century met out of
doors in barns and houses, or in the
end settled for very plain meeting-
houses.

It is at the same time worthy of
note that an artistic movement,
clearly associated with the theology
of the Catholic Reformation, namely
the Baroque, leapt over confessional
boundaries to influence the architec-
ture, interior decoration, the
homiletical style and the music of
churches beyond the jurisdiction of
Rome, as if to demonstrate that an
artistic feeling can pervade a period
regardless of confession and create
comparable art forms in diverse na-
tional and confessional traditions.

Again in the period of German
Pietism, the most disciplined and
pious developed the ecclesiosa, a

circle within the established Lutheran
state church for Bible readings,
prayer and good works, midweek
gatherings centered in homes. One
Pietist leader, Count Nicholas von
Zinzendorf attached so much impor-
tance to marriage that when his
group finally separated as a separate
church, in the simple edifice at Herrnhut, there was the Blue Room with floral frescoes evoking Paradise, in which the reverend Count presided at the nuptial union to the point of consummation, likening the bridegroom mystically to Christ and Adam before the Fall, and his bride to a new Eve, destined never to lapse. (I am not suggesting that you architects rush to your drawing boards for something quite on this model in the name of creative transition!) At about the same time in Great Britain John Wesley finally preached in the open air against the order of his bishop and soon formed the equivalent of the ecclesiola — what he called the mid-week "class-meeting" in homes for the mutual oversight of groups in different parts of town — the beginning of the later Methodist chapels. In America revivalism also went outdoors and to this day the name "tabernacle," attached to some street-corner edifice, recalls the days when that originally revivalistic congregation thronged under a great tent called by the biblical term for the canopied structure covering the Ark of the Covenant of the Elect People on the march. And great public arenas are still used with many of the forms of the outdoor revival, now with a new stress on healing.

In our own day we are more fully aware than at any time since the barbarian invasions that brought the Western Roman Empire to an end that we live religiously and therefore architecturally and artistically in an age of rapid transition; that we must find new forms, liturgical and architectural, to reflect the end of a three-storey universe (hell, earth and heaven), and to set forth our new awareness of infra-atomic and intra-psychic as well as of cosmic space.

Clearlv the problem uppermost among participants of this Conference is what is to be done with the religious edifices that we have and what is to be projected with respect to new ones to be constructed. Here the Church historian, who has barely given any details about the architecture and art of the period he knows with some degree of authority, presumes upon you as an amateur, but an amateur in the sense not merely of the beginner but also of the one who loves and is concerned.

To be at once bold and provocative, I should like to say that change is already so much a part of global society and American society in particular that we must take very seriously the role of the big church edifice that is no longer capable of being filled to capacity — the basilica, shall we call it rather than cathedral because that implies a bishop. I have in mind big edifices, synagogues and temples — but also lesser structures like the historic Roger Williams Baptist Church and the Sephardic synagogue in Truro, and many a white-steepled church in the now sparsely populated or secularized parts of New England that may manage only one token service a year. Nevertheless these edifices are pointers to heaven, symbols of the directed gaze of our ancestors towards the realm of their heavenly citizenship. I think it is an error of small congregations or communities still responsible for these edifices to feel that they have no significance when empty. So long as they are kept up, painted and perhaps illuminated, they should be preserved as long as possible in the role of the temple ruins of Greece and elsewhere as symbols of the abiding yearning for the transcendent. And this principle applies to churches and synagogues in congested urban areas where property values are high. To be sure, other considerations have to be included in dealing with downtown churches no longer fully used. But in general the same principle applies. Passersby who may never have entered such an edifice are unconsciously influenced over a decade or even a lifetime by the mere existence of such a church — a quiet reminder that their forefathers knew there was something more to the cosmos and to society than what we perceive with the ordinary eye.

Many congregations get nervous when their rooms and even the main sanctuary are not used by some group during the week. Just as an opening in the forest is a relief to the woodman — often providing him with a point of reference if for no other reason than that he can see the sun or the stars — so in the midst of a great city, a church wholly uncoupled serves that same role. Here it is the quiet and an intentional void that has that personal and social value I pointed to when I said earlier that the church can be described as a sacred space as well as a sacred people. Filling sacred space with all kinds of activities in order for the congregation to feel relevant and justified in receiving tax exemption is the wrong way to think about our congregations and edifices, many of which antedate the Republic. The church, at least in our pluralistic constitutional federai Republic of limited powers, does not have to feel like a mendicant or wastrel. It should probably contribute to the maintenance of fire and police departments, but otherwise it should be serenely confident in its tax exemption as a great gnarled oak, valueless as timber, should not have to question its ultimate worth in its giving even more than just shade. There must be enclosed and sacred space of memory and hope sufficiently ample for the soul to be at leisure from itself — whether anybody else is present or not.

To turn to edifices old and new to be remodeled in terms of the church as primarily the people — I have a number of suggestions. Let me start with a very strong concern of mine. I hold that the Church is essentially the community of rebirth, although in fact of course one is usually born into the church, be it Catholic or Congregational. Yet in principle the sacrament of baptism is the ordinance whereby one is initiated into membership in the body, recruited into this spiritual militia, whether as an infant with godparents saying the vows for the baptisand or as a believing adult, immersed in a tank normally covered by draperies (as in a Baptist church). As woman is the means of our coming into the world, I would urge that a woman as ordained deacon or as ordained minister be the usual officiant at baptism to dramatize the fact that baptism is the symbolic ordinance of one's coming through the portals of nature into the realm of grace, of the new creation, sustenance in which realm, among most Christians, is the Lord's Supper. As Christianity becomes more and more a matter of one's choice, I predict that baptism, with its rich patristic and medieval theological elaborations recovered, should become much more prominent in the life of the church and the Christian home. In socialist bloc
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ment and police force a full-time occupation. Charles Bulfinch introduced the current neoclassicism of England to Boston, creating a style that satisfied the aspirations of increasingly prosperous Federalist merchants.

In the course of thirty years of practice in Boston, Bulfinch designed the State House, Court House, Faneuil Hall, a theatre, concert hall, five banks, four insurance offices, three schools, two hospitals, four churches, three entire streets, and a considerable number of private houses. Because of the American passion for knocking things down and starting over, only a fraction of Charles Bulfinch's work in Boston has survived. In the course of the nineteenth century, through immigration and industrialization, Boston changed from an homogeneous English seaport of twenty-five thousand inhabitants to a polyglot city of over half a million. To make room for this new population the whole topography was radically altered. By filling of land, whole new areas like the South End and the Back Bay were created, with corresponding migrations of people. As fashionable Bostonians moved to Beacon Hill and the Back Bay, older residential districts were swallowed up by business or lapsed into slums.

The nineteenth century saw great changes in the religious life of Boston. The first Roman Catholic church was begun in 1799 and a first bishop of Boston named in 1808. By 1875 when the see was raised to the dignity of an archdiocese there were twenty-eight Catholic churches in Boston. The present archbishop, like his two immediate predecessors, is a cardinal. Charles Bulfinch gratifiedly furnished the plans for the first Catholic Church (later Cathedral) of the Holy Cross in Franklin Street. It was one of his most attractive buildings, but in 1862, being long outgrown, it was demolished. Its site is now in the banking district.

The North End, where Christ Church, Salem Street, is located, is the only part of colonial Boston that is still residential, after 346 years. Bulfinch's only surviving church is there, in Hanover Street, a few hundred yards to the east of Christ Church. It was built between 1802 and 1804 for a Unitarian society, the New North, whose members moved to other parts of town as newly arrived immigrants crowded into the region. When the New North Church was dissolved in 1862, the Catholic bishop bought the building and gave it new life as St. Stephen's Church. About 1870 it was raised six and a half feet to insert a lower church beneath it, but in 1964 the late Cardinal Cushing, in the course of a major restoration, lowered St. Stephen's back to its original level, using the same firm, Isaac Blair & Co., that had jacked it up for Archbishop Williams some ninety years earlier! As a freestanding table was placed in the apse, in lieu of altar and reredos, according to dictates of the Vatican Council, the interior of St. Stephen's now looks much as it must have when the Rev. Francis Parkman preached to his Unitarian congregation a century and a half ago.

The changing use of old churches in Boston throws valuable light upon the social metamorphoses of the regions in which they stand. In the West End, at the corner of Cambridge and Lynde Streets, the architect Asher Benjamin, who worked in the red brick tradition of Bulfinch, designed in 1806 a new meetinghouse for the West Church, originally Congregational, later Unitarian. When through changes in the neighborhood the church dissolved in 1892, the building was adapted to accommodate the West End branch of the Boston Public Library, which was marked by the possession of a fine collection of Judaica, much appreciated by the newer residents of the region. When the library was closed in 1960 because of the wholesale demolition of the streets from which its readers came, the building was once more in jeopardy. In 1962 it was conveyed to the New England Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church, and reopened for religious use in 1964. Its congregation was drawn from the First Methodist Church in nearby Temple Street (demolished for an extension of Suffolk University) and the former Copley Church at Newbury and Exeter Streets in the Back Bay (demolished for a parking lot).

Parenthetically I might mention another game of religious musical chairs. A South Congregational Church, which was in spite of its name Unitarian, had been founded in 1828 at Castle and Dover Streets, as an offshoot of the Hollis Street Church, for young people living in the fast growing South End. From 1856 to 1899 its pastor was the Rev. Edward Everett Hale. The growth of Unitarianism in the region required in 1862 the construction of a substantial new meetinghouse in Union Park Street. Within a quarter of a century the South End had changed so greatly in character that in 1887 the South Congregational Church united with the parent Hollis Street Church (whose meetinghouse was transformed into the Hollis Street Theatre). The reunited groups moved to the Back Bay and built afresh at Exeter and Newbury Streets. It was an unwise move, for there were three other Unitarian churches in the Back Bay, the most distant of which was four blocks away. In consequence, the building was eventually sold to the Methodists, who moved off to the West Church in 1964.

The church that Dr. Hale's society had deserted in Union Park Street was for forty years the Ohabei Shalom Synagogue, before it passed into the hands of its present owners, the Greek Orthodox Church of St. John the Baptist. Although they have substituted an iconostasis for Edward Everett Hale's pulpit and covered the spaces between the tall windows with mural paintings in the Byzantine style, the structure designed by N. J. Bradlee for the South Congregational Church has suffered little basic change; the building is today admirably kept up.

Closing this long parenthesis and returning to the work of Asher Benjamin, the Charles Street Meeting House, at the corner of Charles and Mount Vernon Streets at the foot of Beacon Hill, was built in 1807 for the Third Baptist Church in Boston. In its original design it was similar to the West Church. In 1876 the Baptists sold the meeting house to the First African Methodist Episcopal Society, which is said to have been founded in the seventeen eighties. In the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries much of the black population of Boston lived nearby, on the north slope of Beacon Hill. In 1939 the African Methodists moved to St. Ansgrarius Church in Roxbury, which was more convenient to their present homes.
selling the Charles street property to a non-sectarian neighborhood group that allows a Universalist congregation to occupy it today.

In Smith Court, just off Joy Street, on the north slope of Beacon Hill, black residents built in 1805 an African Baptist Church with funds raised by Cato Gardner, a freed slave. It is a graceful brick structure, which recalls the architectural style of Asher Benjamin, and is said to have been built entirely by black labor. In 1905, when the population of the region had changed, the meeting house was bought from the black congregation by the Congregation Anshe Libowitz for use as a synagogue. When that body sold the building a few years ago, it was returned to black ownership to be converted into a Museum of Afro-American History.

The Park Street Church, at the corner of Park and Tremont Streets, built in 1809 from designs of Peter Banner, is a red brick structure, whose graceful white wooden spire dominates Boston Common. It was designed to house orthodox Congregationalists, bent on combating the growing strength of Unitarianism. For 167 years it has dealt out the same Gospel to such an extent that its location has long been known as Brimstone Corner. Of the surviving early churches in Boston, Park Street was the last to be built in red brick that quietly blended with the houses that originally adjoined it, with only a spire for added emphasis. Thereafter the house of God was apt to differ markedly from those of his neighboring worshippers. St. Paul's Church, diagonally across Tremont Street from the Park Street Church, is a Greek Revival Temple, with a gigantic Ionic portico of sandstone from Aquia, Virginia. It was completed in 1820 from the designs of Alexander Parris and Solomon Willard. Since 1908 it has been the cathedral of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts.

With the immense amount of filling of land that went on, particularly in the second half of the nineteenth century, churches in the older parts of Boston soon followed their congregations to the new residential districts. The Unitarians of Federal Street, long presided over by the Rev. William Ellery Channing, were the first to move to the new Back Bay, building in 1859 at the corner of Arlington and Boylston Streets. The Arlington Street Church is of local brownstone, as are many Back Bay houses. Although its architect, Arthur Gilman, claimed to have drawn his inspiration from the Church of Santissima Annunziata in Genoa, there are strong reminiscences of English Georgian in both the interior and the spire.

In spite of the local stone used, Arlington Street Church is of European post-Renaissance style. Elsewhere in the Back Bay architects went back to the middle ages for their inspiration. A new Episcopal parish in Newbury Street, Emmanuel Church, built from designs of A. R. Estey a Gothic structure of Roxbury conglomerate stone, consecrated in 1862. In 1867 the Central Congregational Church moved from Winter Street to a Gothic building with a striking 236-foot spire, designed by Richard M. Upjohn at the corner of Newbury and Berkeley Streets. This is now the Presbyterian Church of the Covenant. The First Church (Unitarian) of 1630 moved in 1868 from the center of the city to a new Gothic building at the corner of Marlborough and Berkeley Streets, designed by Ware and Van Brunt. The Third Church, which had remained Congregational, abandoned the Old South Meeting House in 1875 for a north Italian Gothic building with a striking campanile, designed by Cummings and Sears, at Boylston and Dartmouth Streets at one corner of Copley Square.

The Brattle Square Church (Unitarian) in 1871 sold its meetinghouse of 1772, in favor of a new Romanesque church, designed by H. H. Richardson, dying of the financial effort within five years. The free-standing corner tower, adorned with a frieze by Bartholdi of trumpeting angels, was more admired than the church. During the next five years when the building remained vacant as an imposing white elephant, there was talk of demolishing the church but preserving the tower. Finally in the winter of 1881-1882 the First Baptist Church bought the building.

Trinity Church, the third Episcopal parish in Boston, lost its Summer Street building during the great fire of 1872. Even before that disaster, the parish had bought land in the Back Bay on the east side of what is now Copley Square, for which H. H. Richardson designed the masterpiece of his short career. This great build-

A less happy Romanesque derivation was the First Spiritual Temple, built for the Working Union of Progressive Spiritualists at the corner of Exeter and Newbury Streets in the Back Bay in 1885 from designs of Hartwell and Richardson. For years it has been better known as the Exeter Street Theater.

Although Congregationalists, Unitarians, and Episcopalians embraced Gothic in the Back Bay in the third quarter of the nineteenth century, the oldest Gothic Revival church to survive in Boston is St. Augustine’s Chapel (Roman Catholic) in South Boston, built in 1820. The taste for Gothic transcended theology, for in 1831 the Rev. Lyman Beecher, addicted to inflammatory rabblerousing against Catholics, moved his congregation of ultra-orthodox Calvinists from Hanover Street in the North End to a new church in Bowdoin Street, on the north slope of Beacon Hill. This was a chunky Gothic revival building of undressed granite, probably designed by Solomon Willard. When Beecher moved to Cincinnati in 1832, some of the brimstone went with him, for in 1862 the church was sold to the Episcopal Parish of the Advent. This first Anglo-Catholic parish in Boston, founded in 1844 as the result of the Oxford Movement, remained in Bowdoin Street for less than two decades, for in 1876 it began construction of a new church at the corner of Mount Vernon and Brimmer Streets, nearer the homes of its more solvent parishioners. John Hubbard Sturgis' design produced a richly textured Victorian Gothic church in red brick. When the parish moved there in 1883, the Bowdoin Street church was taken over by the Cowley Fathers, who have maintained it for more than ninety years as the Mission Church of St. John the Evangelist.

The Church of the Immaculate Conception, built by the Jesuit order
in Harrison Avenue in the South End between 1858 and 1861, is an imposing granite building in the classical style. It was the work of Patrick C. Keeley of Brooklyn, N.Y., an architect who was ever ready to meet the need for designing new Catholic churches in the rapidly expanding Archdiocese of Boston. Although Keeley provided the Jesuits with a church that evoked the period of the creation of their order, he worked most usually in the idiom of the Gothic Revival. The second Cathedral of the Holy Cross which he designed was inspired by English Gothic of the thirteenth century. It is an immense building, almost the size of Notre Dame in Paris, for it covers an area of 45,000 square feet. Its total length is 364 feet, its width at the transept 170 feet, the width of the nave and the aisles 90 feet, and the height to the ridgepole 120 feet. The open space of the interior is broken only by the two rows of columns that separate the nave from the aisles, above which are clerestory windows; the building is covered with a wooden roof adorned with carving and tracery. The exterior walls are of Roxbury pudding stone, trimmed with granite and sandstone. Although the substantially completed cathedral was dedicated on December 8, 1875, the towers of the western facade never received the soaring spires contemplated in Keeley’s plan, while for reasons of economy the clustered columns separating the nave from the aisles were built in iron rather than in stone.

The building of the cathedral was greatly delayed by the Civil War. In 1860, when business was encroaching upon Franklin Street, the Bulfinch Cathedral of the Holy Cross, long since outgrown, was sold and land for its replacement bought on Washington Street in the new South End. Although the plans were in hand, Bishop Fitzpatrick used the money he had collected for its construction to alleviate the financial distress of parishes that had suffered losses of income because of the war. Consequently it was 1866 before excavations began. The choice of site for this huge building was unfortunate, for in the fifteen years that elapsed between the purchase of the land and its completion, the South End had begun to decline. From a promising region, it was becoming a tacky one of lodging houses. The appearance of the cathedral was impaired when the elevated structure carrying trains to Dudley Street was built on Washington Street in 1901, directly in front of the west facade.

Douglas Shand Tucci’s *Church Building in Boston 1720-1970*, published by the Dorchester Savings Bank as an uniquely intelligent contribution to the Bicentennial, illustrates three of P. C. Keeley’s other Gothic Revival Catholic churches in the area: St. Peter’s Dorchester (1873-1875), Holy Trinity, South End (1875), and St. Mary’s, Charlestown (1892). This is a valuable book, for it offers a pictorial survey of Boston churches over two and a half centuries, including much material that would not be easily found elsewhere.

In a classical style, but even more grandiose in scale than the Catholic cathedral is the domed Extension to the Christian Science Mother Church. The founder, Mary Baker Eddy, in the early eighties had conducted her Massachusetts Metaphysical College at 569-571 Columbus Avenue in the deteriorating South End. In 1887 she moved to 385 Commonwealth Avenue in the Back Bay; within a few years construction was begun on Falmouth Street, off Huntington Avenue, of a stone Mother Church, of Romanesque inspiration, dedicated on January 5, 1895. As it proved inadequate in size within a decade, a great domed Extension, seating 5,012 people, was begun in 1904. Designed by Charles Brigham, with inspiration from the Renaissance in Rome, this, the largest church in Boston, was dedicated on June 10, 1906. The surroundings of the Mother Church were undistinguished, because of an adjacent train yard. When that was replaced by the Prudential Center, the church bought and demolished numerous buildings in Huntington and Massachusetts Avenues and created from the designs of I. M. Pei Associates a noble setting that has elevated the appearance of that part of Boston.

Boston’s two nineteenth century contributions to the religious life of the world were the creation of the American Unitarian Association and of the Church of Christ, Scientist. The rise and growth of the Catholic church during that period is the most striking phenomenon; it has con-
continued, for Catholics today amount to almost half of the population. Judaism made little visible impact on Boston until late in the nineteenth century. Although there had been a few Jewish families here during the colonial period, Jewish community life only began in the eighteen forties. The first Jewish congregation, Ohabei Shalom organized in 1843, built its first synagogue in 1851. Numbers remained small until the eighteen eights, when persecution in the Russian empire caused great numbers of Jews to come to the United States. As most of them on arrival were poor refugees, their congregations initially worshipped in improvised quarters, often disused Protestant churches, as I have indicated earlier. Only in the present century were synagogues of architectural distinction built, like the Byzantine Temple Ohabei Shalom on Beacon Street in Brookline, designed by Clarence H. Blackhall.

In the last third of the nineteenth century institutions were created that profoundly affected the quality of architectural and artistic life in Boston. In 1865 the recently created Massachusetts Institute of Technology appointed William Robert Ware to head a proposed architectural school. After a period of exploring architectural education in France and England, Ware returned, bringing with him Eugène Létang, who imported for the first time to America the system of design training of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. The Boston Society of Architects was established in 1867. Three years later the Boston Athenaeum, Harvard College, and M.I.T. joined forces to create the Museum of Fine Arts. From the appointment of Charles William Eliot as president in 1869, Harvard began to change from a country college to a great university. Charles Eliot Norton, long the arbiter of the arts in the region, began in 1874 to give the first Harvard courses in fine arts; in 1893 he was joined by H. Langford Warren, who before the end of the century had devised a complete curriculum in architecture. In 1894-1895 the Fogg Museum of Art was created at Harvard.

Into this Boston scene the young Ralph Adams Cram came from a New Hampshire farm in 1881, through the helpfulness of William R. Ware, to study architecture. Through travel in Europe and conversion to Anglo-Catholicism he developed a vision of carrying English Gothic forward beyond the point where it was arbitrarily stopped by the Protestant Reformation. Cram and Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue, who was his partner from 1892 to 1913, profoundly influenced church architecture throughout the United States for the next half century. Their first Episcopal church in the region, All Saints, Ashmont, in 1892, has recently been the subject of a meticulous monograph by Douglass Tucci, who has also written about Cram in his Church Building in Boston 1720-1970, and in Ralph Adams Cram, American Medievalist. The latter was prepared for a great exhibition held at the Boston Public Library last winter, which in May moved to New York, where it was shown in Cram's masterpiece, the Cathedral of St. John the Divine.

The early Gothic church work of Cram and Goodhue can be seen within easy reach of Boston at All Saints', Brookline, Christ Church, Hyde Park, and the Unitarian Church in West Newton. At Audubon Circle, Brookline, is the Ruggles Street Baptist Church, a Georgian meeting house with a graceful tower, that Cram designed in 1914 for the now defunct Second Church (Unitarian) of Boston. The small rubble chapels, inspired by the Romanesque of Lombardy and Catalonia, that Cram did for his own estate in Sudbury and for the Sisters of St. Anne in Arlington Heights, are particularly appealing. His last major work in the region is the austere stone chapel that he designed in the nineteen thirties for the Cowley Fathers at their new monastery near Harvard on Memorial Drive, Cambridge. Valuable allies of Cram for decorative work were the artist in stained glass, Charles Jay Connick, who worked in Boston from 1900 until his death in 1945, the woodcarver Johannes Kirchmayer, and a number of other craftsmen who gravitated to Boston early in this century under the wing of the Society of Arts and Crafts.

Although Cram was a devout Anglo-Catholic, he built not only for Episcopal parishes but for Roman Catholics, Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Methodists, Unitarians, and Swedenborgians. His chief Roman Catholic contemporary in Boston,
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Charles Donagh Maginnis, who was sick and tired of Patrick C. Keeley's Victorian Gothic churches, went back for inspiration to the medieval brick styles of Lombardy. Over fifty years the firm of Maginnis and Walsh revolutionized the architecture of the archdiocese of Boston. St. Catherine's, Somerville, and St. John's, North Cambridge, are admirable examples of their work. Maginnis' mastery of a fresh approach to Gothic is shown in the new campus that he began to build in 1909 for Boston College, overlooking the Chestnut Hill Reservoir. His sense of magnificent simplicity and appreciation of textures are best exemplified by the high altar that he designed for Trinity Church in Copley Square and the manner in which he redecorated the interior of H. H. Richardson's awkward chancel.

The depression and World War II, combined with the arrival of Walter Gropius at Harvard, marked the end of church architecture as Cram and Maginnis had conceived it. In the second half of the twentieth century, with a shrinking population and increasing secularism, Boston architects have less call to design churches than in the past. However, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1954 commissioned Eero Saarinen to build a small round interdenominational chapel. New Lutheran churches, like Arland Dirlam's of 1950 in Cambridge, Pietro Belluschi's of 1959 at Marlborough and Berkeley Streets in the Back Bay, and Joseph Schiffer's Mount Calvary in Acton of 1963, have been built. Within this decade The Architects Collaborative, Inc., have built a new Temple Israel in the riverway to replace the congregation's synagogue of 1907 in Commonwealth Avenue above Kenmore Square that was sold to Boston University, while an award-winning Charles River Park Synagogue, designed by Childs, Bertman, and Tschekares, has been built in the redeveloped West End of Boston. But today the chief problem is not how to build new churches, but what to do with old ones that, although religiously redundant, have architectural quality that makes them a necessary part of the Boston landscape. The Back Bay would be a dull place without Arthur Gilman's spire in Arlington Street, Richard M. Upjohn's in Berkeley, or H. H. Richardson's campanile in Clarendon.

In the days ahead you will be considering such problems. I urge you to fortify yourselves this evening by enjoying the beauty that is around you. This building and its contents are the creation of one woman, Mrs. John Lowell Gardner. After travelling in Japan with her husband in the eighteen eighties, she became absorbed in the glories of European painting. During the nineties she seriously settled down to collecting works of art, aided by Bernard Berenson, a brilliant Lithuanian Jew who had grown up in the slums of Boston, whom she had helped to send to Italy after his graduation from Harvard College in 1887. Through his absorption in the study of Renaissance paintings in Italy, Berenson often brought to Mrs. Gardner's attention pictures of major importance that she acquired.

As the collection outgrew her two adjacent houses in Beacon Street, Mrs. Gardner bought land in the Fenway for the construction of the building in which we are meeting. From its inception Fenway Court was designed to be the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, a public institution, although its creator lived on the fourth floor from the winter of 1902-1903 until her death in 1924. As her will forbade rearrangement, substitutions, additions, or changes to the collection, you see around you a superb document in the history of American taste — some of the finest Italian paintings in the United States in the setting that their collector planned for them at the turn of the century.

Mr. and Mrs. Gardner were parishioners of the Church of the Advent, who gave the reredos behind the high altar in 1890. In designing Fenway Court she planned chapels on the third and first floors. My first sight of the house was on a snowy Christmas Eve in the early nineteen twenties, when the rector of the Church of the Advent who was to celebrate a midnight mass in the third floor chapel brought me along as his acolyte. Tonight there are no logs blazing in the fireplace of the Gothic Room as there were then, but the house is otherwise unchanged. If this is your first visit, I hope you will remember it with affection for as long as I have remembered mine.

Environments for Worship is the result of a study done at the Art Center College of Design, Los Angeles, Cal. One hundred and forty-three people participated in the study which set out to clarify the relevant qualities essential for the worship environment and helpful to the people who worship there.

In his preface, Father McAlister has written: "Reverence for the symbolic manifestation of God's presence on earth has given rise to numerous architectural forms in which God's people are housed. . . . While costly magnificent edifices for worship may now be out of place, the sense of the sacred is not. . . . It is our contention that qualities normally attributed to the sacred are really those psychological qualities that all people need in order to function well. The great worship architecture of the past possessed those qualities and that is why they were, and often still are, symbols and centers of worship."

Sixty-nine pairs of slides dealing with environmental settings were used in the study, to which non-verbal as well as verbal responses were given. After an analysis of the findings, nine projects are shown which people considered most appropriate to worship as they were presented in the study which set out to clarify the relevant qualities essential for the worship environment and helpful to the people who worship there.

Although the survey is wisely limited to our country, the text does not disregard influences from England and the Continent. One excellent aspect of the book is that it does not cover just the works of architects but recalls the influence of historians, authors, interior designers and landscape architects on the Gothic movement. Nor does the book limit itself to the better known architectural practitioners; it gives coverage to many designers whose names are omitted from surveys of American architectural history. Every imaginable type of building is reviewed — even some offbeat structures which I had not considered as being influenced by the Gothic style. In addition, the book is graced with some 250 illustrations that materially supplement the text.

With a good historic perspective, the authors have included photographs, designs and line drawings of a number of fine buildings now removed from the landscape in the name of progress. The survey maintains a good balance as it views such a wide diversity of structures that have a common stylistic vocabulary. Nor does it overlook the decorative arts that were influenced by the Gothic style. The coverage treats both the good and the bad of the Gothic movement as practiced in America. Indeed, some of the poor applications of the Gothic style are clearly illustrative of the influences that caused many architectural critics to view the Gothic as being inferior.

The Only Proper Style, Calder Loth

Now that the July Conference on Religion and Architecture is over and I have had a chance to reflect on what was experienced there, I have some thoughts that I, as an artist/craftsman participating for the first time in such a Conference, would like to share.

As an Associate Member of the American Institute of Architects (Long Island Chapter), I had anticipated that this Conference would be geared to architects' problems, not unlike a typical AIA business meeting. But perhaps because of the artists present to whom I could relate, the Conference proved to be — to my surprise — a rewarding experience.

It provided a protective shelter in which people could communicate, at least for the duration of the Conference — one step removed from the realities of the business world. It offered an opportunity for artist and architect to meet in a congenial atmosphere; a chance to meet people from across the country who probably would never have met otherwise.

Parts of the Conference could be said to be inspirational — at least for me — as feelings emerged and new ideas began to take shape due to the combination of sights and sounds that made up the Conference content and my response to them.

I felt unique in the fact that my work in the exhibit was the only mosaic shown. I was able to relate to both artists' and architects' points of view as they were presented in the workshops that I attended. In addition, the theme of the Conference — Tradition — Transition — was appropriate to my work since the centuries-old craft of mosaic has been in recent years, and still is, in a period of change in order to relate more fully to contemporary religious architecture and liturgical format.

In spite of and because of the problems encountered that made it what it was, I am glad to have had the opportunity to participate in this year's Annual Conference.

Joseph Anthony Russo
Studio of Contemporary Mosaic Art
Deer Park, N.Y.

Letters to the Editor should be addressed to the Editor, c/o Providence College, Providence, R.I. 02918.
countries, it is no small matter to be a Christian, and many parents in Czecho-lovakia and Hungary, for example, are postponing baptism of their children so that they will accept responsibility in being baptized at a time in their lives when it can mean a yes to Christ above the state, without being provocatively against the Communist state. I hope that architects, mosaicists, painters and musicians will give thought to something more appropriate to the ordinance that for Christians means their rebirth in Christ than a small stone or silver basin and a rose, sometimes with the congregation rising to pledge life-long support to this new recruit of Christ, when they can scarcely make out whether the baby is a girl or boy and whom they know for a certainty, in our mobile society, they probably will never see grow into adolescence! Too long has the altar or the communion table or the pulpit dominated the interior furnishings of our churches. Baptism must have all its meaning recovered, although before architects and others begin to draw up their blueprints, they must alas wait upon the theologians for whom what baptism has now come to mean behind the detente draperies is only slowly reaching them. To be a Christian in a totalitarian state is not to advance to the university, not to advance to the higher positions in technocracy and ideological bureaucracy. Baptism in our secularized America must also recover the deep covenantal and sacramental meaning it had for the re-born in Christ in the pre-Constantinian era.

With no intention of being systematic or consistent, I propose a wholly new room in every church and synagogue: the room of confession and counsel. The Catholics have long had impersonal, dark, confessional booths, which are now being replaced with new ideas of personal and group confession and absolution. But as yet there is no architectural innovation of which I know that takes seriously one of the primary tasks of the modern rabbi, priest or minister. He is a psychological counselor of first and often last resort. Before speaking architecturally, let me say something about money. I believe that all recipients of the counseling resources of the ministry should pay for it — according to their ability, not directly to the minister but to the church or synagogue. Perhaps a distinction might be made between the charge for a church member and one for a nonmember. The minister's salary should be correspondingly increased, and a specialist who is non-competitive with medical psychiatry, should be added to the staff in due time. Religious counseling is or should be different from any other kind of counseling.

To speak now architecturally — the confessional or counseling office should not be the minister's study with its books and other ministerial equipment. It should be an intimate room — perhaps even austere. It should be a room large enough for the minister and one other person, or at most a troubled couple. The room would have books — not many — but no telephone. I picture it as a very high but otherwise rather small room with symbols of earth, sea and sky and other forms of life therein, including some token of the long evolution of plant and animal life, of human life and society, of religious and moral aspiration, and of the ambiguity of the same. There should also be therein the architectural and iconographic suggestion of depth — perhaps in the use of changing hues. Let me turn abruptly to the poignancy of memorial plaques and windows — and the other pathetic ways by which the church as edifice comes to be a kind of collective tomb. In our excessive mobility, the same congregation may have occupied three sites in one lifetime. I have come to feel more and more that just as there is a committee on music in every church, there should be one on the visual arts, including drama and even film, and another on the congregation as the local community of memory and hope. More and more I think that memorials should take the form of memorial funds. The visual aspect of religion and the history of the congregation are among the ways in which some of these funds would be best used and best transferred to a new site, should that necessity eventuate. I think that it is in one sense presumptuous — not to say short-sighted — for certain members to make a plaque or window the memorial to a deceased loved one without consultation with a standing committee on the visual arts. Moreover, I think that names and memories can best be kept alive by attaching them to certain recurring performances of music or certain expressions of the visual arts and drama — or even to study-group lecturerships.

As for actual individual lives, I think every church should have its room of memory and of hope. Ever since the astronauts photographed our blue-white globe, we knew if not before that it must be at once our terrestrial as well as our celestial home. But I still believe in immortality or resurrection; I still believe in some kind of personal survival and hold that in any case it is right and proper that on the occasion of the birthday and the deathday of our beloved departed, the still bereaved could enter a special room designed for that purpose. As an historian, I see it appropriately decorated with paintings of successive pastors, priests or rabbis as spiritual leaders, to give the sense of ongoing time. I envision the drawers and files containing brief accounts of deceased members, official obituaries and eulogies as well as documentation of each person's role in the church or synagogue. The contents of such a room would be moveable. Eventually they could be reduced to microfilm. The historian of the congregation should deposit in this room — perhaps every quarter of a century — a general account of the life of the congregation as a whole. But it should be a place not only of recorded memory but of personal recollection, intercession, special musical recordings such as requiems from several traditions, and possibly even professional guidance, if requested, in cases of protracted despair or loneliness.

A major activity of the congregation is education, ranging all the way from instruction in the liturgical language of this or that ethnic community, to the catechism. As for basic factual religious history and moral values, it is clear that the American educational system, as a result of a succession of court decisions, and as a result of the ecumenical, interfaith and civicly more fraternal relations among religious groups of quite diverse beliefs, is going to be able to do more in the public schools than in
the past about teaching religion. However, there will probably always be groups that wish to retain and perhaps even here and there extend their church or synagogue-related school system. But surely religious education in the local church is destined to remain a major activity in most communities. I think of this as emerging in two different directions: direct counseling of one or a few young people together dealing with a moral-religious problem. I can imagine this kind of activity going on in the room I described earlier because faith is a more difficult concept for our young people than formerly; and a skilled minister is required for such counseling.

As for the other direction, I believe the era of the rigidly graded classes may be over. I think the children of the congregation and others whose parents are not connected with the church or synagogue should be placed in larger groupings with resources as sophisticated as those on television and in public schools employed on an increasingly ecumenical basis — films, lectures, plays as well as serious study. I think too that children and youth should see their elders occupied in a comparable way, if not at the same time. Religion and morality are surely as complicated as mathematics and physics, and who in the religious community would wish to go no further than addition and subtraction in the realm of faith and ethics, especially since the transcendent world appears to be much more complicated than even the authors of our sacred books imagined, inspired though they were by God! Since education and worship, especially for Christians — less so for Jews — are sharply differentiated, I feel that the space that shapes these different activities should not be identical. Worship is a process in which by various ritual routines — from holy water to hymn-singing — we overcome our particularity and somewhere in the service become something more than our individual selves, as if the very temples of our cranium dissolved within the temple, and a common spirit came to subsume, heal and guide us. In contrast, education is a matter of individual concentration, even if there is but a single teacher, and I think the spaces for study and worship should be accordingly differently shaped and equipped.

Protestantism disavowed marriage as a sacrament. In many indirect ways, Protestants have tried by various means to reassert its sacred character, in this commonly following the Church of England which had largely preserved the medieval Catholic view. It is not generally known that the Puritans, so unjustly maligned in the realm of sex, were the first to conceive of the first purpose of marriage as companionship and mutual spiritual and sensual fortification rather than procreation. However that may be, the institution of lifelong marriage is everywhere in jeopardy. The religious community must draw upon its past and yet must forge ahead, using the new insights regarding changing compatibility with increasing longevity, and at a time when religious thought on sex and marriage is being clarified in new circumstances. I hope that in addition to the marriage ceremony celebrated in home or sanctuary there will be instituted extensive training in marriage and children, marriage and career tensions — especially as married women increasingly enter upon careers — marriage and the changing psychologies and vitalities of men and women in the course of a lifetime. Instead of a room well stocked with sex manuals, I can imagine a special room for priest, rabbi, minister that is decorated with large photographs of the stages of life where counselor could vividly place before those who are entering upon the most intimate and difficult of human relationships the full range of permutations in the life-cycle. These pictures and words of counsel could reach full meaning only when the couple had reached a given life stage. But the same pictures in album form might be given as a supplement to whatever is handed out on sexuality alone. I confess that this is a more psycho-social problem but it might well come to pass that the conference room for those preparing for marriage and for those contemplating divorce could turn out to be an architectural and artistic contribution to relieving a major problem in this time of changing mores, swift transition, in which the religious community has a tremendous stake. I could probably think up half a dozen other appropriate things to...
say about transition as part of religious tradition. However, I wish to close by saying that religion usually insists that while the outside world is in transition, sometimes indeed in upheaval and even revolution and civil war, religion is not essentially innovative because God is, and was and will be for aye the same. Usually reforms in prophetic Hebraism and medieval and sixteenth-century Christendom were made under the heading: return to the covenant; return to the sources; the restoration of the Primitive Church, etc. Yet the Church and all religions change inwardly, especially fast when least noticed. It is a real question whether on close encounter present-day suburbanite-Episcopalian could recognize in Justin Martyr, who died under the Stoic Marcus Aurelius, their kinsman rather than the philosopher emperor or the righteous prefect of the city who actually put Justin and his companions to death in 165 A.D. The prefect and the ruler were so much more like us than that devout teacher Justin, the Church’s first major theologian outside the New Testament, who provocatively answered the questions of the relatively benign magistrate and who was utterly certain that he would live eternally and that the Prefect Rusticus would suffer eternal torment for not accepting Christ.

Yes, all religions change. But I think like individuals, religions retain from the womb of history — not to say from their classical period — not only the same “DNA” code of their Founder but also the same socio-cultural input that shapes us as individuals, institutions and communities until dissolution, whatever psychologists and sociologists try to do about it. In any case, the God they worship in these several religions is surely the same, though perceived from various angles at different times. And he may be best perceived in company with others. Hence neither the people of God nor the edifice of God, in which we may discern or overhear something of the cosmic liturgy, is going to disappear. Yet as we change, and as society changes swiftly and unpredictably, we need different shapes and subdivisions of whatever the edifice of worship, which the earliest of Hindus thought of as at once a replica of the Primordial Man and as the throne room of the Deity. Without a sense of the transcendent — without religion, however swift the transitions in each — we run the risk of becoming instead of a congeries of living communities of faith and of still relatively free societies, a gigantic termite colony, destined to live in cells within a technocratic, ideological global termitarium.

Theologians, divines, architects, city and environmental planners, artists and sociologists must join to make corporate religion ever new, ever renewing, while yet the Church with its allies in other traditions remains the steward of the ideal humanity.

Book Reviews — Cont. from p. 25

to other more native styles of architecture in this country.

Obviously the authors have a warm feeling for the Gothic style and something I appreciated about the book is that they do not assume the role of critics and put down the bad pieces of architecture. In compiling the survey the authors have remembered that they are historians and not judges. Yes, here and there are a few subjective statements with which I might take issue, but that would be nitpicking. I think they have made an excellent attempt to be evenhanded in their judgment and presentation.

One thing any good book of this nature should have is a comprehensive index; and The Only Proper Style has an excellent one. Accompanying it is a first-class bibliography for the reader who wishes further study in any phase of the subject. The style and layout of the book are splendid, with readable typeset and excellent arrangement of photographs. All in all I found it an excellent volume and hope that it becomes required reading for every architectural student. The Only Proper Style is now a new friend in my library with whom I shall confer many times in the years to come. I commend it to all readers of FAITH & FORM not as a source of new ideas but as an excellent survey of a very flexible style on the American landscape.

Temple Beth El, West Palm Beach, Fl. Architect: Alfred Browning Parker, FAIA, GRA, Miami, Fl.

With the intent of bringing the congregation as close as possible to the traditional bema and ark, Mr. Parker designed a circular structure featuring a concept of roof design which he classified as “spiraloid.” He has said that he wished to create an aura of ascension while utilizing the engulfing atmosphere of the circle.

Temple Beth El combines the internal symbolism and aesthetics of the sanctuary with an external compatibility to the surrounding area.

Cont. p. 31
THE IMPOSSIBLE MADE POSSIBLE!

Through space-age technology, the I. T. Verdin Company has done what scientists called impossible... duplicating the sound of bells. Metal rods have long been the source of carillon music. These rods cannot produce a true bell sound... only a facsimile. The remarkable Verdin Century III carillon electronically recreates the actual sound of bells... without metal rods... and without bells. It also gives the carillonneur complete freedom of expression through the touch-sensitive keyboard.

Century III... a revolution in sound.

2021 Everal Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 • Phone (513) 221-8400

Stained Glass
Faceted Glass
"Leptat" Glass
Mosaics
Sculptures
Fitments
Renovations
Decorating
ARE YOU GOING TO BUILD OR REMODEL?

These filmstrip packages can help you:

"Toward Understanding Modern Churches"
filmstrip $15.00/slide version $20.00

"Toward Understanding Flexible Church Space"
filmstrip $21.50/slide version $26.50

Designed for architects and planning committees. Good for adult education
Written and produced by Ruth E. Fryhle, ASCA, AGRA

Order from LFA Media, 360 Park Avenue South, New York, NY 10010

HAVE YOU HEARD? “St. Peter's: People on the Move” has razed their urban church and is starting all over. Write for more information about this 28 minute 16mm film.

Stone carvers at Washington Cathedral are now available to prepare models and execute carving in the United States. Shown here is a bicentennial medallion done for Trinity Church, Portsmouth, Virginia. The full-size model and carving in the marble was done by Cathedral Carvers in their studio from an original design by Jack Witt, sculptor, in association with P. J. C. Hanbury of Williams & Tazewell Associates, Architects.

For further information and prices, please send complete requirements to:
John G. Fanfani
Assistant Clerk of the Works
Washington Cathedral
Mount Saint Alban
Washington, DC 20016
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The difference is the exclusive Century II Mod-Lok design; an interlocking seating system that uses the versatility of individual units and locks them together for continuous seating.

For the name of our nearest representative, call or write today!
Sauder Manufacturing Company
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Archbold, Ohio 43502
419/445-7870
The Unitarian Center: First Unitarian Church of San Francisco
Architects: Callister, Payne & Rosse, San Francisco, Cal.

The First Unitarian Society of San Francisco has occupied the same site for over eighty years. San Francisco's Western Addition Redevelopment Project gave the congregation an opportunity for expansion. The Building Committee's program sought to provide new ancillary meeting spaces, administrative area, new church school, etc. After study, it was decided that the Parish Hall and Church School would be demolished, permitting the Sanctuary to stand almost free. All new construction would be built around an atrium with planting creating an oasis of green as relief from the surrounding high-rise apartment structures. The landscaping plan is deliberately kept open for easy circulation.

Beautiful looking.
Beautiful hearing.
Because the architect and Möller worked hand in glove.

Milton L. Grigg of Charlottesville, Virginia, an architect of unusual musical sensitivity, invited us to spend hours with him—working together from earliest sketches to stunning finish—on Braddock Street United Methodist Church in Winchester.

The new church looks radiant, functions beautifully, and sounds joyful. Thanks to this architect's enthusiastic awareness, the Möller organ has an impressive presence, visually and aurally, in an acoustically alive worship space. Might it ever be thus!
these past years we know more than ever the importance of having a tent where we belong, a place where we can be human among the skyscrapers.

Five: We are committed to a ministry of hospitality. It is important for us to have a room which provides space for others. It is Henri Nouwen who has written beautifully on this theme. Another primary vocation of our congregation is to be a place of hospitality, to enable people to move from loneliness to solitude, from hostility to hospitality, from illusion to spirituality. We have attempted to create a space for visitors — such as a corporation executive, a secretary to spirituality. We have attempted to try of hospitality. It is important for Peterson Christian house, a place where we gather as a community to serve others, where we can serve under the sign of an hospice. We see ourselves called to provide a place of human warmth in a world too cool for comfort.

Six: We are committed to create a place of meaning in the city. The city needs places to discover human meaning. The city needs to have a garden — a place where water flows, where things grow. Recent studies have indicated that New Yorkers need places where they can perch, places where they can "schmooze." Schmooze, by the way, is a Yiddish word which means sit or stand around and gab. It needs a place in which to gather; a place in which to pray. The Chapel of the Good Shepherd, being created now by Louise Nevelson, will be a place of meditation and hope for many. The Ellington Room will be a place where one can experience that music which the late Duke Ellington once defined as being "beyond category." A theatre for avant-garde artists. A place which is in scale with the cityscape of New York which we find so full of life and promise.

Seven: We are committed to share in the development of a market place. The disciples spent a lot of time in the market place. There has recently been announced the formation of what is now called "The Market." Three floors of the low-rise building adjacent to the church, behind as well as beneath the skyscraper will be set aside for a venture which will offer international foods and restaurants. It is hoped that some thirty small shops reflecting the incredible flavor of New York City will be housed here. Food is a universal expression of that which is most real; it is a common thread in the fabric of any city. New York is an international experience for many people — an environment in which to learn by seeing, touching, tasting, hearing, smelling. The developers of the market hope that in this place there will be what they call a perpetual urban event. In a profound way, the creation of the market, a place of this perpetual urban event, is at the heart of our mission.

Eight: We are committed to create an independent and separately incorporated cultural center which will be called The Common. This will be a place supported by the people of New York who share our commitment. This will be an institution committed to the vision of a society that actively pursues what is good and true and beautiful. This will be a center which improves the cultural and spiritual quality of life with programs in the arts, ethics and society. We see this as a special gift to the people of New York. It is a place for those who have a dream — for those who work for the good and simple things of creation and where the purpose given to us by our creator can be experienced and understood.

Finally, we are committed to being a sign of hope in a time when many look at the city as a place of despair. Recently, in a film presentation at a dinner of the Regional Planning Association, there was a projection of the shape of our new church with the comment that this was one of the signs of hope. Today any kind of new building is a sign of hope in our city. There is also the theological dimension. We see promise in the city. The city is a place in which a vision and a life can be shared through a feast. As people of the covenant, a people on a journey, we live in faith and obedience to the Lord who calls. These are not days of great optimism for those of us within the religious community. Recently Martin Marty referred to "religion as a pseudo-event." He says: "Now all there is to theology is learned polemics in theology journals and media-non-events like Hartford and Boston." We are not building in order to create a non-event for the media. We see this time as a moment for faith to people to continue in their life of prayer and celebration. For the congregation of Saint Peter's Church there came a moment — an opportunity in which there was a chance to do something, to do something because we believed. Because we believe and celebrate what we believe, we have built a new home. We have built in order to serve a city that we love and provide a place in which we can gather in the name of Jesus because he loves us through death into life. Living in the heart of our beloved New York City, we celebrate the promise of the new Jerusalem. As we proclaim the coming of the Kingdom, we find our calling a continuing event of celebration and hospitality.

And, as an urban pastor, building on tradition in a time of transition, I would like to close with a quote from a conversation with Louise Nevelson. After working on some designs for our new chapel, she observed, "Ralph, most people walk in order to go from one side of the street to the other; there are a few of us who walk because we are alive." I will always remember those words. Walk because you are alive! We lead a people in worship; we walk not in order to approach the altar or a pulpit — we walk because we are alive. In a very real way, the community of Saint Peter's Church has built a new house because we are alive in the Lord Jesus. We have built because we are committed to the city and the life which is ours in Christ. We have built because we are alive and need a paschal living room in which we celebrate this life and share our life, and continue to live in the praise of His Kingdom.
The author defines the nucleus of the religious experience as: (1) uneasy awareness of the limitations of man’s moral or theoretical powers, especially when reality is restricted to what can be known primarily by means of sensation; (2) awe-ful awareness of a further reality — beyond or behind or within; (3) conviction that participation with this further reality is of supreme importance. He adds that “without the participative experience the religious experience is impossible.” Following Heidegger, he calls sense data and objects “beings” or “things” and the world of beings or things “ontical reality.” This is contrasted with “ontological reality” composed of “Being.” Martin goes beyond Heidegger in explicitly identifying this “Being” with a god of monotheism. For him, “Being” is the source or ground of objects but is not itself an object or sense datum. “Being” reveals itself, if at all, not as a thing but as a “presence” in religious experience.

So far, most believers would agree with him, particularly in the appeal to inner experiences rather than sense data. I have defined religious art as art in which the artists express their sense of the presence of God. However, at this point, Heidegger and Martin dissent from traditional theologies and also from the ideas of Plato. For Martin, “Being” is nothing apart from beings, and so “Being” is not some “thing-in-itself” or some kind of invisible world lurking behind beings. Thus “Being” is always embodied; “Being” is absolute — as “ab-solved” from all beings — is an empty negative concept. He dismisses contemptuously all idea of a spiritual realm or of a god existing apart from the world as “purely illusory, a mist of make-believe, for there are no empirical grounds for this so-called further reality.”

Martin goes on to reject the claims of the mystics to spiritual experience, although his own definition “awe-ful awareness of a further reality — beyond or behind or within” seems to describe them aptly. However, for Martin, any belief in the spiritual as distinct from its embodiment in physical beings is “not religious in either the narrow or the broad sense.” Consequently, art that expresses such ideas is “not religious at all.” Equally he dismisses paintings of a Christ-figure of a type that he finds sentimental as “not art at all.” This is Scylla and Charybdis indeed. His first ban excludes almost the whole of the art of major religions, since a belief in spirits or gods (or at least in a human soul capable of surviving the body as in Buddhist teaching) has been their foundation.

Art expressing a strongly humanistic version of Christianity might escape Martin’s first ban. In fact, he makes no reference to any other form of religious faith. But, in its contemporary expression, much humanistic art would be likely to fall under his second ban as being “not art at all”! It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the very few examples of visual art that he admits as explicitly religious are mainly from the Renaissance. In view of his high claims for the role in modern Western societies of artists using “the language of the sacred,” it is disheartening that he did not recommend the work of a single contemporary religious artist. If he has indeed discovered a language of the sacred, it is evidently a dead language.

---

**Rambusch helps create a flexible environment.**

When client, architect and consultant become aware of the need to have an architectural space serve the worshipping community, flexibility becomes an important consideration. In this way maximum advantage can be taken of the sacrament ritual options as well as adult cultural events. The Dahlgren Chapel is a statement which we feel expresses an environmental arrangement to be worked at, without specifying how this might be accomplished.
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To say I was surprised is putting it mildly when I saw Mr. Sovik's reply in the Spring 1976 FAITH & FORM. My reading of Mr. Sovik's latest book produced a profound respect in me for Mr. Sovik's advocacy to recreate the early Christian society.

It has so happened that since I read Mr. Sovik's book there has been a deluge of quality histories devoted to the first four centuries of the Christian Era. These histories have been written by highly qualified professors in universities both in America and England. Why these histories appeared at this particular time is not clear to me, but why they did appear seems to me quite clear. And that is that up to now we have not been given the complete story about these first four centuries by the people who have been telling us about them.

I doubt very seriously if I would have read these histories if Mr. Sovik had not whetted my appetite. My surprise resulted from reading in Mr. Sovik's article that he agrees a place of Christian worship should have a sense of the sacred, but so should all architecture devoted to worship. He then reminds us that the wilderness where Christ prayed and the restaurant housing the Lord's Supper were made what they were by the people using them the way they did. To make a brief point, the Early Christians were themselves the only sacred thing in the new religious faith. Nothing at all was sacred but they, themselves. The pagans had sacred shrines and sacred temples. Not so the Early Christians. But Constantine helped change all this by appropriating empire tax money to build sacred basilica for the Christians. So a “Church Architecture” was invented and the House of God became sacred for the Christians, who also sacralized religious functions, clergy, etc., just as the pagans did.

This was a precipitous revolution. I see every reason why a precipitous revolution would be in order to restore the sacredness of Christian people themselves and remove sacredness from objects and functions. In fact, I cannot conceive of the revolution occurring any other way. Any change of any importance among Christian people has always been precipitous, namely: Constantine's tragic moves, the Reformation, Vatican II, the departure of Christians from China, Cuba, Vietnam. Even the Second Coming of Christ, the Resurrection from the Dead, and the Great Day of Judgment will be precipitous.

Homer W. Smith, AIA
Louisville, Ky.
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