It must be admitted that among the rather large pantheon of mid-century modernist German architects who are generally known in the United States – Gropius, Mies van der Rohe, Breuer; Mendelsohn, Behrens, Banting, Böhm, Taut, Poelzig, Scharoun, Luckhardt, inter alia – Rudolf Schwarz is relatively unknown. Among the most significant English speaking architectural historians, Schwarz hardly rates a mention in Henry Russell Hitchcock’s Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, only to be compared somewhat unfavorably to the Böhm as a church architect and, in an epilogue to a later edition, acknowledged that his work might have been slighted. He is not even mentioned in Pevsner’s An Outline of European Architecture, nor in Frampton’s Modern Architecture: A Critical History, nor in Curtis’ Modern Architecture since 1900, nor in Giedion’s Space Time and Architecture, nor in Banham’s Theory and Design in the First Machine Age, nor in either Fletcher’s or Kostof’s respective books, A History of Architecture. Today, apart from small world of contemporary Liturgical Movement writers, and other academic specialists, few would probably know of either Schwarz’s writings or buildings.

Amidst this pantheon, Schwarz is consigned to the shadows, and yet he does have a definite presence. His relative anonymity is somewhat curious given how highly regarded he was by his contemporaries, especially by the monumental figure of Ludwig Mies van der Rohe. This anonymity may be explained partly, if not fully, by the fact that Schwarz stayed in Germany during the Second World War, while the well-known Bauhaus circle and other modernists who were disfavored by the Reich fled to England and the United States where they found safety and vigorous careers at places like Harvard and Chicago. And that Schwarz remained to rebuild his homeland after the devastation of the war, working as a city planner in Köln, teaching at Kunstakademie Düsseldorf and resuming private practice with his wife Maria, conspired to keep him on the periphery of the mainstream English-speaking architectural circles. Yet as we shall see, the ground in the United States was already prepared to receive him, and he had strong support among the enthusiasts of the Liturgical Movement in America, even if wide spread acclaim came only in the last years of his life and after his death.

The Ground Prepared

There is scant evidence of any impact of either Schwarz’s thought or architecture upon America before the late 1930s. It seems that unless one had a professional interest in the nascent Liturgical Movement and followed the work of Guardini through a subscription to the periodical Die Schildgenossen, there was little chance of knowing of Schwarz or his work. Guardini himself was virtually unknown in the United States before the mid 30s, even though Vom Geste der Liturgie had been translated into English in the 1930s. Nevertheless, the ground for reception was already being prepared. Especially in the work of Barry Byrne (1883–1967) we see strong parallels with Schwarz’s concerns for contemporary Catholic architecture and the importance of a vital and well considered architecture to support the liturgy (image 1). Byrne was a protégé of Frank Lloyd Wright, who later ran the Chicago office of Walter Burley Griffin (another Wright apprentice), and went on to have a substantial and influential career on his own, both in architectural design and in writing regularly on arts, architecture and liturgy in America magazine, Commonweal and other publications. Byrne was ahead of the curve in bringing the ideas of the International Style to America, having made the grand tour of Europe in 1924, where he met and befriended many of the leading modernists of that era – Mies, Feininger, Klee, Kandinsky, Mendelsohn, Oud, among others. This was several years before H.R. Hitchcock and Philip Johnson made their own momentous pilgrimage though Europe in Johnson’s shiny Cord convertible, which would lead to the official ordination of the International Style in America with the famous “Modern Architecture – International Exhibition” at New York’s Museum of Modern Art in 1932. Such was his prestige that Lewis Mumford would dub Barry Byrne as “A Modern Catholic Architect” in Commonweal.

Byrne had already broken from the Prairie Style School and was working in the fashion of Art Deco, such as his justly well known churches in Ireland, Chicago, and Tulsa. While not embracing the International Style, it seems that Byrne had a sympathetic sensibility for the ideas of Guardini and Schwarz. In a 1934 review of Fr. Williamson’s book, How to Build a Church, Byrne favorably quotes:

“There are great styles of the past have each attained their full perfection and we cannot hope to equal, much less surpass them, by copying; we must set our faces towards the future with full confidence that the newly dawning epoch will express the aspirations of our time, as the work of former epochs expressed theirs. . . . The glance of the artist is forward, not backward.”

He then expressed his own thoughts, in which we can find sympathies with the architectural mission of Schwarz: “Catholic church design in Europe is showing a definite response to such an underlying thought, which in its essence is this – that to be creative, architecture must be a contemporary matter and on a plane on which growth is possible.” He comments positively on the work and influences of Hans Herkommer, but concludes with a challenge for those seeking to produce a meaningful contemporary Catholic architecture:

“As details are a superficial and relative matter, an architecture that depends upon them for its character will, of necessity, be superficial also. The plan of a church, on the other hand, is a basic matter, and fresh and logical arrangements in the building plan would assist in producing a vital religious architecture rather than a superficial one. If such a plan were evolved around a simplified and renewed conception of the relation of the people to the Sacrifice of the Mass, the vitality
of the arrangement and its architectural expression in the mass and detail of the church would derive nourishment from a profound source.9

Byrne’s notions of the vitality and fecundity of Catholic architecture in service of the Mass speaks to the growing appreciation for liturgical and architectural renewal in America: whether or not directly influenced by the thought of Guardini and the examples of Schwarz, Byrne was well acquainted with the new directions in European church architecture, especially the work of Augustine Perret who he had visited in 1928, as well as the works of Bohm and Paul Linder. Byrne’s work joined the efforts of Virgil Michel and the Benedictines of St John’s in Collegeville MN, the work of the Liturgical Arts Society, along with prominent Catholic journals such as America and Commonweal, in rethinking Catholic architecture. This is evinced in a later Byrne article, writing in the spirit of Schwarz:

“Deeply conscious, as I have always been, of the Church as a living organism, I looked upon the dead architectures as envelopments of musty, discarded clothing for her. . . . I saw that if our architecture was again to be a living, rather than a dead thing, it would be necessary to rediscover its basis. On what was it predicated? What was the nature of the building and its functions? These underlying facts, it was evident, were embodied in the building plan, and if a new and logical church plan were to be achieved, it was also evident that that plan would beget a living architecture. The plan was the cause, the enveloping form of architecture, integrated with the plan, was the effect resulting from that cause.”10

In these early years, I have not found any direct connection of Byrne to Schwarz, though it is not improbable that he knew of his work. Byrne was a long time friend of Mies van der Rohe, who was a great admirer of Guardini.11 So it is not unlikely that the floor plan which Byrne included in this article, a fan shape evocative of Schwarz’s parabolic “dark chalice”, may be derivative. Though invoking none of Schwarz’s ideas behind the arrangement, Byrne’s plan is intended “to reintegrate the architectural movement and whose first church, Corpus Christi at Aachen, caused a storm of protest in Germany...” He writes enthusiastically, “I have myself celebrated and seen many a Mass in these empty and simple churches, and I can only say that nowhere except maybe in the catacombs did I feel in such a way the reality of our holy Liturgy – and is that not the meaning of a church?”15

Quite a first introduction of Schwarz to his American audience.

Schwarz might be even yet more obscure except for the efforts of a fellow German, a refugee who found his way to the United States and became a leading voice in the mid century Liturgical Movement. Fr. Hans Ansgar Reinhold (1897–1968) was profoundly moved and found healing in reading Romano Guardini’s Vom Geist der Liturgie in the years before his ordination.5 Reinhold seized upon Guardini’s ideas, and as a young priest adopted such unconventional innovations as the dialogue Mass, centralized liturgy and versus populum, and simple and sober liturgical settings comprised of “honest” materials such as the wooden kitchen table to serve as an altar for a family Mass.

A decade later, in 1956, Reinhold published two seminal articles on the work of Schwarz (among numerous other articles in Commonweal, Blackfriars, Orate Fratres, and American Ecclesiastical Review), surgically placed to reach the right audience in two of the most influential architectural journals of the day.

The Liturgical Arts which was founded by Fr John LaFarge SJ, the prominent editor of America magazine, as a publication of The Liturgical Arts Society. Though by our present sensibilities it would be seen as “conservative” – typically showing small elegant neo-Romanesque and neo-Gothic aula style churches with the high altar draped with a heavily embroidered antependium, the central tabernacle covered with the requisite conopaeum flanked by six candlesticks, and the altar rail firmly setting the sanctuary apart from the nave – this quarterly journal was the main aesthetic vehicle for churchmen, liturgical scholars, artists, architects, church decorators, and ecclesiastical goods suppliers in the United States.

In his first article in 1958, “A Revolution in Church Architecture”, Reinhold introduced the American Catholic clergy, architects and artists to both the liturgical ideas and the architectural expressions of the German Liturgical Movement, focusing particularly on Guardini’s work with the Quickborn youth movement and the architectural theory and principles of Rudolf Schwarz. In the glossy photograph inserts, Reinhold highlighted a representative selection of the best of contemporary German churches, works by Hans Herkommer, Paul Linder, Dominikus Boehm, and Rudolf Schwarz. Even in this early article, Reinhold intuits the future liturgical arrangement which would dominate and very much characterize the typical “modern Catholic church”: the innovation of the fan shape. As importantly, the author introduces his American audience to Schwarz’s liturgical aesthetic, which was “a strong and manly tendency toward sobriety and honesty”, and where the “conception of ‘holy emptiness’ is nothing negative” but rather “[T]he emptiness and sobriety emphasizes God’s wealth and majesty in an overwhelming and impressive way.” Reinhold focused particularly on Schwarz, calling him “the most radical and revolutionary leader in the architectural movement and whose first church, Corpus Christi at Aachen, caused a storm of protest in Germany...” He writes enthusiastically, “I have myself celebrated and seen many a Mass in these empty and simple churches, and I can only say that nowhere except maybe in the catacombs did I feel in such a way the reality of our holy Liturgy – and is that not the meaning of a church?”
This article was followed within months by another well placed article, “The Architecture of Rudolf Schwarz” in The Architectural Forum, the national glossy published by Time magazine. Here Reinhold focused on two churches: the parish of Corpus Christi in Aachen and the small chapel in Leversbach. The text is grandiloquent, comparing the feelings engendered by the monumentality, majesty and beautiful proportions at Corpus Christi to “that ‘magic’ element of architecture which thrills us in the pyramids, the Parthenon, the domed Hagia Sophia, the vaulted cathedral of Mainz, and the splendor of Paris and Chartres”. But arguably more compelling were the stunning photos which capture the elegant materials, purity of form, stark contrasts of tones, and monumental volume of Aachen against the intimate, barn-like structure of Leversbach with its simple local materials, bucolic setting, and “touching simplicity”. Reinhold ends with another glowing tribute to Schwarz, claiming that he “has made the church anew a house for divine worship, not an autonomous, architectural expression of religious feeling, religiöses Weltgefühl. That is a step forward.”

Vom Bau der Kirche

The intervening war years brought little opportunity for actual building. Based on the survey of literature for book reviews, it is not clear if the 1938 first edition of Vom Bau der Kirche had any immediate reception in the United States, although it would not be surprising if the book found its place in the libraries of German speaking Catholic clergy or architects, or through the small circle of those interested in the work of Fr. Guardini. We will see that the 1938 edition did later play into a significant post war building in the heartland of America.

Given the timing of the first edition of Vom Bau der Kirche in 1938 with the growing hostilities in Europe, it is not surprising that Schwarz’s methodology is not mentioned in English publications, even if his architecture and general sensibilities were well received. With the second edition of Vom Bau der Kirche published in 1947, Schwarz’s ideas found a strong reception in the English speaking world, although at this point we must distinguish between the reception of Schwarz’s liturgico-architectural methodology from the reception of his aesthetic and formal ideas. Schwarz would undoubtedly be troubled by such a divorce, but this does seem to be the reality.

Within a year of publication, a major article titled “The Seven Archetypes” of Rudolf Schwarz appeared in Architectural Record which briefly outlined the taxonomy of Schwarz’s methodology and showed Schwarz’s lovely ideograms which capture the essential character and meaning of his models. As the reviewer comments on Vom Bau der Kirche, “The volume itself has a German cast, metaphysical and allegorical, but the language of the drawings is clear and universal”. The reviewer attempts to give a credible, critical and fair minded synopsis of Schwarz’s book and his schemata, humbly noting that “So brief a review does grave injustice to a deep and poetic book, escaping as it does from small controversies of the day, with the rare gift for humility and for viewing time ‘sub specie aeternitatis’.”

In contrast, Gerhard Rosenberg’s 1952 book review of Vom Bau der Kirche, published in the British journal Architectural Review, seem curiously bowdlerized, even perfunctory. While writing glowingly of Schwarz as a thinker and writer – comparing his work to Ruskin’s Seven Lamps of Architecture – the reviewer working from his own translation and giving his own interspersed critical interpretation of Schwarz, concentrates heavily on the natural effects of the liturgical arrangement and the qualities of light and darkness which these various plans suggest, but little of the theology or the complex and more challenging aspects of Schwarz’s thought.

When Vom Bau der Kirche was finally released in English as The Church Incarnate: The Sacred Function of Architecture, interestingly by the arch-conservative publishing house of Henry Regnery in Chicago, it was received to great acclaim, even if many were not quite sure what to make of it. Undoubtedly, the yond the depth of most of us. To review it poses a dilemma: I have no choice but to recommend it enthusiastically. During the next year every architect I meet who will have followed my advice and read it is likely to ask what I – or it! – was all about, and I shall not be sure that I can answer.”

Marty, like so many of Schwarz’s reviewers, only presented a veneer of Schwarz’s ideas, for instance reducing the complexity of the fifth model to “the dark chalice of reception at the altar of the mysteries.” Marty nevertheless intuited that this is a great book deserving to be read but that “reading it demands a high price in attention, commitment, and release from past prejudices as to what a book on architecture ought to set out to do.”

In fairness to the reviewers, it must be admitted that the ideas contained in Vom Bau der Kirche are elaborate, innovative, recondite,
multivalent, profoundly personal, and even controversial. Yet despite the reluctance, or inability, of Schwarz’s reviewers to grapple with the density of his text, on a more superficial level we can see that Schwarz was very well received in the English speaking world. It is not unreasonable to think that the power of the images – both photographs and ideograms – are more impressive on the imagination of the architect than words and theories. Pictures and plans, diagrams and models have a more immediate sense apprehension than abstracted ideas. Architectural journals are often heavily illustrated, and architects tend to be visual thinkers. Given the observation “the language of the drawings is clear and universal”, perhaps the simplest and most satisfactory explanation of Schwarz’s positive reception in the United States lies in the power of these simple ideograms. While the ideas are dense, and hence difficult to comprehend especially upon a first reading, the illustrations possess a certain clarity – clari
tas formae – which is encapsulated in the ideograms and which is ultimately so persuasive (image 3).

A true Schwarzian application

If it has not been demonstrated that Byrne was directly influenced by Schwarz’s models or ideas, but rather was another sympathetic thinker working through many of the same concerns, we do see such direct and demonstrable influences in the post-war church designs of the architectural firm of Murphy and Mackey from the early 1950s. Joseph Denis Murphy (1907–1995) was a professor and later the dean of Architecture at Washington University. He was founding partner in his firm of Murphy and Mackey, a prominent St Louis architecture firm which designed among other significant buildings, the geodesic domed Climatron at the Missouri Botanical Gardens and the John Olin Library at Washington University. George Kassebaum worked for Murphy and Mackey before founding Hellmuth, Obata + Kassebaum, now HOK, which is among the world’s largest architectural firms.

Murphy was introduced to the work of Rudolf Schwarz through his client, Msgr. George Dreher, pastor of the Church of the Resurrection in St Louis. Msgr. Dreher, a St Louis native, was raised in the German speaking community at St Francis de Sales parish. Dreher had a keen appreciation for the liturgical ideas of both Guardini and Schwarz, and supplied his own translation of Schwarz’s 1938 edition of Vom Bau der Kirche to Murphy as together they collaborated in the design of the new church. Murphy developed plans for Dreher’s Resurrection Church. His enthusiasm was almost palpable as he extended his arms to embrace all of us with his ideas for the design of the new church:

Indeed, for Schwarz this was part of the meaning of the parabola: “Now they think that they have come home and the Lord thinks so too. These open arms will close to embrace, heaven and earth unite.” But for Schwarz this plan was ambiguous, complex, and even painful: “Yet the Lord hesitates. He does not close his arms in embrace although the church is now at hand. As he looks toward the people he sees back over their heads into the darkness and he beholds the judgment… The arms, which he already wants to close about the church, are raised anew, now no longer in embrace but in imploring supplication. He stretches out his arms to the Father in darkness, beseeching his mercy for the people: ‘If it be possible, let this pass by.’ But it does not pass by… Why does the Lord hesitate? Now as they look at him they begin to sense the true situation. The light is really at hand, the Lord is really here and he is gentle and close to them, but he is himself in need, here in this hour he suffers his mortal agony for this people, and he begs his own to tarry and watch with him until all is fulfilled.”

For Schwarz this was a most important point, and considered that “it is certainly right that there are churches which have become forms of sacred agony, church in which the fi-
nal things are summoned into the haunted forms of transition.” It is not a hopeless form, it is not a form of despair, since “it is nevertheless the Father who proffers ‘dark chalice’ there.”

It is however noteworthy that this dark side of the symbol is ignored for the “positive” side of the message – just as the symbolism of the baptismal waters is nowadays flattened from the complex, ambivalent, and painful meaning of both life and death, nourishment and drowning, labor pain and the joy of new birth, leaving and arriving, to speak only of “welcoming” into the community.

Furthermore, we might also note that the parabolic model, as innovative and as alluring as it may be, seems to be a curious choice for a church titularly commemorated to the Lord’s Resurrection. For Schwarz this stage was about the cup the Lord prays would pass, Gethsemane, pain, angst, about “whether to hold out with the Lord in the everlasting agony of the dark chalice, which he Lord must forever drink”. The stage of the Resurrection is expressed in the sixth plan, the dome of light, which is “one single glorification, a song of praise, the unalloyed existence of joy. The wedding of the Lamb is at hand and the bride is attired in radiant white”. Perhaps the oculus above the altar is a gesture to the “Dome of Light”, but even if so that would suggest that while Schwarz’s diagrams are powerful images for liturgical and architectural arrangements, the underlying methodology and meaning which engendered them seems to be detachable from the form, or that those who used his ideas in thinking about church building did not grasp the objective integrity that Schwarz so carefully encoded in his book.

Regardless, the Resurrection church in St. Louis was very well received both by the Catholic hierarchy and the secular media. St. Louis Archbishop (later Cardinal) Joseph Ritter fully supported the design and intention of the architect, writing “This represents a new era. The Byzantine, Gothic and Renaissance served their time; it seems only right that a different architecture should serve our time.” In the secular media, the project was featured in both Architectural Record and Architectural Forum, and was displayed prominently in a special religious issue of Life magazine, which highlighted the church in the article “Faith’s New Forms”, showcasing a few examples of shifting directions in contemporary church design.

Conclusion

After the War, Schwarz’s reputation in Catholic circles, largely through the efforts of Fr. Reinhold, gained him a request from St. John’s Abbey in Collegeville, home of the influential Liturgical Press and of Orate Fratres (later Worship), to be considered for their strategic campus master planning. Although he was not shortlisted for the project, Schwarz’s place among the invitees – including Neutra, Gropius, Saarinen, Byrne, Belluschi, Murphy, and the eventually-selected Marcel Breuer – shows the stature of his reputation in America in the post war years. In 1957, Schwarz’s church projects were highlighted in both Architectural Record and in Architectural Forum, in two sympathetic articles written and photographed by G.E. Kidder Smith.

Schwarz’s reputation only grew throughout the late 50s and early 60s as The Church Incarnate was published in English, and Schwarz’s architectural works became better known through their regular inclusion in popular books such as Peter Hammond’s Liturgy and Architecture and Towards a Church Architecture, G.E. Kidder-Smith’s The New Churches of Europe, Maguire and Murray’s Modern Churches of the World, Christ-Janer’s Modern Church Architecture, and Sep Ruf’s German Churches of the 20th Century, as well as by mentions of his work and ideas in books and articles concerning liturgy and architecture in the years around the Second Vatican Council. Schwarz was notably included in the 1960 monumental tome Modern Catholic Thinkers: An Anthology, in which a chapter from The Church Incarnate was featured along with the writings of such other better known Catholic luminaries as von Balthasar, Rahner, Teilhard de Chardin, de Lubac, Congar, Jungmann, Maritain, Danielou, Dawson, Gilson, Pieper, Blondel, Bouyer, and his teacher Romano Guardini.

As evinced in the first works of American architects clearly influenced by Schwarz, and the redacted versions of his ideas, this reception in America cannot be said to include his full thought, but rather often only restricted to the formal and aesthetic qualities of his architecture and methodology. Those aspects of Schwarz’s poetic insight which make us uncomfortable due to their profound depth, or their challenge to the easy suburban life the contemporary American Catholic feels to be one’s due, are simply ignored. The fact that no significant group of architects, theorists, liturgists or theologians have grappled with Schwarz’s taxonomy, let alone embraced it – that there is no transnational “Schwarzian” school of thought about church architecture or liturgical arrangement – raises the obvious question about their universal applicability. However, Schwarz was generally well received in America and the English-speaking world especially in the last decade of his life and the years following his death, and his projects and meditations continue to be a source of inspiration and challenge to architects. His passing was noted in Architectural Forum, where he was said to be “one of the world’s leading church architects and writers on church architecture.”
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