

The Religious Architecture of Paul Rudolph

Daniel L. Ledford

Yale Divinity School
Reading Course, Fall 2014
Karla Britton
December 16, 2014

Introduction

Paul Marvin Rudolph (1918-1997), one of the most influential and controversial late Modern American architects,¹ is known for his public building commissions (Temple Street Parking Garage and Yale Art and Architecture Building in New Haven, CT; Orange County Government Building in Goshen, NY; Boston Government Services Center, Blue Cross-Blue Shield Building, Jewett Arts Center at Wellesley College, and UMass-Dartmouth Campus in/near Boston, MA; Riverview High School in Sarasota, FL; and his later work in Southeast Asia, including The Concourse and The Colonnade in Singapore and the Lippo (Bond) Centre in Hong Kong) and private residences inside and outside of Florida (Milam Residence in Jacksonville, FL; Walker Guest House on Sanibel Island, FL; Healy Guest House and Hook Guest House in Sarasota, FL; Wallace House in Athens, AL; Sid Bass Residence in Fort Worth, TX; Micheels Residence in Westport, CT; and Rudolph's own residence at 23 Beekman Place in New York City).² Rudolph's architecture was always in conversation with, what he believed to be, the shortcomings of Modernism and his view of urbanism.³

What is missing from the above list of notable works by Rudolph are his religious buildings. Although not prolific in building religious structures, when compared to Pietro Belluschi who completed almost fifty ecclesiastical structures,⁴ Rudolph completed six

¹ <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/08/09/arts/paul-rudolph-is-dead-at-78-modernist-architect-of-the-60-s.html>

² For an exhaustive chronology of Rudolph's built work and projects, see the site, *Paul Rudolph and His Architecture*, curated by Bruce Barnes, Claire T. Carney Library, UMass Dartmouth, <http://prudolph.lib.umassd.edu/> and Timothy M. Rohan's recent monograph, *The Architecture of Paul Rudolph* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014).

³ See Paul Rudolph, "Six Determinants of Architectural Form," *Architectural Record* 120 (October 1956): 183-190*, for what can be called Rudolph's manifesto for late Modernist architecture. He would uphold much of these opinions and beliefs throughout the remainder of his career, both in writing and built form. *Asterisk designates articles, essays, and interviews of Paul Rudolph that have been republished in Paul Rudolph, *Writings on Architecture* (New Haven: Yale School of Architecture/Yale University Press, 2008).

⁴ See Meredith L. Clausen, *Spiritual Space: The Religious Architecture of Pietro Belluschi* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992).

religious structures and designs for another four.⁵ Furthermore, of these six built structures, three of them (Tuskegee Chapel, First Church Boston, and Cannon Chapel) are spectacular examples of late Modernist architecture and are anomalies in Rudolph's oeuvre. Among these three built works, the Cannon Chapel is the most anomalous of Rudolph's oeuvre for various reasons that will be explored below. One of the reasons why these religious structures are anomalies of Rudolph's architecture is because of their positive success. These buildings continue to be used, adored, preserved, and advertised by their respective institutions. So why haven't Rudolph's religious buildings, especially the Cannon Chapel, received similar critical analysis as his other major works, like the Yale Art and Architecture Building?

For one reason, the Cannon Chapel has been in continuous use with only non-structural renovations since its completion in 1981. It did not undergo a large renovation of its form, nor was its place on Emory's campus ever hidden by other buildings. The only controversy over the building was the minor critiques of modern architectural forms as a whole from some members of the Emory community when the building was constructed. Since 1981, the Cannon Chapel has lived positively, and it seems very likely that this will continue well into the future. The Cannon Chapel has become a symbol both for Candler and for Emory. On the back of the most recent *Emory Magazine* (Fall 2014) an advertisement for the centennial celebration of the Candler School of Theology featured a picture of the curvilinear cross-banner of the Cannon Chapel. This is almost ironically

⁵ I cannot say that these ten projects are the *only* religious structures designed by Paul Rudolph, although it is very unlikely that other designs for religious structures exist. The ten religious structures presented here, both built and design projects, have documented plans either published or in institutional archives.

symbolic since Rudolph designed the chapel and his father was in the first graduating class from Candler in 1915 (the reason for the centennial celebration!).

All of this is to say that perhaps in architecture, especially Rudolphian buildings, critical analysis rests on critique. If there is nothing overly critical, negative, or controversial, the building can be hidden behind more controversial or problematic works, especially when renovation/preservation is an issue. The history of the Yale Art and Architecture Building from its opening in 1963 (critically acclaimed then taking a downward spiral into critically attacked), the mysterious (student-ignited?) fire in 1969, years of irregular renovation, until its preservation in 2008 and awarding of The Landmark Plaque by the New Haven Preservation Trust in 2014⁶, conveys this controversy. Yet, perhaps this is an issue of architectural history. It was not until the summer of 2014 that a complete monograph of Rudolph's work was published, and still, the author deliberately left out Rudolph's religious buildings, specifically the Tuskegee Chapel and Cannon Chapel, stating that these two important works by Rudolph needed their own analysis as works of religious architecture.⁷ Maybe it is a combination of these and other issues, but what holds true, as Tim Rohan rightly suggested, is that Rudolph's religious buildings deserve their own analysis.

These buildings require a unique application of Rudolph's ideology and possibly his family and childhood history, his father being a Methodist minister.⁸ These religious

⁶ <http://news.yale.edu/2014/05/06/yale-s-rudolph-hall-receives-preservation-trust-s-highest-honor>. As a part of this honor, the New Haven Preservation Trust held their 2014 Annual Meeting in Rudolph Hall on Wednesday, October 1, 2014, at which this author was present for Robert A. M. Stern's lecture on the history of Rudolph Hall and art and architecture at Yale, "The Life and Death and Life of a Great American Building."

⁷ Rohan, *The Architecture of Paul Rudolph*, 7.

⁸ Rudolph first learned that he wanted to be an architect, at the age of six, after watching his father discuss plans for a new church building with an architect.

buildings are all unique and are built for unique clientele. The First Church in Boston was designed for one of the oldest Unitarian congregations in the United States, while also preserving the neo-Gothic steeple from their previous sanctuary. The Tuskegee Chapel was designed, along with a greater campus plan, for a Historically Black College during the 1960s in rural Alabama. The Cannon Chapel was designed for a historically Methodist institution, one that Rudolph's own father graduated from and worked for post-graduation. Other minor religious buildings of Rudolph are fundamental as well. The small chapel inside the Boston Government Services Center is hidden in the turret of an upper floor of this nebulous building. The Christian Science Center at the University of Illinois featured similar elements as the A&A Building, but was a reinterpretation of scale, and then demolished in 1987. The little known, and sometimes misinterpreted as built or unbuilt, Addition to Beth-El Synagogue in New London, CT displays Rudolph's attention to sightlines and the manipulation of light and geometry.

As bookends to Rudolph's religious buildings are two project designs. The design for the St. Boniface Episcopal Church of Siesta Key, Florida in 1956 reflects Rudolph's first attempt at designing a religious space, and its simplicity could relate to his mental images of Methodist sanctuaries from his childhood and the influence of Frank Lloyd Wright's Pfeiffer Chapel at Florida Southern College. The design for the Maris Stella Chapel in Singapore in 1993 combines Rudolph's contemporary designs for Asia and some of his earlier perspective views for institutional and government buildings. Finally, one published and one unpublished project by Rudolph are at the middle of his oeuvre. The unpublished plan for the May Memorial Unitarian Church in Syracuse, NY, of which Rudolph was the initial architect but later designed by Pietro Belluschi, is housed in the Bird Library at

Syracuse University. The published project of the Addition to the Jewish Center Synagogue in East Northport, Long Island, New York features the layered roof lines and clerestories of several Rudolph designs, including the Addition to Beth-El Synagogue in New London, CT and the John W. Chorley Elementary School in Middletown, NY.

While Rudolph's repertoire of religious building designs is not prolific, the religious buildings designed by Paul Rudolph create a detailed, oriented time-lapse of Rudolph's entire oeuvre: 1) beginnings [St. Boniface, 1956; May Memorial Unitarian Church, 1959] 2) apogee [Tuskegee Chapel, 1960-1969; First Church, 1968-1972; BGSC Chapel, 1962-1971; Addition to Beth-El Synagogue, 1966-1971] 3) revival [Addition to Jewish Center Synagogue, 1973; Cannon Chapel, 1975-1981] 4) endings [Maris Stella Chapel, 1993].

Rudolph and Religion

We have the buildings and the plans. We can analyze the fervency of spirituality in the religious architecture of Rudolph, or argue for a more secular spirituality that focuses on the communal or theatrical – but how does Rudolph describe religion and spirituality? Rudolph was not a gifted writer. Although he did publish articles, essays, and interviews over his career, his theories and opinions are repetitive, vague, and sometimes banal. However, the repetition with which Rudolph wrote can help locate the crucial ideas of Rudolph and his architectural theory within these texts.

Rudolph was explicit about many things in his life, including his lament of the failures of Modernism and his critique of others' work, yet he was not explicit about two very specific and biographically-tinted subjects: religion and homosexuality.⁹ For Rudolph,

⁹ I am indebted to Timothy Rohan for insightful information and theories into Rudolph's biography both in his monograph, *The Architecture of Paul Rudolph*, and through his conversation with Karla Britton and myself in New Haven on October 13, 2014.

his homosexuality was a personal matter than never entered the forefront of his biographical image, as it did for other architects, such as his colleague Philip Johnson. Possibly a product of growing up in the South and spending several years in a military career, Rudolph's personal life is sometimes as clouded as his expressions about architecture. Another reason for this privacy was his relationship to his parents, which is also the most likely reason for his inexpressive, non-explicit views on religion or spirituality. Rudolph's father, Keener, was a Methodist minister, traveling around the southern United States during Rudolph's childhood until they settled in Athens, Alabama, where Rudolph attended high school and took piano and art classes.

As a preacher's son in the post-war South, Rudolph undoubtedly attended every Sunday service at his father's church and was subject to the strict moral system of a southern Methodist, only to continue, of sorts, when he worked in the navy yard in Brooklyn in the 1940s. Perhaps Rudolph's eventual departure from a religious household and religion itself, along with his homosexuality, is the basis for his silence on religion and spirituality in his writing. If Rudolph did discuss religion, it was on an architectural basis. In his discussion with Rudolph as a member of the building committee for the Cannon Chapel at Emory University, Professor Don Saliers claims that Rudolph mentioned his father's church in their discussions, leading Prof. Saliers to think that he had "some visual images left over from the church that was earlier in the 20th century."¹⁰

Rudolph clearly understood the basic liturgical uses of a church, at least from a historically Methodist point of view, and it is possible likely that his idea of a sanctuary was

¹⁰ Phone Interview with Don Saliers, Professor at Candler School of Theology, Emory University. October 3, 2014. Audio and transcribed text.

based on the single room, linear pews, pulpit-facing congregation of Methodist churches of the southern United States; yet, Rudolph's great love of the cinema is another possible origin. Attending the cinema many times as a young man, Rudolph's staged spaces, theatrical spaces, or any space of performance can be likened to a theatrical-cinematic space.¹¹ For Rudolph, these spaces were for people to see and be seen. Rudolph claims:

All architecture is, for me, a matter of participation of the human being – contrary to what a lot of people have had to say. I regard it as memorable space. It must be acoustically and visually rewarding. You should be aware that you have arrived at a room where theater is going to take place. You ought to feel you're absolutely at the same level as the performance. I don't think it can be just any old room; it needs to be a breathing, dynamic thing.¹²

For a religious space of performance, the liturgy (sermon, sacraments, choir, etc.) was the silver screen and the congregation was the audience. Even more interesting are the layered sections of views and viewers in Rudolph's religious spaces. Not only did he want the congregation to view the liturgy, but he wanted specific congregants, depending on their seating, to view other congregants viewing the liturgy. This can be likened to Rudolphian space in general. For example, the framed views, catwalks, sightlines, and purposeful openness of the Yale Art and Architecture Building detail Rudolph's idea that people have framed views of others within and without the architectural space.

Furthermore, Rudolph's design was influenced by his love of classical music and piano. Rudolph claimed:

People, if they think about architecture at all, usually think in terms of the materials. While that's important, it's not the thing that determines the psychology of the building. It's really the compression and release of space, the lighting of that space—dark to light—and the progression of one space to another. Because one remembers in that sense. Architecture is very much like music—just as you remember the introductory themes of any great

¹¹ See discussion of *Phedre* at the First Church Boston below.

¹² "The Changing Practice: Theaters," *Progressive Architecture* 46 (October 1965): 160-220.

symphony; architectural themes are experienced throughout the space from within. And that's what unifies it.¹³

Rudolph's view of architecture is thus made complicated. Rudolph claims that materials are important for interpreting a space, but that it is the architectural space of the structure that evokes the function and meaning of the building. And, as the architect, Rudolph had the responsibility of producing architectural space that would act as caretaker to the religious or spiritual performer/viewer. Rudolph believed that he could accomplish these elements of space in design, and that these would lead to a positive psychology of that space.

Rudolph was always perplexed by architects and critics who cared only about a single space within and without the building. He claimed that it is not just about the 'here' but about 'how' the user gets 'there.'¹⁴ Especially for a religious building, where the user is directed in space to a possible altered state of mind and/or body, the psychology of the space has to be nurturing and positive.

Rudolph, too, believed that religious structures were to be primary within the urban fabric, along with government centers, gateways, and entertainment complexes. He thought that they should be 'dominant' and 'focal points' in a city until they could become 'true monuments.'¹⁵ In this way, religious buildings can be monumental in some settings, and have the responsibility to be monumental in that they should invite the user and direct the

¹³ John Zinsser, "Staying Creative: Artistic Passion Is A Lifelong Pursuit – And These Mature Masters Prove The Point (Otto Luening, Elizabeth Catlett, Paul Rudolph)," *50 Plus 25* (December 1985): 49-55. See description of the Cannon Chapel as "frozen music" by King and Domin below.

¹⁴ Paul Rudolph, "Changing Philosophy of Architecture," *Architectural Forum* 101 (July 1954): 120-123, republished in *Writings on Architecture* (New Haven: Yale School of Architecture/Yale University Press, 2008), 15.

¹⁵ Paul Rudolph, "Six Determinants of Architectural Form," *Architectural Record* 120 (October 1956): 183-190, and Paul Rudolph, "Modern Architecture and the Rebuilding of Cities," Speech given at the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, November 13, 1961, republished in *Writings on Architecture*, 22-23, 81.

viewer. The forms of the structure should not be banal, or misinterpreted for secondary structures. Rudolph describes the humanizing space of a religious structure in Le Corbusier's Notre-Dame-du-Haut at Ronchamp (1954):

One becomes conscious that there are many ways to organize a building; that structure is not an end, nor a beginning, but a means to an end-and that end is to create space that is an appropriate psychological environment. Perhaps the greatest chapel of this century, Ronchamp, has a most impure structure-sprayed concrete covers everything. It does not resort to the crutches of geometry and pattern-making, but creates breathing, dynamic spaces appropriate to human use.¹⁶

Religious structures as dynamic spaces is what Rudolph set out to design and create in architectural space. The Tuskegee Chapel happens to be Rudolph's interpretation of Le Corbusier's chapel at Ronchamp, complete without right angles, and including the colored light openings from light cannons, the mysterious structural clerestory of natural light, undulating walls, and a monumental entrance from the exterior space.

Yale Art and Architecture Building (Paul Rudolph Hall)

Before surveying Rudolph's religious buildings, the Yale Art and Architecture Building (Rudolph Hall) can act as a Rudolphian structure *par excellence*. Through a brief analysis of the spatial dynamics and formal qualities of the building, Rudolph's religious buildings can be placed in the context of Rudolph's personal architectural practice and ideology.¹⁷ A building of nine floors with thirty-seven levels creates many architectural spaces, yet these spaces are fluidly attached to each other. Furthermore, the movement of

¹⁶ Paul Heyer, *Architects on Architecture: New Directions in America* (New York: Walker, 1966), 295-296.

¹⁷ The Yale Art and Architecture Building is Rudolph's most egotistical work, because he was the client and architect. He designed the space for himself...and for the students of art and architecture that were under his tutelage. Rudolph struggled with the criticism that the building received after its completion and troubled history, declining to talk about the building in length until plans for the renovation of the building were being discussed and the architecture students were rediscovering Rudolph's architectural genius in the building's form. See Michael J. Crosbie, "Interview with Paul Rudolph," *Architecture* (1988): 102-107*.

physical bodies through the A&A Building yields an experience of architecture, of the deliberate art of architecture. Rudolph was not just an architect, but also an artist. He took the details and decoration of his buildings as seriously as the design of the structure. The details lead the body (and the spirit) through the space; they allow the body to react to the architecture. Rudolph's influences from humanism and the architecture of Italy are found in these ways. For Renaissance and Baroque architecture, movement within the space was key in determining the essence of the structure. This essence (religious, communal, spiritual, authoritarian, public, private, industrial, theatrical) was key in the sense that the experience of the space by the user developed the building and the building, in turn, developed the user. The reciprocity of building (architecture) and users impacts the legacy of the structure both in form (design) and function (reception).

The recently renovated and expanded A&A Building preserves the idea of Rudolphian space. Rudolph wanted people to see each other, to share in whatever they were doing, to hear each other, to experience space together. For the A&A Building, aspiring architects and successful architects, critics, guests are the actors for Rudolph's theater. This varying-leveled form by develops a communal experience. Not so much a support system, as it were, but a shared communal aesthetic, with aesthetic referring to the experience of the space through the cognitive senses. The A&A Building is Rudolph's version of the industrial-communal space of Frank Lloyd Wright's Larkin Building. Described as an inward-facing building, the Larkin building upheld the values of a work community, of a family owned industry.¹⁸ The A&A Building upholds the values of an

¹⁸ "Society even needs an amphitheatre shape: it creates an image of being together. Even when it's empty it creates an image of (the possibility of) an event and of being together." Klaske Havik, Gus Tielens,

academic community, one that Rudolph shaped both as the Chair of the Architecture Department from 1958-1965 and continued today through the architectural space he designed and through one of his students, current dean, Robert A. M. Stern.

Perhaps Rudolph put too much of himself in the design, which is a common critique of the A&A building. Perhaps the subjectivity in experience was his own experience. Perhaps we should not only think about the A&A Building as shaping its users, but also how it shaped its designer. Rudolph put himself into the design, his experience as an educator shaped the product of the building itself. The corduroy, bush-hammered concrete walls and the encased nautilus shell of the A&A Building are Rudolph's lasting reminders to sense the building, to move in it, to create things, to build, to discuss, to see, to critique, to hear as an academic community. From the design to the execution to the function of the building, Rudolph's ego was in the corduroy concrete walls, the orange carpets, and the framing views of New Haven. In this sense, Rudolph Hall is a self-reflection of Rudolph's psychology in built architectural space. And, Rudolph would be burdened by this for the rest of his life, his psychological-self wrapped up in one single work: "I've never worked on a building that affected me as much as that one does. I'd like to think that, in spite of everything, it says something about the nature of architecture."¹⁹ And while no other work of Rudolph is as egotistical, it is interesting to think about his biography when studying the Cannon Chapel (for Candler School of Theology at Emory, where Rudolph's father graduated).

"Atmosphere, Compassion and Embodied Experience. A Conversation about Atmosphere with Juhani Pallasmaa," *Building Atmosphere*, OASE 91 (December 2013): 43.

¹⁹ Crosbie, "Interview with Paul Rudolph," 148.

Cannon Chapel at Emory University

The story of Paul Rudolph and Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia begins in 1975 when the Dean of Candler School of Theology and eventual University President and United States Ambassador to South Korea, James T. Laney, suggested that the old campus chapel, Durham Chapel, be turned into the Pitts Theology Library to house the 220,000 books purchased by Emory from Hartford Seminary in Hartford, Connecticut.²⁰ Laney's suggestion also included an architect for the job, Paul M. Rudolph. Laney chose Rudolph both because of his prominence as an architect and because Rudolph's father, Keener L. Rudolph was in the first graduating class at Candler in 1915, about the same time as the Henry Hornbostel designed quad was under construction. No doubt Laney's familiarity with Rudolph and his Art and Architecture building at Yale was a significant reason why Rudolph came to Laney's mind, having completed a Bachelor of Divinity at Yale Divinity School in 1954 and beginning his Ph.D. at Yale in 1964, just a year before Rudolph left his tenure as chair of the architecture department at Yale. Rudolph completed the renovation of Durham Chapel into the Pitts Theological Library to the acclaim of the building committee, afterwards deciding to commission Rudolph for the building of the new chapel as well.

²⁰ The following description, formal analysis, and anecdotal information of the Cannon Chapel is a compilation of research conducted by this author, including the following sources: *Emory Magazine* articles: October 1981, Autumn 2001, Winter 2005; Grace Anderson, "Rudolph's Chapel forms a quiet quadrangle," *Architectural Record* 170 (July 1982): 94-101; "William R. Cannon Chapel, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, 1975." *A + U* 152 (May 1983): 40-49; "Manierismo Rudolphiano," *Architettura* 28 (December 1982): 852-853; *AIA Guide to the Architecture of Atlanta*, Isabelle Gournay, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993; Text from *Paul Rudolph: Cannon Chapel*, a unique part of the larger traveling exhibition, *Paul Rudolph: The Florida Houses*, that was on exhibit only at the Museum of Design, Atlanta (2004) and Emory University, Atlanta (2005). Curated by Christopher Domin and Joseph King; "Southern Accents: An Exhibition Explores the Unique Flavor of Paul Rudolph's Site-Friendly Projects in Florida and Atlanta," Mireille Hyde, *Metropolis* 24 (November 2004): 46; Personal correspondence with James T. Laney, Don Saliers, Christopher Domin and Joseph King; and a phone interview with Don Saliers, October 3, 2014.

Rudolph completed several designs before a final version was decided upon by the building committee, of which Don Saliers, professor at Candler, played a prominent role. Saliers claims that Rudolph went through at least three initial designs with the building committee before a finalized version emerged after numerous revisions were made. After the second initial design was submitted, the building committee had Frank Kacmarcik, an important architectural and liturgical consultant who worked with Marcel Breuer at St. John's Abbey, to assess the liturgical and aesthetic functions of the space.²¹

A major problem for the design in the early stages was the site of the building. Located adjoined to the Pitts Theology Library yet just off the main sidewalk of the quadrangle, the Cannon Chapel would be placed over a major fire lane on Emory's campus. This resulted in the main chapel having to be placed on the upper floor because of the 40,000 brick courtyard and fire lane beneath the north section of the chapel. The chapel was also to be placed in connection with a prominent theology building, Bishops Hall, and at the top of a ledge on the campus which led down to a road below. With this in mind, the resulting Cannon Chapel is connected to the Pitts Theology library on its west side, to the quadrangle on its south side, to Bishops Hall and the ledge on the north side, and open to the fire lane thoroughfare on the east side. In 2013 the chapel was renovated and the demolition of Bishops Hall and eventual construction of the new Pitts Theology Library on the Bishops Hall site began. The result is a fully integrated movement from Candler School of Theology to the new Pitts Theology Library to the Cannon Chapel. The original courtyard

²¹ See Jay M. Price, *Temples for a Modern God: Religious Architecture in Postwar America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 153, 171, for the role of Frank Kacmarcik as one of the premier architectural/liturgical consultants of American postwar religious architecture.

is still intact and has an even greater function now because it forms the ground level entrance for Pitts Theology Library, across the same courtyard from the Cannon Chapel.

The ground was broken for the chapel on August 30, 1979 with President Jimmy Carter and First Lady Rosalynn Carter in attendance. President Carter gave the address in honor of his friend and Cannon Chapel's namesake, William Ragsdale Cannon, a bishop in the United Methodist Church. The \$4.8 million dollar chapel is an honest campus space. Not only does it contain a main chapel and smaller teaching chapel but it also houses religious life offices, seminar rooms, a cafe and student lounge, and a bookstore in the original configuration of the plan.

Of course, the highlight of the design and main tension between Rudolph and the building committee was the main chapel. A space both plentiful in floor and ceiling space, the chapel does not have a singular directional configuration. The original desire in commissioning a new chapel was to have a more intimate space than the current religious gathering space at Emory, the 1,000 seat Glenn Memorial Church at the edge of campus which also acted as an auditorium for university events. Therefore, the design of the chapel allowed for the altar and podium to be placed on the short eastern wall, with a more nave-like, longitudinal feel to the space, or on the long northern wall, with a more horizontal arrangement of the chapel. In these arrangements the chapel can seat 430 or 150 people. One feature of the Rudolph design was that all of the components of the main floor of the chapel be movable. The chairs, podium, altar, and any religious symbols were designed to be movable within the space or outside of the chapel into storage.

The movable podium and altar were probably one of the biggest points of dispute between Rudolph and the building committee, highlighted in the 1984 short film, *Spaces:*

The Architecture of Paul Rudolph. Rudolph had designed a movable oval podium and altar table to go on the main chapel floor to complement the oval columns and vaults of the chapel space. The building committee argued for a rectilinear podium and altar table based on liturgical reasons. While the oval podium and altar table worked for the eastern wall orientation of the space, the building committee did not like how it functioned in the northern wall configuration, noting its inability to provide a fluid liturgical function. Rudolph becomes visibly and audibly furious in the short film and says that the building committee should finish the building, that they should be the architect. The final result was in fact a rectilinear podium and altar table: the building committee won that argument.

The second disagreement for the main chapel space between Rudolph and the building committee was regarding the \$155,000 organ designed by Holtkamp Organ Company of Cleveland, Ohio. The organ was to be twenty-five high and the case made of red oak. Previously, Rudolph had argued that the red oak pews in the chapel lofts be painted grey to match the concrete space. Rudolph was successful in this argument, but when he also argued that the red oak case of the organ also be painted gray, he lost to Walter Holtkamp, the builder of the organ and its case. There was a compromise that the case be stained to match a darker tone of wood in the chapel's parquet floors.

While Rudolph designed the main floor of the chapel to be of a movable configuration, the various upper levels of the chapel were stationary. In the upper levels of the chapel he placed pew seating on all sides of the chapel except the east. The varying galleries and upper seating levels of the chapel created the Rudolphian pinwheel form, a main component of Rudolph's designs since his earliest commissions. In the Cannon

Chapel, this pinwheel form has been described as allowing a transcendence of the space and a lifting up of the eyes to the penetrating light of the highest vault.

The vaults of the main chapel and the building as a whole are probably the most spectacular elements of the space. These vaults, the exterior clad in red roof tiles to match the other Emory buildings, are visible from all directions outside of the building. The vaults connect the building with the campus from every approach. The long ramp leads visitors in from the quadrangle. The cat walk led visitors from Bishops Hall. Now the new Pitts Theology Library, on the site of old Bishops Hall, is connected with the chapel by the catwalk. The main vaults of the chapel run parallel to the fire lane and sidewalks running east to west on Emory's campus. On the western side a long vault covers a passageway leading to the old Pitts Theology Library. The varying levels of vaults for the chapel which run east to west mirror the flow of traffic on campus yet they still allow for movable configuration on the interior. The vaults of the interior were described by Architectural Record as overlapping vaults which cover the spiral of balconies and represent the ascent of the spirit to God.

Rudolph's inspiration for the vaults is, perhaps, twofold. While James T. Laney claims that he mentioned the vaults of the Norman/Romanesque chapel of St. John in the Tower of London to Rudolph, *Emory Magazine's* 1981 article after the consecration of the chapel claims that Rudolph found inspiration in the round arches of the Henry Hornbostel buildings on campus, which Rudolph had been very familiar with in his renovation of Durham Chapel into the Pitts Theology Library. Christopher Domin and Joseph King describe the arches as, "Rudolph's chapel responds, adapts and carries forward ideas underlying Hornbostel's design without imitating the earlier surface appearance. In this

way, the chapel may be understood as a fugue on the earlier theme.”²² It is very likely that Rudolph had several architectural forms in mind. The acoustics of the chapel’s interior and the “meeting” of vaults are reminiscent of medieval cathedrals. The arch of the cross banner-tower at the western end of the chapel was influenced by the Hornbostel arches in the old Pitts Theology Library/Durham Chapel.

Rudolph was very interested in the lighting of the space, especially as it related to the time of day and the seasons. The manipulation of light in the space corresponded to the vaulting and concrete material of the space as well. Rudolph himself describes the lighting and exposed mechanical systems of the chapel in a 1982 interview:

At the chapel for Emory University there are four identical columns which support the centralized space. The demands of the exposed mechanical system at each of these columns is very different because of the sun's orientation. The regular structure juxtaposed to the irregular mechanical system and the resulting clusters are consequently much more dynamic, lively, humane. You sense that the sun is here, and that the return is there; you need more cooling here, because that's where the sun is, and less there, which, in turn, helps to put you in touch with the universe. We should have buildings which adapt to the changing seasons.²³

The use of concrete on the exterior and interior was very important for Rudolph in designing the chapel. Don Saliers, Candler School of Theology professor and a member of the building committee, claims that he was very moved by Marcel Breuer’s work at St. John’s Abbey in Collegeville, Minnesota and relayed this to Rudolph. However, Saliers claims that Rudolph was interested in going beyond what Breuer had done in Collegeville:

So he was aware of our awareness of the Breuer building, and especially the textured concrete notions, but beyond that he was also interested in going beyond Breuer and he did speak at one point about the way in which the

²² Text from *Paul Rudolph: Cannon Chapel*, a unique part of the larger traveling exhibition, *Paul Rudolph: The Florida Houses*, that was on exhibit only at the Museum of Design, Atlanta (2004) and Emory University, Atlanta (2005). Curated by Christopher Domin and Joseph King.

²³ Jeanne M. Davern, “A Conversation with Paul Rudolph,” *Architectural Record* 170 (March 1982): 90-97.*

barrel vaults and the housing over the barrel vaults really led, reinterpreted the external form, so they were drawn together in a very strong way, and that he wanted that to be outside and inside, in the perception of the building...He knew that and we did talk about textured concrete, we did talk about the building would have to in some sense have an exterior and interior that were congruent and what I liked so much was then his design with those columns that articulate the interior spaces, especially the hallways.²⁴

What Rudolph has achieved in the Cannon Chapel is a lasting space that has allowed for an interfaith community to thrive at Emory. For many of Rudolph's designed spaces, that is, architectural space, a humanizing function is mentioned. Taking influence from Geoffrey Scott's *The Architecture of Humanism*, Rudolph was seriously devoted to how architectural space shaped the psychology of participants in the space. This is what Rudolph has created in the space of the Cannon Chapel. Don Saliers, a resident professor in the chapel for 33 years praised the chapel as a humanizing space which develops movement of both physical bodies, light, and sound. Regarding Rudolph's sense of spirituality and the pinwheel/spiral form of the space, Saliers sees the space as:

...definitely communal, I mean definitely he wanted to build a communitarian, as it were, building where people would see each other and of course one of the delights of that chapel is if you get children in there, they know what to do, they run up spirally, they peek above the high backs, they simply rejoice in this movement that the room has, the natural movement in it, so he may, I think, I don't know whether he would have used the word spiritual, but he certainly was influenced as I said earlier, by the fact that he grew up in a church context, but I think basically what he liked to do is create spaces where people would see each other and are drawn together around something, that also has to do with the circle, doesn't it, the spiral, yeah. So I'm not sure he ever would have said, well you know I was in my father's church and so on, because I suspect that that church may have had high back pews but it certainly wasn't circular or, so I think just some archetypal notion of the circle or the spiral, the seeing one another in a public space is part of what he wanted.²⁵

²⁴ Interview with Don Saliers, October 3, 2014.

²⁵ Ibid.

A final point of Saliers is a summation of the Cannon Chapel's effect on Emory, post-war religious architecture, campus chapels, and for Rudolph's legacy as well:

All I can say is that the building really is a humanizing and deeply shaping space. People go away from there, although it's one of a kind in one sense, you won't find many churches like it, people go away having remarked on how they've experienced light and textures and one another, and that is finally, I think, an architect's greatest compliment.²⁶

Through the formal qualities of the space, Rudolph was successful in creating a positive, nurturing space – a successful religious space. Referring again to Rudolph's biographical information as a musician and son of a minister, Domin and King describes the Cannon Chapel almost as an autobiography of Rudolph:

Cannon Chapel also represents a continuum of expression back to Rudolph's childhood. One might imagine a minister's child, relegated to the balcony, daydreaming through many Sunday services. Might not the balconies in Cannon Chapel be a gift to students as a place of quiet reflection? Rudolph learned to play the piano and organ as a child, and was an organist in the Methodist church he attended during college. This understanding of acoustics as related to churches and music was an important component of his design. The description of architecture as frozen music is especially applicable to Cannon Chapel with its clear, though complex organization, utilizing a series of themes and variations.²⁷

If the Yale Art and Architecture is the embodiment of Rudolph's architectural theory *par excellence*, then the Cannon Chapel is the archetype for what a religious space should be. In this way, the Cannon Chapel is an anomaly in Rudolph's oeuvre, for all of his religious commissions came before the Cannon Chapel (only the Maris Stella Chapel was after the Cannon Chapel, and it was an unbuilt project). It is an anomaly because it was designed by Rudolph, but with the concerns of the building committee in mind. It has functioned in its proposed capacity since it opened in 1981. Even with the renovation in 2013, the Cannon

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Text from *Paul Rudolph: Cannon Chapel*, Christopher Domin and Joseph King.

Chapel still holds its original Rudolphian form. It is the most visited building on Emory's Campus, and one of the most visited Modern buildings in Atlanta.²⁸ It is a beacon on Emory's campus and every students interacts with the chapel consciously or subconsciously. It is Rudolph's perfect installation within an urban fabric – the college campus. Finally, its function as a true interfaith space in 2014 and beyond means that the Cannon Chapel is “here to stay.”²⁹

Tuskegee Chapel

For the remainder of Rudolph's religious buildings, each structure brings its own energy to a discussion of the religious architecture of Paul Rudolph. The Tuskegee Chapel (1960-1969)³⁰ is Rudolph's interpretation of Le Corbusier's chapel at Ronchamp. The chapel has no right angles and features the original stained glass “singing windows” from the previous chapel at Tuskegee that burned down in 1957. Constructed between 1967-1969, the chapel was designed in conjunction with two former faculty members of the Tuskegee Institute, architects John A. Welch and Louis Fry. The only difference in focalization from Ronchamp to the Tuskegee Chapel was that it needed to seat a greater number of people, including balconies, and it needed to feature a large choir space on the

²⁸ <http://www.archdaily.com/101257/architecture-city-guide-atlanta/>

²⁹ Interview with Don Saliers, October 3, 2014. This is perhaps one of the most important reasons why the Cannon Chapel is an anomaly of Rudolph's Architecture, because it is not in danger of being demolished as has been, and will be, the fate of many of Rudolph's buildings (Christian Science Center, Chorley Elementary School, and several houses, with the Orange County Government Center and BCBS Building in Boston threatened by demolition.

³⁰ Published in *100 by Paul Rudolph/1946-1974*, *A+U* no. 80 (July 1977): 148-151; Carl Black and Yukio Futagawa, *Paul Rudolph: Interdenominational Chapel, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama, 1960-1969; Boston Government Service Center, Boston, Massachusetts, 1962-1971. Global Architecture*, no. 20 (Tokyo: A. D. A. Edita Tokyo, 1981); and on the cover and in Mildred F. Schmertz, “A Chapel for Tuskegee by Rudolph,” *Architectural Record* 146, no. 11 (November 1969): 117-126.

stage for the famous Tuskegee University Golden Voices Concert Choir. Rudolph describes the space eloquently:

When working on the Tuskegee Chapel, I suggested a continuous slot of glass around the perimeter just below the roof, so the natural light enters the sanctuary diagonally. The roof is hyperbolic paraboloid in form for acoustic reasons, and the space rises diagonally and escapes through glass. The directions of the movement of space are in opposite but balanced directions, which is largely responsible for the dynamic quality of the space. In addition, there is a varying velocity of the movement of space. The floor is almost level, but the ceiling height above the floor constantly changes, so that the space moves rapidly where the ceiling is high but more slowly where the ceiling is low. All of this must be imagined, so that there is a balance between opposite movements of space and light.³¹

Described in *Architectural Record* as, “...one of the most dramatic and powerful religious spaces to be built in this century,” the Tuskegee Chapel is another successful work of religious architecture by Rudolph, and one that deserves an in depth analysis in conversation with the social-milieu of rural Alabama in the 1960s, pre- and post-civil rights movement.

Chapel, Boston Government Services Center

The chapel in the Boston Government Services Center is perhaps one of Rudolph’s most aesthetically magnificent spaces, both religious and non-religious; yet, it is such in formal analysis only – based solely on its architectural merit. The function of the chapel and the greater BGSC was not what Rudolph or the clientele hoped for. In designing one section of the BGSC, the Lindemann Mental Health Center, Rudolph “tried to recreate the hallucinogenic or exaggerated mental and emotional states of the insane with never ending

³¹ Interview with Peter Blake in Roberto de Alba, *Paul Rudolph: The Late Work* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2003).

corridors, dismal atmospheres, and twisting stairways.”³² Rudolph’s plan for this building has been called “a romanticized view of mental illness...Rudolph made the building ‘insane’ in the hope that it would sooth those who dwell in it by reflecting the insanity they feel within.”³³ This is most pronounced in the small chapel at the top of a turret in the Lindemann Center. The chapel was closed to patients in 1972, only one year after it had opened, because a patient lit himself on fire on the concrete slab altar. A psychiatrist working there at the time claimed that the patient was just following his environmental cues, because “It looks like a place that should be used for human sacrifice.”³⁴ Ironically, the same year the BGSC opened, in 1971, Rudolph wrote in an article, “The users of architecture are interested first of all in the qualities of architectural space.”

The users of the BGSC were definitely interested in its qualities, ones that they perceived as twisted, harsh, and not conducive to an environment of ‘insanity’ although it mirrored the mental conditions of the users. Their perception of the space was as an aggravation of their psychological disorders, stimulated by the perverse sensory details within the space.³⁵ In a recent monograph on Rudolph’s architecture, the BGSC chapel is described as a “remarkable interior, completely curvilinear, bearing an unmistakable resemblance to a giant concrete nautilus shell...Archetypal in feeling, like a cave, it was one of the several churches the architect designed in the early and mid-1960s that

³² Michele Koh, “Architecture of Insanity: Boston Government Services Center,” *Singapore Architect* (April 2010): 148-153. p.148.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid., 152. Anecdotes come from Matthew P. Dumont, *Treating the Poor: A Personal Sojourn Through the Rise and Fall of Community Mental Health* (Andover, N.H.: St. Dymphna Press, 1992).

³⁵ For the link between architecture, emotions, and psychosomatics, see Frank H. Mahnke, “Color in Architecture – More Than Just Decoration,” *Architect*, July 2012, <http://architect.com/features/article/53292622/color-in-architecture-more-than-just-decoration>.

demonstrated his affinity for the emotionally charged interiors of religious buildings.”³⁶

This disconnect between the psychiatrist/patient’s interaction with the chapel (as in the anecdote above) and the architect/architectural historian’s interaction with the chapel (Tim Rohan’s formal analysis of the space) reveal what modern scholars of architectural psychology are calling for: the architect as psychologist (and as sociologist, anthropologist, semiotician, etc.)³⁷

So for the BGSC Chapel, did Rudolph simply miss the mark in designing a humanizing space? Timothy Rohan describes Rudolph’s intentions for the entire spatial complex of the BGSC as, “...he advocated enclosure, believing that it would stimulate strong, positive, emotional responses from the individuals and the community.”³⁸ It elicited two of these responses: strong and emotional. The opposite response of positive occurred, as in the anecdotal examples above. Rudolph was influenced by the psychological-impact theories of Camillo Sitte and Sigfried Giedion. Sitte influenced the enclosed plaza of the BGSC complex and Giedion’s theoretical influence prompted Rudolph to adopt the “undulating walls and flexible floor plans of the late baroque” to bring about an “emotional response to architecture.”³⁹ Rohan claims that Rudolph’s appropriation of baroque forms in the Lindemann Center was to support the recent Community Mental Health Act of 1963. This bill allowed for mentally ill patients to live in community housing rather than isolated

³⁶ Timothy M. Rohan, “Scenographic Urbanism: Paul Rudolph and the Public Realm,” *Place Journal*, June 2014, <https://placesjournal.org/article/scenographic-urbanism-paul-rudolph-and-the-public-realm/>, originally published as, Chapter 5, “Scenographic Urbanism,” in Timothy M. Rohan, *The Architecture of Paul Rudolph* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 125.

³⁷ Umberto Eco, “Function and Sign: The Semiotics of Architecture,” 199-200. Furthermore, Eco claims that the architect is “Forced to find forms that will give form to systems over which *he has no power*, forced to articulate a language that has always to express something external to it...”

³⁸ Tim Rohan, “Scenographic Urbanism,” <https://placesjournal.org/article/scenographic-urbanism-paul-rudolph-and-the-public-realm/>.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

in state-run psychiatric wards. The Lindemann Center was to be a transitional institution to promote this new approach to mental health, with patient care and services for those patients now living in the community (It acted as both an inpatient and outpatient facility). With this in mind, Rudolph used ‘non-orthogonal geometry’ hoping that it would be ‘beneficial and even therapeutic.’⁴⁰

Scholars have produced much literature on the architecture of healthcare facilities and their psychological effects (as successful or not) because it is a rare architectural form that must act as caretaker, an anomaly in building (although an argument has been made for religious buildings as caretakers of the human spirit/soul/religious experience).⁴¹ This is a debated topic of architectural form because the relationship to the mind and body is a complex one, as Rudolph himself claimed. To build a physical space that will house physical bodies that are not totally in ‘control’ of their actions (as opposed to a socially constructed idea of a ‘mentally fit’ person) is not easy. And, as we have seen, the architect’s attempt to create a space that will act as caretaker for these minds and bodies, without producing a wholly sterile, minimalist hospital-like environment, is not always successful, as it would be in his other religious spaces.⁴²

⁴⁰ Ibid. Rohan makes the following claim about Rudolph’s attempt at therapeutic architecture in the BGSC: “Though easily discounted as an example of Rudolph’s desire to show off his skills, such attention to the patients’ environment suggested he felt a true regard for them.” In opposition, Philip Nobel has claimed, “But beyond Rudolph, the saga of the Lindemann is a sort of cautionary tale about Modern architecture’s persistent belief that it can affect human behavior. As this extreme example shows, it can certainly hurt. Can architecture also heal?” In “The Architecture of Madness: Buildings Can Drive You Crazy, But Can They Help Restore Mental Health?,” *Metropolis* 19 (October 1999): 128-131, 161.

⁴¹ Stephen Verderber and David J. Fine, *Healthcare Architecture in an Era of Radical Transformation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000); Andrew Scull, *The Insanity of Place / The Place of Insanity: Essays on the History of Psychiatry* (New York: Routledge, 2006); Carla Yanni, *The Architecture of Madness: Insane Asylums in the United States* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007). None of these publications refer to the Lindemann Center in the BGSC.

⁴² “We have made a particular study of therapeutic environments (hospitals, retirement and nursing homes). Patients and people requiring care have specific physical and psychological needs, so they need specially-

First Church Boston

The First Church in Boston (1968-1972) is interesting in Rudolph's oeuvre of religious buildings not only because of the architecture, but also because of the long history of the congregation in Boston and the larger United States.⁴³ One of the oldest congregations in the United States, First Church was founded with support from Governor John Winthrop on July 30, 1630. After many centuries and buildings, Paul Rudolph entered the picture in 1968 after the, then current, sanctuary of First Church burned. The previous church was a Bostonian neo-Gothic edifice of "pudding stone" that seated 2,000 people. After the fire, the steeple and eastern section of the façade remained. Paul Rudolph would integrate these surviving structures into the new church, saving the congregation almost one million dollars.

Situated at the corner of Marlborough and Berkeley Streets in Boston's Back Bay, across the street from the First Lutheran Church of Boston, designed by Pietro Belluschi in 1957⁴⁴, the First Church Boston combines Rudolph's urban planning and emotionally charged interior spaces. Arriving at the main entrance from Marlborough Street, a theatrical plaza lined by planting beds faces the street and welcomes the visitor around this space up ramps or steps and into the atrium of the church. The entrance plaza and theatrical area are similar to the urban planning design that Rudolph would implement in

designed spaces to promote recovery, convalescence, autonomy and quality of life." Leonhard Oberasche, "architectural psychology," http://leoncolor.com/architectural_psychology.html.

⁴³ Featured in *100 by Paul Rudolph/1946-1974*, *A+U* no. 80 (July 1977): 184-187.

⁴⁴ Rudolph would give a speech honoring Pietro Belluschi after his death at the American Academy of Art and Letter Dinner Meeting, November 10, 1994 (reproduced in *Proceedings*, 2nd series, 45, American Academy of Art and Letters), republished online by The Paul Rudolph Foundation, <http://www.paulrudolph.org/writings/Belluschi.pdf>. Belluschi also admired Rudolph and often recommended him for jobs. Meredith L. Clausen, *Pietro Belluschi: Modern American Architect* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999), 338.

his campus design for UMass Dartmouth. The interiors of First Church Boston are similar in feel to the Yale Art and Architecture Building, and the walls are also of corrugated concrete, but are treated in a more linear, square form than the bush-hammered walls of the A&A Building.

The sanctuary is similar in form to the Tuskegee Chapel, with non-orthogonal geometries and a sloping roof. The windows and clerestory allow a plethora of light into the space, even creeping down the large wall of concrete behind the pulpit and stage. Rudolph designed the interiors and equipment within the space, i.e. chairs, pulpit, and other furniture and fixings (all of which remain in the church today). Described by the church's historian, Leo Collins, the spaces of First Church Boston were created to have two functions: secular and sacred. The sanctuary was recently used for the production of Jean Racine's *Phèdre* by the Actors' Shakespeare Project of Boston.⁴⁵ Little manipulation of the space occurred for this modern interpretation of the tragedy, and the same high wall that frames Rev. Stephen Kendrick for his Sunday sermons had the shadows of actors on it during the production. The theatrical nature of Rudolph's spaces, notably his religious spaces, continues to function to this day.

St. Boniface Episcopal Church (Project)

The St. Boniface Episcopal Church for Siesta Key is an unbuilt project of Rudolph from 1956.⁴⁶ Possibly influenced by Methodist church architecture and Frank Lloyd Wright's Annie M. Pfeiffer Chapel at Florida Southern College, the architectural drawing

⁴⁵ See <http://artery.wbur.org/2014/11/26/asp-phedre-plum> and <http://www.bostonglobe.com/arts/theater-art/2014/11/27/actors-shakespeare-project-presents-puzzling-phedre/7laYsQsADBvOeCMGibjeWO/story.html> for the reception and analysis of the stage setting at First Church Boston for the production.

⁴⁶ Featured in "Current Work of Paul Rudolph." *Architectural Record* 121 (February 1957): 175.

looks like a more traditional, large-room sanctuary with central steeple, plan like many architects were designing in postwar America.⁴⁷

Christian Science Center

The Christian Science Center (1962-1967) for the University of Illinois in Urbana, Illinois was designed just as the A&A Building was being completed.⁴⁸ The Christian Science Center, both in plan and formal qualities is a reinterpretation of the A&A Building on a smaller scale. A large, double-floor height meeting space is reminiscent of the central double-floor height spaces in the A&A Building. The color schemes on the interior and the treatment of the concrete are also very similar to the A&A Building. In plan, the Christian Science Center preserves the pinwheel form of the A&A Building, featuring a core space with ancillary spaces creating wings off of the central space. Demolished in 1987, only twenty years after it was built, the Christian Science Center is the only religious building of Rudolph's to be destroyed.

Synagogue Additions

The two additions to synagogues by Rudolph both feature layered roof structures and manipulated light sources for the sanctuary. The built addition to Beth-El Synagogue in New London, Connecticut (1966-1971, 1973)⁴⁹ has a more geometrically centered form, with parallel flanking spaces. The unbuilt addition, Jewish Center Synagogue in East

⁴⁷ See Joseph M. Siry, "Frank Lloyd Wright's Annie M. Pfeiffer Chapel for Florida Southern College: Modernist Theology and Regional Architecture," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 63, no. 4 (December 2004): 498-539.

⁴⁸ Featured in "Paul Rudolph's Elaborated Spaces: Six New Projects." *Architectural Record* 139 (June 1966): 146; *100 by Paul Rudolph/1946-1974, A+U* no. 80 (July 1977): 240-241.

⁴⁹ Featured in Yukio Futagawa, *Paul Rudolph : Dessins D'architecture : Architekturzeichnungen : Architectural Drawings* (New York: Architectural Book Pub. Co., 1981); *100 by Paul Rudolph/1946-1974, A+U* no. 80 (July 1977): 176-177.

Northport, Long Island, New York (1973)⁵⁰ features a layered roof structure that creates a filtered, leveled clerestory on one side of the deconstructed form.

Maris Stella Chapel (Project)

The last religious work, although unbuilt, of Rudolph is the Maris Stella Chapel for the Maris Stella Convent in Singapore (1993).⁵¹ This design features layered levels along a central plane, a recurring form in Rudolphian architecture, such as in his library and corporate designs. It is described by Roberto de Alba as having, “biaxial symmetry and sixteen-foot-long overhangs, which would reach out to protect the faithful from the hot tropical sun, drawing them into the sacred space.”⁵²

May Memorial Unitarian Church (Project)

Finally, the May Memorial Unitarian Church in Syracuse, New York is a complex case study, and is, therefore, presented last. Rudolph was hired as the architect for the congregation’s new church, although somewhere along the way in 1959-1960, the church decided to hire Pietro Belluschi, who designed the current May Memorial Unitarian Church.⁵³ However, in archival research, it seems that Rudolph had been employed by the church long enough to design an initial plan for the new church. Perhaps this initial plan changed the minds of the church building committee.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Featured in *100 by Paul Rudolph/1946-1974*, *A+U* no. 80 (July 1977): 216-217, 279.

⁵¹ De Alba, *Paul Rudolph: The Late Work*, 196.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Minutes of Annual Congregational Meeting, May 14, 1959, Unitarian Congregational Society in Syracuse, New York (May Memorial Church), Sara M. Duvall, Secretary, p. 1 of 2, <http://history.mmuus.org/1959%20annual%20report.pdf>: “Dr. Gowing Broad reported for the New Church Committee. He announced the selection of Mr. Paul Rudolph as architect, subject to approval of the congregation at a special meeting, June 7.”

⁵⁴ From MMUUS ARCHIVE MATERIALS AT S.U. BIRD LIBRARY, Syracuse University: Box 5, (Third Batch, 2008), 45. Paul Rudolph correspondence and plans April through Dec. 1960 – the initial architect for the new church but later rejected. This is not the first time that Rudolph was approached to design a Unitarian church but never completed it. Rudolph was never chosen to design the First Unitarian Church in Rochester, New York, eventually designed by Louis Kahn, but he was approached by the building committee in New Haven in

Conclusion

As presented above, the religious architecture of Paul Rudolph is a rich subject for study of his entire architectural oeuvre, postwar religious architecture, late Modern architecture, campus chapel architecture, and mental health architecture. A comprehensive study and research of Paul Rudolph's built and unbuilt religious works will yield an enlightening product, furthered even more by an analysis of his early biographical information. The current study, presented here, is the beginning of what scholars have not written about, whether purposefully or neglecting to see – the importance of Rudolph's religious buildings. A survey of these structures has not been compiled before, nor has the importance of Rudolph's religious buildings been argued for in a comprehensive manner. As a result, the current study has aimed to begin the conversation of the total religious structures designed by an important late Modern architect in the postwar United States – Paul Rudolph.

1959: "The committee visited Rudolph, but they were hardly impressed by his work and his reserved personality. They thought his concept for his Greeley Memorial Laboratory of the Yale University Forestry School was 'surface not real' and about his Jewett Arts Center for Wellesley College very 'gimmicky.'" Fehmi Dogan and Craig M. Zimring, "Interaction of Programming and Design: The First Unitarian Congregation of Rochester and Louis I. Kahn," *Journal of Architectural Education* 56, no. 1 (Sep. 2002): 47-56.