Temple Rodef Shalom
City of Pittsburgh Historic Landmark Nomination
Submitted by Rodef Shalom Congregation

November, 2021
INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY HISTORIC NOMINATION FORM

1. HISTORIC NAME OF PROPERTY: 

2. CURRENT NAME OF PROPERTY: 
   Rodef Shalom

3. LOCATION
   a. Street: 4905 Fifth Avenue
   b. City, State, Zip Code: Pittsburgh, PA 15213
   c. Neighborhood: Shadyside

4. OWNERSHIP
   d. Owner(s): Rodef Shalom Congregation
   e. Street: 4905 Fifth Ave.
   f. City, State, Zip Code: Pittsburgh, PA 15213 Phone: (412)621-6566

5. CLASSIFICATION AND USE – Check all that apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Structure</td>
<td>Private – home</td>
<td>Synagogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Private – other</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Public – government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Public - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X Place of religious worship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fee Schedule
Please make check payable to Treasurer, City of Pittsburgh
Individual Landmark Nomination: $100.00
District Nomination: $250.00
6. NOMINATED BY:
   a. Name: Matthew Falcone (President, Board of Trustees, Rodef Shalom Congregation)
   b. Street: 4905 Fifth Ave.
   c. City, State, Zip: Pittsburgh, PA 15213
   d. Phone: (412) 621-6566 Email: falcone@rodefshalom.org

7. DESCRIPTION
   Provide a narrative description of the structure, district, site, or object. If it has been altered over time, indicate
   the date(s) and nature of the alteration(s). (Attach additional pages as needed)

   If Known:
   b. Architectural Style: Beaux Arts, Art Deco, Modern, Postmodern

   Narrative: see attached

8. HISTORY
   Provide a history of the structure, district, site, or object. Include a bibliography of sources consulted. (Attach
   additional pages as needed.) Include copies of relevant source materials with the nomination form (see
   Number 11).

   Narrative: see attached

9. SIGNIFICANCE
   The Pittsburgh Code of Ordinances, Title 11, Historic Preservation, Chapter 1: Historic Structures, Districts,
   Sites and Objects lists ten criteria, at least one of which must be met for Historic Designation. Describe how
   the structure, district, site, or object meets one or more of these criteria and complete a narrative discussing in
detail each area of significance. (Attach additional pages as needed)

   The structure, building, site, district, object is significant because of (check all that apply):

   1. Its location as a site of a significant historic or prehistoric event or activity;

   2. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the cultural, historic, architectural, archaeological, or related aspects of the development of the City of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States;

   3. Its exemplification of an architectural type, style or design distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship;

   4. Its identification as the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder whose individual work is significant in the history or development of the City of Pittsburgh, the State of Pennsylvania, the Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States;

   5. Its exemplification of important planning and urban design techniques distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design or detail;

   6. Its location as a site of an important archaeological resource;
7. Its association with important cultural or social aspects or events in the history of the City of Pittsburgh, the State of Pennsylvania, the Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States;

8. Its exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development or settlement significant to the cultural history or traditions of the City, whose components may lack individual distinction;

9. Its representation of a cultural, historic, architectural, archaeological, or related theme expressed through distinctive areas, properties, sites, structures, or objects that may or may not be contiguous; or

10. Its unique location and distinctive physical appearance or presence representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the City of Pittsburgh.

Narrative: see attached

10. INTEGRITY

In addition, the ordinance specifies that “Any area, property, site, structure or object that meets any one or more of the criteria listed above shall also have sufficient integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship to make it worthy of preservation or restoration”. (Attach additional pages as needed)

Narrative: see attached

11. NOTIFICATION/CONSENT OF PROPERTY OWNER(S)

1.3(a)(2) Community information process.
Preceding submission of a nomination form for a District, the Historic Review Commission shall conduct at least one (1) public information meeting within or near the boundaries of the proposed district, which shall include at least one (1) member of the Department of City Planning and one (1) Commission member, to discuss the possible effects of designation. Notice shall be given to the owners of property in the proposed district in accordance with Section 1.3(b) below. The final public information meeting shall be held no more than six months before the nomination form is submitted.

1.3(a)(1)(a) Subsection F.
In the case of a nomination as a Historic District, by community-based organizations or by any individual, but in either event the nomination shall be accompanied by a petition signed by the owners of record of twenty-five (25) percent of the properties within the boundaries of the proposed District.

- Please attach documentation of your efforts to gain property owner’s consent.-

** The nomination of any religious property shall be accompanied by a signed letter of consent from the property’s owner.
12. PHOTO LOGS: *Please Attach*

13. BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Please Attach*

14. NOMINATION FORM PREPARED BY:

   a. Name: Clio Consulting (Angelique Bamberg) and Time and Place LLC (Jeff Slack)
   b. Street: 233 Amber Street
   c. City, State, Zip: Pittsburgh, PA 15206
   d. Phone: (412) 956-5517 or 802-5406 Email: clioconsulting@me.com, j_h_slack@yahoo.com
   e. Signature: ____________________________
HISTORIC NOMINATION – INSTRUCTIONS

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING OUT THE NOMINATION FORM

1. Indicate the original name of the property if it is currently known by a different name; e.g. Union Station.

2. Indicate the current name of the property.

3. Indicate the street address for the property. For districts, attach a separate sheet listing the street address of each property included in the nomination and a clear street map of the area showing the boundaries of the proposed district.

4. Indicate the owner of the property and his or her mailing address. For districts, attach a separate sheet listing the owner of each property and his or her mailing address.

5. Check the classification as indicated.
   a. “Historic Structure” means anything constructed or erected, the use of which requires directly or indirectly, a permanent location on the land, including walks, fences, signs, steps and sidewalks at which events that made a significant contribution to national, state or local history occurred or which involved a close association with the lives of people of nations, state or local significance; or an outstanding example of a period, style, architectural movement, or method of construction; or one of the last surviving works of a pioneer architect, builder or designer; or one of the last survivors of a particular style or period of construction.
   b. “Historic District” means a defined territorial division of land which shall include more than one (1) contiguous or related parcels of property, specifically identified by separate resolution, at which events occurred that made a significant contribution to national, state, or local history, or which contains more than one historic structure or historic landmarks, or which contains groups, rows or sets of structures or landmarks, or which contains an aggregate example of a period, style, architectural movements or method of construction, providing distinguishing characteristics of the architectural type or architectural period it represents.
   c. “Historic Site” means the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure whether standing, ruined or vanished, where the location itself maintains historical or archaeological value regardless of the value of any existing structures.
   d. “Historic Object” means a material thing of historic significance for functional, aesthetic cultural or scientific reasons that may be, by nature or design, moveable yet related to a specific setting or environment.

6. Indicate the person(s) responsible for the nomination. Please note: According to the Historic Preservation Ordinance:
   “Nomination of an area, property, site, or object for consideration and designation as a Historic Structure, Historic District, Historic Site, or Historic Object may be submitted to the Historic Review Commission by any of the following:
   a. The Mayor of the City of Pittsburgh
   b. A Member of the Historic Review Commission
c. A Member of the City Planning Commission
d. A Member of the Pittsburgh City Council
e. The Owner of Record or any person residing in the City of Pittsburgh for at least one year (for the nomination of a Historic Structure, Site or Object)
f. A signed petition of 25% of the owners of record (for the nomination of a Historic District)

7. Write a physical description of the nominated property or district. Include the following information as applicable:
   - architectural style(s)
   - arrangement of architectural elements
   - building materials
   - method(s) of construction
   - visual character
   - street pattern
   - density
   - type and arrangement of buildings
   - topography
   - history of the development of the area

8. Provide a narrative history of the structure, district, site, or object. Include the following information when available:
   - History of the development of the area;
   - Circumstances which brought the structure, district, site, or object into being;
   - Biographical information on architects, builders, developers, artisans, planners, or others who created or contributed to the structure, district, site, or object;
   - Contextual background on building type(s) and/or style(s);
   - Importance of the structure, district, site, or object in the larger community over the course of its existence.
   - Include a bibliography of all sources consulted at the end. Where historical information is uncertain or disputed, reference sources in the text.

9. Listed below are the categories and criteria for historic designation as set forth in the Pittsburgh Historic Preservation Ordinance. Describe in detail how the structure, district, site, or object meets one or more of the criteria. According to that legislation in Section 1.4 of the Pittsburgh Historic Preservation Ordinance, 
   *Criteria for Designation*, a building must meet at least one of the following criteria in order to be designated:

   1. Its location as a site of a significant historic or prehistoric event or activity;
   2. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the cultural, historic, architectural, archaeological, or related aspects of the development of the City of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States;
   3. Its exemplification of an architectural type, style or design distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship;
   4. Its identification as the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder whose individual work is significant in the history or development of the City of Pittsburgh, the State of Pennsylvania, the Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States;
   5. Its exemplification of important planning and urban design techniques distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design or detail;
   6. Its location as a site of an important archaeological resource;
   7. Its association with important cultural or social aspects or events in the history of the City of Pittsburgh, the State of Pennsylvania, the Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States;
8. Its exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development or settlement significant to the cultural history or traditions of the City, whose components may lack individual distinction;

9. Its representation of a cultural, historic, architectural, archaeological, or related theme expressed through distinctive areas, properties, sites, structures, or objects that may or may not be contiguous; or

10. Its unique location and distinctive physical appearance or presence representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the City of Pittsburgh.

10. In addition, the ordinance specifies that “Any area, property, site, structure or object that meets any one or more of the criteria listed above shall also have sufficient integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship to make it worthy of preservation or restoration.”

11. The nomination must be accompanied by evidence that the nominator has made a good-faith effort to communicate his or her interest in the historic designation of this landmark or district to the owner(s) of these properties. Describe how this was done, and attach evidence that the owner(s) of the nominated landmark or of the properties within the nominated district have been informed of the nomination. This may include a copy of a notification letter with a mailing list, a letter confirming phone calls, or a petition signed by affected property owners.

12. Clear photographs of the nominated buildings or districts should accompany the nomination form. The applicant shall include photographs of all elevations of an individual building and its setting, or the front elevation of each building in a district. In the case of closely spaced buildings or rowhouses, several buildings may be included in one photograph. Each photograph must be labeled with the street address of the building(s) and the month and year the photograph was taken.

13. Copies of major supporting documents should accompany the nomination form. Such documents may include, but are not limited to:

- historic photographs;
- historic and contemporary maps;
- historic or contemporary texts describing the subject property or district;
- historic or contemporary texts describing people, places, or events that comprise the historic context of the subject property or district.
- Oversized materials (such as architectural drawings) and materials too fragile to copy may be accepted.

PLEASE NOTE: It is the responsibility of the nominator to provide the Historic Review Commission and its Staff with information sufficient to fairly evaluate the nomination. **Incomplete nomination forms will not be accepted. Fee must be included. Nominations must be submitted in both electronic and hard-copy format.**
## Checklist: Temple Rodef Shalom

### #1-6 Nomination Form:
- Address, Ownership, Classification, Nominator Info.
- #7: Description
- #8: History
- #9: Significance

### #10 Integrity
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### Fee

**Hard-Copy nomination**
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Temple Rodef Shalom

Historic Nomination Form

Addendum
Present Day—Construction Chronology Summary

- **1906-07 Original Building**
- **1938 Religious Education Wing**
- **1954-56 Social Hall Wing**
- **2000-03 Additions/Renovations**
- **Skylight**

**FIFTH AVENUE**

### 2000-03 Additions/Renovations
- **Skylight**

### 1938 Religious Education Wing
- **Classrooms**
- **Classrooms/Admin/Reception**
- **J. Leonard Levy Hall**
- **Sanctuary**
- **Josiah Cohen Chapel**
- **Multiple renovations**
- **Aaron Court enclosed**

### 1954-56 Social Hall Wing
- **Classrooms/Admin/Reception**
- **Porte-cochere**
- **Solomon B. Freehof Hall**
- **Deaktor Terrace**
- **Social Hall Wing—1956**
- **Kitchen addition on 1st floor**

### Original Building—1907
- **Vestibule**
- **Sanctuary**
- **Entry vestibule**
- **Classrooms**
- **‘Relief’ sculpture by Kent Bloomer (1965)**
- **Original Building—1907**

### Deaktor Terrace

[Roof Plan]
7. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

Summary Paragraph
Temple Rodef Shalom is located at 4905 Fifth Avenue in Pittsburgh’s Shadyside neighborhood, approximately three miles east of Downtown. Constructed at the height of America's enthusiasm for formal, monumental, civic and institutional architecture, the building was a significant contribution to Pittsburgh’s expression of the City Beautiful movement at the turn of the twentieth century. The temple is roughly shaped like a plus-sign in plan and consists of four primary components: the sanctuary (1907, designed by Henry Hornbostel of Palmer & Hornbostel in an eclectic style, with Modern French and Beaux Arts influences—Hornbostel had been educated at the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris); two large, modern additions to the rear: a religious education wing to the west (1938, Ingham & Boyd with Alfred M. Marks) and a large social hall wing to the north and east (1956, Alexander Sharove and Harry H. Lefkowitz); and a smaller, two-story porte-cochere that projects to the north from the center of the rear façade (ca. 2000-03, The Design Alliance).

The building has operated as a temple since its dedication in 1907. It retains integrity as a prominent work of architecture by master architect Henry Hornbostel, as a significant part of Jewish history in Pittsburgh, and as the most significant extant resource representing the broad contributions of Rodef Shalom to the evolution of Reform Judaism in the United States. The additions, which were designed by important Pittsburgh architecture firms, are sympathetic to the original design, and the two larger wings have now, over a half-century later, become significant in their own right.

Setting
The sprawling temple complex occupies the southern end of the block bounded by Fifth, Morewood and Ellsworth Avenues and Devonshire Street. The temple campus is located immediately east of Oakland, Pittsburgh’s cultural and educational district that evolved during the City Beautiful era (Photo 1). Oakland is home to Carnegie Mellon University (founded as the Carnegie Technical Schools in 1900, with most of the early campus designed by Hornbostel in 1905), the University of Pittsburgh (which began relocating from the city’s North Side in 1908), and the Carnegie Institute museum and library complex (1895, by Longfellow, Alden and Harlow, with later renovations and additions).

The immediate neighborhood is a mix of residential and institutional buildings. To the north are large, mostly turn-of-the-twentieth-century, single-family homes on Devonshire Street and Morewood Avenue; to the west across Devonshire is Holy Spirit Byzantine Catholic Church (1962, Williams, Trebilcock, Whitehead and Associates), and to the east are the Regency on Fifth condominiums. Across Fifth Avenue, from west to east, are the WQED public television studio (1969, Paul Schweiker), residential buildings of the Carnegie Mellon campus, and the 5000 Fifth Avenue condominiums (1980).

Site
The site is generally flat, with a gradual slope down from east to west and south to north. The entry vestibule of the sanctuary is built almost to the south property line, with only a few granite steps and a shallow, full-width terrace separating it from the Fifth Avenue sidewalk (Photo 1). The terrace, which measures approximately 108 by 9 feet, is comprised of red brick in a herringbone pattern. Facing one another, at the east and west ends of the terrace, are piers that are C-shaped in plan and constructed of cream-colored brick and terra cotta with granite foundations. They encircle ornate electroliers of polychromatic terra cotta (also called architectural faience), which were manufactured by the Rookwood Pottery Company in Cincinnati, Ohio and installed as part of the original construction (Photo 2). Wing walls of brick and terra cotta extend from the front plane of the entry vestibule; between them and the electrolier piers are black, painted, cast iron, double-swing gates. Designed to resemble menorahs, they are topped by handles in the form of stylized antelope heads (Photo 2). The gates once opened to sidewalks leading to rear entrances to the original building. Today they are fixed in place and serve only an ornamental function, with the sidewalks behind having been removed.

Large green spaces flank each side of the sanctuary. To the east, in the corner formed by the sanctuary and 1956 social hall wing, is Morewood Lawn, a broad swath of grass with a perimeter of low hedges and a half-dozen shade trees (Photo 3). A simple, black, aluminum, double-swing gate (ca. 1980s), set between large evergreen hedges at Fifth Avenue, provides access to an interior sidewalk that leads to the social hall (via what is today Wechsler Gallery). Between this sidewalk and the east façade of the sanctuary is a large planting bed containing groupings of low shrubs and perennial border plants. Extending across the south side of the social hall is Deaktor Terrace, a brick patio with low limestone walls that was created circa 2000-03 (Photo 4). In the northwest corner, between the sidewalk and terrace in a bed of evergreen groundcover, is a series of bronze sculpted figures titled Procession I by American-Jewish sculptor Elbert Weinberg (1928-91; Photo 5). One of three
cast editions, this multi-piece work consists of four figures headed by a Tallit-clad figure bearing a Torah. Behind him and to one side follow two linked figures, one of whom holds an open prayer book. First cast in 1957, this edition was cast in 1968 for Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Kobacker, art collectors who donated the piece to Temple Beth El in Steubenville, Ohio. In 2013, after the closing of the temple, Weinberg’s work was relocated to its current home at Rodef Shalom.¹

The space to the west of the sanctuary is largely occupied by the Biblical Botanical Garden (Photo 6), which was established in 1986 by Irene and Walter Jacob (the latter having served as rabbi to Rodef Shalom from 1966 to his retirement in 1996). The one-third acre garden is enclosed by a black aluminum fence and tall hedges along the Fifth Avenue and Devonshire Street sidewalks. The entrance is reached via a sidewalk from Devonshire Street that extends along the south side of the religious education wing. Set into a white stuccoed wall, a delicate, black, wrought iron gate with stylized papyrus motifs leads to an open, post-and-beam garden pavilion (constructed in 2017 to replace the original entry structure). From there, a concrete path encircles a central water feature representing Lake Kineret (the Sea of Galilee) and the Dead Sea, all of which is surrounded by more than one hundred plants native to the area around biblical Israel, which are on display every summer. From October through May, the specimens are replanted in a greenhouse located at Westview Cemetery (Rodef Shalom’s burial ground, located just north of Pittsburgh).

Tucked largely out of sight behind the garden, in the corner created by the walls of the sanctuary and religious education wing, is a playground designed to support the congregation’s Family Center Preschool (Photo 7). The space, which was renovated in 2017, can be accessed directly from the religious education wing (via steps and a concrete ADA ramp, which both have painted, black iron railings) and also via a gate in a white vinyl fence adjacent to the garden entrance. The playground features a variety of equipment and different surfaces for recreational activities.

To the rear of the building, the site is almost fully occupied by a paved parking lot that extends from Morewood Avenue to Devonshire Street, with an entrance and exit at each street (Photo 8). Plantings are minimal, with a few small trees and shrubs in beds near the streets, in a bed between a sidewalk and the north wall of the religious education wing (which also contains a small fenced area for mechanical equipment), and on the north side of the porte-cochere. The residential neighborhood north of the parking lot is largely screened from view. The western half of the border contains a series of ornamental trees and a tall hedge that abuts a brick wall on the north side of 803 Devonshire. The eastern half contains a lower hedge that abuts a wood, vertical-slat fence on the south edge of 806 Morewood.

SANCTUARY—EXTERIOR

Form/Materials
The sanctuary portion of Rodef Shalom consists of a monumental, square-planned auditorium (the sanctuary proper) topped by a convex mansard roof, or square dome, in green tile with a central skylight, along with a two-story, projecting entry vestibule that faces Fifth Avenue (Photo 9). When originally constructed, the sanctuary had an adjoining rear wing, which was used for Sunday School, social programs, administration and other functions (see Construction Chronology: Original Building). Today, virtually no recognizable trace of this wing remains, it having been subsumed by subsequent additions and multiple renovations.

The expansive exterior walls are finished in cream-colored brick from the Kittanning Brick & Fire Clay Company and terra cotta trim in warm cream shades along with more ornate polychromatic bands, both from the Perth Amboy Terra Cotta Company (later, the Atlantic Terra Cotta Company).² At the time of the building’s completion, the architectural press noted the vibrancy of the colors, calling out “blue, yellow and white decorations” among the palette.³ Today, the multi-colored glazes are quite faded, with muted reds and greens being the most discernable surviving tones.

Vestibule/Front Facade
The vestibule is rectangular in plan, with semi-elliptical bays at the east and west ends of the first story and a low, curved parapet crowning the front façade (behind which is concealed a barrel-vaulted roof covered with EPDM, a rubber membrane system). The vestibule measures approximately 75-feet wide, 25-feet deep and 65-feet high.

² The Perth Amboy Terra Cotta Company merged with a number of New York City area manufacturer’s during the construction of Rodef Shalom, becoming the Atlantic Terra Cotta Company in January 1907 (Perth Amboy Evening News, 21 January 1907).
³ “Rodef Sholem [sic.] Synagogue, Pittsburg, PA,” Architects’ and Builders’ Magazine, 9, no. 11, New Series, August 1908, 497.
The front façade is symmetrical, five bays wide and finished in cream-colored brick in two tones laid in Flemish bond (Photos 10 and 11). At its base, in bays 1 and 5 (counting from west to east), the brick facade rests upon a granite foundation then rises approximately five feet to an ornate terra cotta stringcourse featuring a torus decorated with bundled bay leaves (a.k.a. Grecian laurel), that encircles the vestibule and sanctuary. As noted above, the brickwork beneath the stringcourse extends beyond the vestibule to the east and west to form projecting wings walls. Above the stringcourse, the plane of the facade steps back approximately fourteen inches. In bays 1 and 5 at the first story level, there are narrow, rectangular stained-glass windows set within a recess framed in terra cotta and topped by an eight-pointed terra cotta star with a pyramid projecting from its center. The windows illuminate stairs to the second-floor balcony.

At the center of the front façade, in bays 2, 3 and 4, four granite steps lead from the front brick terrace to a triple entrance. Each entry contains a pair of paneled, Kalameined doors (i.e., wood doors, wrapped in copper for fireproofing and treated originally to provide a green patina). They were subsequently painted black, ca. 1990. Over each pair is a black, iron grille in an open, fish scale motif, behind which is a glass transom. To each side, decorative terra cotta brackets at the tops of the door jambs provide the appearance of support for each doorway lintel.

The triple entrance is contained within a great arch that springs from projecting piers of granite, brick and terra cotta that flank the front stairs, with a three-bay wide, semicircular, stained-glass lunette above that illuminates the balcony level (see “Stained Glass” below for details on this and other major windows in the sanctuary). The terra cotta voussoirs of the arch contain the inscription, “My House Shall Be Called A House of Prayer for All People” from Isaiah 56:7. Two terra cotta tablets representing the Ten Commandments sit above a terra cotta bracket at the keystone. Wide bands of polychromatic terra cotta with intertwining leaves and fret-like ribbons separate the elements within the arch (Photos 11 and 12). Over the center doorway, the design culminates in a pediment featuring an inset menorah. The cream-colored, top and bottom borders of the horizontal bands above the doors continue across the front façade and encircle the vestibule and sanctuary. Interspersed in this band, typically above or adjacent to windows, the motif of the eight-pointed star with projecting pyramid is repeated. Near the top of the façade, an ornate terra cotta band featuring diamonds and eight-pointed stars serves as a frieze. Once polychromed but now faded, it follows the arc of the curved parapet and also encircles the rest of the building. Notes on the Hornbostel drawings indicate that it was to contain three colors of terra cotta glaze. The very top of the wall terminates in a delicate terra cotta cornice with a leaf-and dart motif, which is also carried around the building.

The side walls of the vestibule are two bays wide and identical to one another. While simpler in detail than the front façade, they present a unified design by repeating the materials and encircling bands of terra cotta from the front elevation (Photo 13). On each wall, the stringcourse in bay 1 (counting from south to north) is interrupted by a narrow, rectangular stained-glass window set within a terra cotta recess that illuminates an interior landing to original basement restrooms (now unused). Bay 2 is slightly recessed and contains the previously mentioned semielliptical bay on each facade, which has a simple, planar, terra cotta stringcourse, is capped by a domed terra cotta roof, and contains a narrow, rectangular stained-glass window that illuminates historic men’s and women’s waiting rooms. Above, in each wall, is a taller, arched stained glass window that illuminates the stairs to the balcony.

Sanctuary/Auditorium

Behind the vestibule, the large volume of the sanctuary measures approximately 100-feet on each side at its base and rises almost 100 feet to the apex of the skylight. In plan, it has the shape of a canted square—a square with its corners clipped or chamfered—a shape which is repeated elsewhere in the building’s design and also in Hornbostel’s Machinery Hall (now Hamerschlag Hall) at Carnegie Mellon.

Chamfering the four corners softens the voluminous cube of the auditorium and provided bearing points for proposed steel trusses that were originally intended to support the roof, but were subsequently abandoned by Hornbostel shortly after construction began in favor of self-supporting Guastavino tile. Centered on each chamfered wall is a projecting brick pier, which tapers in width and depth as it gets higher. On the interior of the sanctuary, these projections create voids, or alcoves, in the four corners of the main floor.

---

4 In bricklaying, Flemish Bond refers to an arrangement where each course consists of alternate bricks having their short sides (headers) and long sides (stretchers) facing outwards, with alternate courses being offset.
6 Charles Rosenblum, “The Architecture of Henry Hornbostel: Progressive and Traditional Design in the American Beaux Arts Movement” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Virginia: 1997). The authors thank Charles Rosenblum for sharing his Ph.D. dissertation and allowing his physical description to be adapted in part for this nomination.
The southeast and southwest chamfered walls and their piers continue the materials and bands of ornamentation from the side walls of the vestibule (Photo 14). At these two corners, the piers contain a narrow, rectangular stained-glass window at the first story level (illuminating the rear corners of the auditorium). Above, at all four chamfered corners, the tapered piers step back approximately three feet and are ornamented with planar terra cotta motifs that resemble the form of the pediment over the center doorway.

The east and west facades are symmetrical and identical to one another, except for the motifs in their stained glass windows (Photo 15). They are simpler in detail than the walls of the vestibule and southern chamfered walls, containing only one tone of cream-colored brick laid in a simpler common bond, with a course of header bricks every sixth course. However, the side walls continue the unified design by continuing the encircling bands of terra cotta ornamentation. In the center of each wall are three monumental, arched stained glass windows. The two outer openings measure approximately 9 feet wide by 32 feet tall and contain windows from the synagogue’s previous temple on Eighth Street downtown. The center opening is the tallest, measuring approximately 9 feet wide by 36 feet tall, with each containing windows designed for the building.

The side facades also repeat the curved parapet of the front façade, (behind which are concealed wide cheneaus, or rain gutters). Rising behind the cheneaus and extending between the tops of the four chamfered corner piers, is the canted square base of the dome, whose brick walls are capped by polychromatic terra cotta cresting (though now faded) featuring torches alternating with stylized leaf motifs (which conceal cheneaus for the main roof).

The rear façade of the auditorium is largely concealed by the later renovations and additions that replaced the original rear Sunday School wing. However, visible at the center of the rear wall is the flat-roofed, projecting, rectangular mass of the equipment room for the sanctuary organ. It is covered with EPDM and continues the same materials as the side walls of the sanctuary, but with simplified bands of horizontal terra cotta ornamentation.

**Dome/Main Roof**

The square dome over the sanctuary is in the form of a coved vault, which is formed by the intersection of four quarter-cylinder surfaces or coves. The form is decidedly French and can be readily seen in historic convex mansard roofs and, most notably, in Jacques Lemercier’s Pavillon de l’Horloge, which was added to the Louvre around 1640, and from which the term “Louvre dome” is derived. The dome at Rodef Shalom is open at the top to allow for a large central skylight.

As noted, the roof vault is executed in Guastavino tile, as is a second, lower vault that forms the ceiling of the sanctuary. Patented by Spanish building engineer and builder Rafael Guastavino, his Tile Arch System features interlocking layers of thin terra cotta tiles laid in mortar to create a lightweight, strong vault without the need for wood or steel beams for additional support. The roof is covered in glazed, grass green, interlocking Ludowici tiles. The groins formed at the corners are clad in broad, flat bands of terra cotta. Originally intended as caps over the steel trusses, they remained in the revised design as decorative features, connecting the chamfered piers to the skylight. Like the piers, the width of the caps diminishes as the building height increases. On each side of the dome, two smaller, parallel, terra cotta ribs were retained for the same reason.

At its base, the square dome measures approximately 88 feet on each side per measurements scaled from Hornbostel’s drawings, though a clear span of 90 to 92 feet has historically been reported. From the base, the dome rises approximately 24 feet to the canted square base of the central skylight, which measures approximately 46 feet on each side. The base of the skylight rises approximately 6 feet and is finished in a frieze of terra cotta that features multiple bands of decorative horizontal moldings with cartouches at the chamfered corners and Stars of David above the junctures of the smaller roof ribs. The skylight itself rises an additional five feet and is supported by intersecting diagonal ribs with a smaller framework supporting each glass panel. When the roof is viewed from above, the diagonal braces of the skylight continue the lines of the diagonal ribs, which in turn continue the vertical lines of the chamfered piers.

**SANCTUARY—INTERIOR**

**Vestibule/Balcony**

From the Fifth Avenue terrace, the three pairs of front entry doors are followed closely by six pairs of stained wood interior doors, forming a shallow vestibule that then opens to a large lobby (Photo 16). The lobby floor is terrazzo, laid in a diagonal pattern resembling square tiles, with white marble borders. Walls and ceiling are painted plaster with a carved plaster crown

---

molding encircling the space. At each end are stairs to the balcony along with a women’s waiting room to the west and a men’s waiting room to the east, both of which contain stairs to now-abandoned basement rest rooms. The balcony contains 288 individual theater-style seats of oak with cast iron frames and blue upholstery arranged in straight rows on eleven tiers of hardwood flooring with two side aisles and two center aisles. The balcony cantilevers approximately eight feet over the rear of the auditorium below and terminates in a paneled mahogany rail.

Sanctuary/Auditorium
From the lobby, eight pairs of leather-clad doors with oval glazing lead to the sanctuary. In plan, the sanctuary reflects the canted square visible on the exterior. The voluminous space is defined by the broad, gently sloping floor that descends two feet from south to north; by a paneled wainscot of mahogany and gold leaf that reaches a height of 20 feet at the front of the auditorium and corresponds to the lower ornamental terra cotta bands of the exterior; and by the lower Guastavino tile dome, which forms the structure for the plaster ceiling, which has been painted in an ivory tone (Photo 17). The four groins of the ceiling vaults spring from the four chamfered corners in wide, tapering ribs that echo the form of the curved corner ribs of the roof. Each contains ten recessed caissons, or coffers, decorated with painted panels that resemble mosaic tile, and framed in geometric patterns (echoing motifs of the Israeli flag). Originally, seats were upholstered in green leather with carpets also being green—carrying the greens of the roof and polychromatic terra cotta into the interior.12

Seating is arranged in curved rows, with two side aisles and four interior aisles. The resulting five groupings have no center aisle, a feature attributed to Rabbi J. Leonard Levy, who reportedly stated that he wished to speak to people, not to an empty aisle.10 The oak seats themselves are of the individual theater-style, with folding seats and cushions in blue upholstery, with ornate oak end caps at the aisles that feature a carved Star of David. Today, the seating count in the sanctuary totals 802 after renovations in 2010-12 removed 98 seats from the front of the sanctuary to allow a lower level of the bima to be constructed, which can be reached by flanking ADA ramps and two steps at the center.11 The seats sit upon the original stained hardwood floor. Aisles are covered with broadloom carpet runners (ca. 21st century) containing fields of white with blue borders and geometric patterns (echoing motifs of the Israeli flag). Originally, seats were upholstered in green leather with carpets also being green—carrying the greens of the roof and polychromatic terra cotta into the interior.12

The lower level of the bima is covered with blue broadloom carpet. Beyond it, three steps lead up to the original bima, set within the north arch. It is covered in white broadloom carpet with blue borders and can also be reached by flanking sets of stairs. On the face of the arch is the verse “Hear O Israel, the Eternal is our God, the Eternal is One” from Deuteronomy, which forms the structure for the plaster ceiling, which has been painted in an ivory tone (Photo 17). The four groins of the ceiling vaults spring from the four chamfered corners in wide, tapering ribs that echo the form of the curved corner ribs of the roof. Each contains ten recessed caissons, or coffers, decorated with painted panels that resemble mosaic tile, and framed in geometric patterns (echoing motifs of the Israeli flag). Originally, seats were upholstered in green leather with carpets also being green—carrying the greens of the roof and polychromatic terra cotta into the interior.12

Above, a large organ fills the upper space within the arch, with the space immediately above the Ark serving as a loft for the organist and organ console. Manufactured by the W.W. Kimball Company to the specifications of Rodef Shalom’s organist, W.K. Steiner, the organ contains a decorative organ façade of gold-colored pipes and horns visible to the congregation, with the actual sounding pipes and other organ equipment being contained in a room immediately to the north.13 On the thin mahogany frieze at the base of the organ pipes is the dedication “In Loving memory of Irene Kauffmann” in gold letters. Kauffmann, the daughter of Pittsburgh mercantile magnate Henry Kaufmann, died tragically in July 1907. The organ has the distinction of being “the largest remaining vintage Kimball in the world.”14

From the ceiling are suspended four, original, monumental, six-armed chandeliers. Executed in wood with gilt and blue finishes, each arm terminates in a menorah. Matching wall sconces can be found in the sanctuary, with matching ceiling

---

9 Rosenthal.
10 Ibid.
12 “One of the Most Beautiful and Costly Jewish Synagogues in the United States, Soon to be Dedicated. . . ,” Pittsburgh Daily Post, 1 September 1907, 6.
14 Organ historian Nelson Barden, quoted in Guyer, 118.
fixtures in the front vestibule. Over the bima, are ten acoustical clouds that were installed in 1990. Consisting of circles of steel and clear glass, they can be raised or lowered to improve the sound quality of speakers or performers.

**Stained Glass**

Below is a summary of major windows in the sanctuary portion of Rodef Shalom:

**Willet Stained Glass Company**

As noted, four monumental Memorial Windows from the congregation’s previous temple on Eighth Street were incorporated into the side facades of the 1907 sanctuary. They were designed by Willet Stained Glass Company of Pittsburgh, which had been founded in 1899 by William Willet and his wife and partner Anne Lee Willet, who were equals in the studio’s operations. William Willet had worked for noted stained glass artist John La Farge from 1885 through 1887. The windows reflected a growing trend in Reform Judaism of including figural compositions, a marked break from the traditions of Orthodox Jews, whose interpretation of the Third Commandment forbade the depiction of people in religious art.

| Title: | “Moses Interceding for His People.” |
| Location: | Sanctuary, west wall, south end. |
| Date: | 1901, relocated and reinstalled in 1907. |
| Theme/Imagery: | Exodus. Features Moses kneeling in prayer on a lonely hill with his hands clasped in anguish. Beneath him, an inscription from Exodus reads, “And Moses returned unto the Lord and said, ‘Oh, this people have sinned a great sin. Yet now, if Thou wilt only forgive them their sin—and if not, blot me. I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou has written.’” Exodus 32:31-32. |
| Dedication: | “In Loving Memory of Asher Guckenheimer;” donated by Mrs. Ida Guckenheimer. |

| Title: | “Charity.” |
| Location: | Sanctuary, west wall, north end. |
| Date: | 1901; relocated and reinstalled in 1907. |
| Theme/Imagery: | Features two young women ministering at the bedside of a sick girl, while above, angels bear a new soul into heaven. Based on Proverbs 31:10-31, “A woman of valor,” who reaches out to the poor and needy. Beneath the figures is the passage “She stretcheth out her hand to the poor; yea, she reacheth forth her hands to the needy.” Proverbs 31:20. |
| Dedication: | “To the Glory of God and in Memory of Fannie Hanauer Hamburger;” donated by Philip Hamburger, in memory of his wife. |

| Title: | “Mercy and Judgment.” |
| Location: | Sanctuary, east wall, south end. |
| Date: | 1901, relocated and reinstalled in 1907. |
| Theme/Imagery: | Features an aged man with a child on his arm, another child at his side, and at the foot of the steps to a palace, a poor pale woman who is crouched down with a pair of doves at her feet. Overhead are green trees and a hint of blue sky. Beneath the figures are the following excerpts from Isaiah: “Learn to do well. Seek judgment. Relieve the oppressed. Judge the fatherless. Plead for the widow.” Isaiah 1:17. |
| Dedication: | “In Memoriam, Jacob M. Gusky, Eva Gusky;” donated by Mrs. Esther M. Gusky (wife and mother, respectively). |

---


17 Ibid.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid., 9; “One of the Most Beautiful and Costly Jewish Synagogues in the United States, Soon to be Dedicated. . . .”, *Pittsburgh Daily Post*, 1 September 1907, 6.
Location: Sanctuary, east wall, north end.
Date: 1903; dedicated two years after the Eighth Street temple was finished; relocated and reinstalled in 1907.
Theme/Imagery: Depicts Naomi embracing her daughter-in-law, Ruth, under a tree in an oasis while Naomi’s other daughter-in-law, Orpah, remains in Moab. Ruth utters “Entreat me not to leave thee or to return from following after thee, for whither thou goest I will go and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people and thy God my God.”
Dedication: “In Loving Memory of Our Parents: Jacob and Lena Klee;” donated by the Klee family (including Pittsburgh members Mr. and Mrs. I.W. Frank).

Herman T. Schladermundt (1863-1937)
Remaining windows in the sanctuary were designed by Herman T. Schladermundt. Schladermundt was a noted American muralist and stained-glass designer. He was born in 1863 in Milwaukee and studied in Paris. He worked for the architecture firms of Burnham & Root and Carrere & Hastings. He painted murals for the Agriculture Building at the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago (for which he was awarded a medal); the apse of Central Congregational Church in Providence, Rhode Island; and the Ponce de Leon Hotel in St. Augustine, Florida. He made stained glass windows for the Missouri State Capitol in Jefferson City, Missouri; the Main Reading Room of the Library of Congress in Washington, DC; the sanctuary of Memorial Presbyterian Church in St. Augustine, Florida; and the emigrant Industrial Savings Bank and General Motors Building in New York City.21 He died on January 26, 1937 in Kent, Connecticut, leaving behind his widow, Anna Gardner, and two children.

In 1906, Schladermundt served on the executive committee of the Architectural League of New York with Henry Hornbostel.22 Within a year, he would begin work on windows for Hornbostel’s Rodef Shalom. They include the two center windows on each side of the sanctuary, the lunette over the main entrance (the center of which was later altered), the central skylight, and the narrow rectangular windows in the vestibule and chamfered piers.23 Unlike the figural work by the Willets, Schladermundt’s designs reflect a return to more established Jewish iconography and geometric forms.24

Title: Unknown.
Location: Sanctuary, center of west wall.
Date: 1907.
Theme/Imagery: A combination of interwoven geometric patterns and, in richly colored medallions, the Twelve Tribes of Israel.
Dedication: “In Loving Memory of Joseph and Jennie Lehman.”

Title: Unknown.
Location: Sanctuary, center of east wall.
Date: 1907.
Theme/Imagery: A combination of interwoven geometric patterns and, in richly colored medallions, the Twelve Tribes of Israel.
Dedication: “In Loving Memory of Minnie W. and Joseph H. Ruben.”

---

20 Ibid.
25 The text panel appears at first to be a memorial panel, suggesting that the Rubens were deceased. However, it was actually a living tribute. Joseph H. Ruben, the founder of McKeesport’s Ruben’s Furniture Store, did not die until 1936, followed by his wife in 1975, leaving no children.
Title: “The Eye of God,” a later appellation attributed to Pittsburgh architectural historian James D. Van Trump.  
Location: Skylight over sanctuary.  
Date: 1907.  
Theme/Imagery: An elaborate geometric abstraction with multiple borders, interwoven circles, and paired Stars of David in the corners of the central field.  
Dedication: None known.

Title: “Seek Peace and Pursue It,” a name derived from modifications to the window in 1969 (see Arnold Bank, below).  
Location: Above front entrance.  
Date: 1907; modified 1969.  
Theme/Imagery: A monumental semicircular lunette intersected vertically by two pairs of parallel vertical mullions that continue the lines of the exterior polychromatic terra cotta flanking the center entry door below. Only the very outer, concentric, geometric borders of the current window were designed by Schladermundt. Until it was altered, the center of the lunette contained a colorful motif of leaping flames (sometimes also described as a sunburst). The innermost remaining border by Schladermundt is similar in pattern and scale to the outermost border in his two sanctuary windows.  
Dedication: None known for Schladermundt’s design.

As mentioned, Schladermundt is also credited with creating the narrow rectangular windows in the vestibule and chamfered piers.

Arnold Bank (1908-1986)
Arnold Bank was a nationally-known artist and teacher from Pittsburgh. Known primarily for his calligraphy and typography, his work included the lettering for the serialization of Ernest Hemingway’s *The Old Man and the Sea* in *Life Magazine* (1 September 1952) and the inscription in the memorial to John D. Rockefeller, Jr. in New York City. He was born in 1908 in Harlem and began his career as a sign painter. In 1941, he became art director at *Time Magazine*. He later became an instructor of lettering and layout at Cooper Union and also taught at Pratt Institute and the Royal College of Art in London, before joining the faculty at Carnegie Mellon University in 1960.  

Title: “Seek Peace and Pursue It.”  
Location: Above the front entrance.  
Date: 1907 (Schladermundt); modified in 1969 by Bank.  
Theme/Imagery: Bank replaced Schladermundt’s central sunburst with the arcing inscription “Seek Peace and Pursue It” (from Psalm 34:14), interspersed with symbolic doves of peace. He filled the center field with a stylized rainbow of geometric shapes (with colors moving through the spectrum from red just below the doves to violet at the center/bottom).  
Dedication: “This window was dedicated in memory of Carrie Arnold Weinhaus, 1875-1967, “A woman that feareth the Lord shall be praised,” Proverbs 31:30.”

---

RELGIOUS EDUCATION WING—EXTERIOR

Form/Materials

The religious education wing (also known historically as the religious school) is located to the northwest of the sanctuary, with its primary entrance facing Devonshire Street. Designed by Ingham & Boyd and completed in 1938, it adjoined the rear Sunday school wing, which underwent considerable renovation and partial demolition as part of the same building campaign (see Construction Chronology: Religious Education Wing). The wing is rectangular in massing and consists of two floors with a partially exposed basement on its north façade. Exterior walls of the west/primary façade are cream-colored brick laid in a Flemish bond, while secondary facades (i.e., north and south) are cream colored brick laid in a common bond. All facades contain cream-colored terra cotta and limestone accents, many of which contain subtle Art Deco motifs. Roofs throughout the wing are flat and covered with EPDM.

West Façade

The west/primary façade of the religious education wing is five bays wide and is set back about forty feet from Devonshire Street (Photo 19). The space between the sidewalk and the building is occupied by two flights of broad concrete steps with four aluminum handrails that create travel paths aligned with three arched entries in the center bay. Flanking the lower flight and first landing are low limestone wall. Flanking the second flight are rectangular limestone piers whose caps step back and terminate in an Art Deco-inspired fluted band (Photo 20). Flanking the top landing are ornamental aluminum railings from Pittsburgh’s Blumcraft Company, which contain stylized Art Deco motifs of leaves and sheaves of grain. Extending from each side of the top landing is a terra cotta water table featuring palm leaf motifs. Evergreen hedges line both sides of the stairs. To the north is a large shade tree and some low hedges on the edge of the rear parking lot.

The west façade features an entrance vestibule at the head of the stairs in the center bay, which projects about two feet beyond the main mass of the building. As noted, it contains three tall entry arches, which relate visually to the three arched window openings on each side of the sanctuary. The intrados and side walls of each arch are clad in terra cotta decorated with stylized Art Deco floral and leaf patterns, including fiddleheads, and a variation of the eight-pointed terra cotta stars found on the 1907 sanctuary (Photo 21). At the top of each arch is a recessed leaded glass light fixture. Set within each two-story arch are paired, single-lite, stained wood entry doors with a six-lite window with cast iron mullions above, all of which are surrounded by deep-green (nearly black) marble panels. The marble lintels above each door feature Art Deco wave designs. Above each entry arch is a flush, semicircular brick arch consisting of eight concentric header (or rowlock) courses. Above this is a frieze of terra cotta, bounded on its top and bottom by simple blocks of limestone that extends across all five bays of the west façade. It features motifs of grapes and leaves interspersed with two carved, bas-relief, stone medallions (one featuring urns overflowing with fruits and vines, the other featuring a menorah). The walls of the center bay extend above the frieze and are capped by fluted, Art Deco-inspired bands of carved stone that match those found on the cheek walls of the entry stairs.

On each side of the center vestibule, in bays 2 and 4 (counting from north to south) is a two-story, single bay that projects about one foot from the main mass of the building (i.e., from bays 1 and 5). In the basement level, each contains a narrow, punched window covered by an aluminum grill featuring Stars of David and other geometric designs. Aligned above each basement window is a similar, two-story window and grille, each containing a decorative limestone sill with a projecting pyramid motif reminiscent of that found on the sanctuary.29 The outermost bays of the west façade (1 and 5) continue the same materials and design elements, but contain no openings.

South Façade

The south façade of the religious education wing is fourteen bays wide (Photos 6 and 7). Counting from west to east, doors are located in bays 1 (at grade), 5 (stairs down from the first floor to grade) and 9 (ramp down to grade). The latter two being later additions. There are also doors at grade in a single-story brick vestibule addition that projects from bays 13 and 14 (late-twentieth century). Interspersed among the doors are three window wells that provide illumination to basement classrooms. The water table from the west facade continues across this façade, as does the simple limestone band that tops the frieze (on this façade, it becomes the parapet cap). However, the terra cotta frieze that originally extended across this façade is no longer present, having been removed as part of parapet repairs in the late-twentieth century. Bays 2 through 13 contain Art Deco-inspired inset window bays with narrow stacked windows separated by limestone spandrels. The windows are one-over-one, double-hung sashes, with the top sashes being smaller than the bottom sashes (ca. 2000-03). A similar window is located above the doors in bays 1 and 14. At the base of these is a carved limestone spandrel panel featuring vertical Art Deco wave motifs; above is a carved limestone lintel featuring a Star of David.

---

29 Like the aluminum railings, the window grilles are believed to have been designed and fabricated by the Blumcraft Company.
North Façade
The north façade (Photo 22) is identical to the south façade, with the following exceptions: it is sixteen bays wide (with doors to grade in the eastern- and westernmost bays); it has a partially exposed basement level with one continuous window well (the windows are set below the terra cotta water table that continues from the west façade and they align with the stacked windows on the floors above); the terra cotta frieze and both bands of limestone from the west façade continue across the top of the façade (serving as a cornice). Between the window well and the sidewalk that runs along the south edge of the parking lot are planting beds and enclosures for mechanical/electrical equipment. The enclosures are constructed of piers of matching brick and black aluminum fencing and gates. Similar fencing runs along the north edge of the window well.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION WING—INTERIOR
The interior of the religious education wing consists of classrooms on all three floors arranged along the north and south walls with a double-height auditorium in the center. Between the classrooms and auditorium on each floor is an east-west corridor that connects the wing to the rest of the building. On the west end of the first floor, the parallel corridors are connected by the auditorium lobby. Its finishes include original terrazzo flooring, walls clad in bands of white marble, and a painted plaster ceiling consisting of a grid of shallow coffers of concentric squares with a plaster flower in each center (Photo 23). The remaining two arms of the first-floor corridor were renovated ca. 2000-03 and contain contemporary finishes, like broadloom carpet and walls and ceilings of painted drywall. All classrooms throughout the wing were renovated at the same time and are similarly finished with broadloom carpet and the addition of suspended tile ceilings.

The central auditorium is dedicated to Rabbi J. Leonard Levy, and is known as Levy Hall. It features two seating groups separated by a center aisle, a raised wooden stage at its east end (that can double as a bima for religious services), and a clerestory that contains bands of stained glass windows (Photo 24). A newspaper report covering the December 1938 dedication ceremonies indicates that “decorations in the school building, which adjoins the temple, were copied after those in a temple in Essen, ‘the Pittsburgh of Germany.’” Further research is needed to confirm if this included the clerestory windows. Current finishes date from ca. 2000-03 renovations, which also reduced the footprint and seating capacity of the auditorium (to provide rooms on the perimeter) and added second-floor balconies on the north and south sides.

In the basement, the corridors are connected on the west by an additional corridor (creating a U-shaped plan). Finishes are largely original and include terrazzo flooring and a high wainscot of structural glazed tile. Ceilings consist of suspended tiles with painted plaster walls above. Lighting is provided by bands of fluorescent fixtures at the tops of the walls that contain perforated front panels that allow light to shine through various images of Jewish iconography.

On the second floor, the corridors are connected on the west by a large multipurpose room (ca. 2000-03). Illuminating the space are the three large arched windows above the Devonshire Street entry doors. Corridors are finished in broadloom carpet, walls contain a tile wainscot, and ceilings are suspended tiles (all ca. 2000-03). The bands of perforated light fixtures in the basement are repeated here.

SOCIAL HALL WING—EXTERIOR
Form/Materials
The social hall wing (designed by Sharove & Lefkowitz and completed in 1956) is located to the north and east of the sanctuary, with its primary entrance facing Morewood Avenue (see Construction Chronology: Social Hall Wing). It consists of a series of rectangular volumes with flat, EPDM-covered roofs. The wing provides space for two primary functions: An Administration/Reception Area (two floors plus basement) immediately north of the sanctuary, adjoining the religious education wing (largely in the footprint of the 1907 Sunday School wing); and The Solomon B. Freehof Social Hall—a cavernous single-story assembly space of over 7,800 square feet (plus adjacent support spaces) to the east. Walls are clad in cream-colored brick laid in a common bond along with limestone accents (visually unifying both wings and the sanctuary).

East Façade
The east/primary façade of the social hall wing is nine bays wide and set back about forty feet from Morewood Avenue (Photo 25). The space between the sidewalk and building is occupied by a concrete plaza that leads to a stylized, seven-bay  

30 Spaces in the basement are arranged around unexcavated space beneath the auditorium.
wide, central entry portico of rectilinear limestone blocks. Bays 4, 5 and 6 (counting from south to north) contain paired, stained wood, 4-panel entry doors with a single-lite transom above. Bay 4 has been modified to contain a concrete ADA ramp with stainless steel handrails (late-twentieth century). Bays 1 and 9 are recessed about six feet behind the portico and are solid brick (i.e., no openings), with a limestone water table and limestone parapet (they conceal anterooms off the main vestibule). In front of these outermost bays, to each side of the entry plaza, are two-tier, rectangular, limestone planters containing evergreen shrubs and small ornamental trees. To the north are two large shade trees and some low hedges that create a buffer from the rear parking lot.

**South Façade**
The south façade of the social hall wing faces Morewood Lawn and Fifth Avenue and consists primarily of three volumes/planes (Photo 26). To the west, and projecting farthest to the south, is Wechsler Gallery (originally a simple vestibule that welcomed visitors entering from Fifth Avenue across Morewood Lawn; it was renovated ca. 2000-03 to also be a museum/display space). Its first story consists of a stylized, three-bay wide, entry portico of rectilinear limestone blocks. Above, is a sculpture by Kent C. Bloomer (b. 1935), titled *Relief* that was installed in 1965 (Photo 27). Bloomer, who taught at Carnegie Tech (now Carnegie Mellon University) won an invitational competition to create an outdoor sculpture that would visually connect the 1907 sanctuary and 1956 social hall. Constructed on a Styrofoam base covered with epoxy, fiberglass and Wirand (an innovative, lightweight reinforced concrete product), the sculpture features seven parallel rows of waves, the amplitude of which decreases as the rows ascend. The result is a dynamic work with strong horizontal and uplifting qualities. Its visual effect changes throughout the day and the year as the shadows cast by the waves are constantly moving.

In the center of the façade is the five-bay wide south wall of Freehof Hall, with Deaktor Terrace extending across its base (Photos 4 and 26). Executed in brick with a water table and parapet of limestone, the façade’s three center bays contain two-lite glass doors topped by transoms consisting of three horizontal lites. This horizontal fenestration is repeated in the two flanking bays, where four lites are arranged above an operable fifth lite at the bottom. The doors and windows are all accented with broad, flat surrounds of limestone. To the east, and recessed slightly to the north, is the vestibule’s south anteroom (Photo 26). Its façade is two bays wide, with each bay containing windows similar to those in the center façade (except that they contain frosted glass to conceal restrooms for the social hall and have limestone window surrounds that are smaller in scale). The lower limestone planter, limestone water table and limestone parapet continue from the east façade.

**North Façade**
The north façade of the social hall wing also consists primarily of three volumes/planes (Photo 28). The largest extends from the religious education wing eastward to about the midpoint of Freehof Hall (it contains various administrative functions, the social hall kitchen, and an addition to the kitchen from 2000) and is interrupted at its middle by the two-story porte-cochere addition (ca. 2000-03; see description below). This façade contains a limestone-capped water table and limestone parapet and ribbon windows that primarily consist of three one-over-one double-hung sashes grouped together. In the kitchen area, the ribbons are half the height and consist of three adjacent single-lite sashes. To the east (and recessed a full bay to the south) is a two-bay wide section of the north wall of Freehof Hall. It repeats the water table, parapet and window details from the hall’s corresponding south façade. To the east, and recessed slightly to the south, is the vestibule’s north anteroom. Its façade matches that of the south anteroom and conceals kitchen/event support space.

**SOCIAL HALL WING—INTERIOR**

**Administration/Reception Area**
The Administration/Reception portion of the social hall wing, in the center of the building immediately north of the sanctuary, underwent a near total renovation between 2000 and 2003. Led by the Pittsburgh architecture firm The Design Alliance, the work updated finishes and created new spaces resulting in an archive in the basement; a reception desk, Commons Area (Photo 29), library, and chapel on the first floor; and classrooms, a large central office suite, board room and support spaces on the second floor. The chapel, dedicated to Judge Josiah Cohen Chapel, was created in 1938 from part of the former Sunday School auditorium and features richly paneled walls, a cornice and ceiling of decorative plaster, rows of wooden pews, a bima and marble-clad ark at the east end, and two stained glass windows (in the center of the north and south walls) from Pittsburgh’s Aurora Art Glass Company.33 The board room, also known as the Falk Library, was first conceived as part of the Fanny Edel Falk Memorial, an addition to the Sunday School wing by Palmer & Hornbostel (1912) that also

---

contained a gymnasium and swimming pool. When the Falk Memorial was demolished as part of the 1956 construction and renovations, many of the room’s finishes were relocated to the current second floor space, including much of the wood paneling and casework along with “five mural paintings, copies of celebrated works by old world masters. . .[by] J.W. Flenders, a local artist. . .”34

At the north end of Administration/Reception Area, an entry vestibule was created adjacent to a new rear porte-cochere. It features an elevator in a central, round, marble-clad shaft, wrapped by curved flights of stairs. On the curved walls adjacent to the stairs are large painted frames that contain display cases, with the frames reflecting the design of the wide bands of polychromatic terra cotta and the central pediment of the vestibule at the Fifth Avenue entrance. Serving as the primary vertical circulation in the building, the elevator and stairs connect the basement, first and second floors.

With the exception of the chapel and board room, finishes tend to be contemporary (e.g., broadloom carpet, painted plaster walls, broad graceful archways to define major public spaces, and ceilings with a variety of decorative finishes and special lighting).

**Freehof Hall and Adjacent Spaces**

To the east, the remainder of the 1956 construction effort is dominated by Freehof Hall—measuring approximately 94-feet wide (north-south) and 83-feet deep (east west). Freehof Hall is noteworthy for the enormity of its single, large, clear-span assembly space uninterrupted by vertical supports (Photo 30). A simple paneled wood wainscot and crown molding encircle the room along with a frieze that contains the names of donors. Overhead, recessed into the ceiling, are three dramatic oval lighting coves.

To the north of Freehof Hall is a large kitchen to support catering and events (enlarged to the east in 2000-03). To the east is the hall’s entry vestibule from Morewood Avenue along with its anterooms. To the south, doors open onto Deaktor Terrace. To the east are Wechsler Gallery (Photo 31) and Aaron Court (Photo 32), two spaces that attained their current forms and finishes as part of the 2000-03 renovations. The former was originally a simple, square vestibule that welcomed visitors entering from Fifth Avenue across Morewood Lawn; it was redesigned to now also be a museum/display space. The latter, located immediately north of Wechsler Gallery (and connecting to Freehof Hall and the Commons Area), was originally an open-air room that was since covered with a gable-roofed skylight. It features a flagstone floor, brick and limestone walls, open skylight truss work, and the clever concealment of HVAC ductwork at the second-floor level behind a screen of metal panels featuring stylized menorahs. Except for small storage areas beneath the kitchen addition and north anteroom, there is no basement beneath Freehof Hall.
8. HISTORY
The temple at 4905 Fifth Avenue is the third in the history of Rodef Shalom Congregation, the oldest and historically largest Jewish congregation in western Pennsylvania.

**Founding and Early History of Rodef Shalom Congregation, 1847-1860**
In 1847, twelve Jewish immigrants on the North Side, then Allegheny City, formed a burial society, Bes Almon—Mourners’ House—for the purpose of establishing a Jewish cemetery on Troy Hill. The next year, the group began meeting in a rented room for religious services as the Shaare Shamayim congregation. Pittsburgh’s Jewish population grew with the advent of direct train service into the city in 1852. In 1855, Shaare Shamayim split into two factions, one Polish, the other German. Calling itself Rodef Shalom, or “Pursuer of Peace,” the German congregation received its official charter in 1859. Its articles of association expressed the need for a German religious society to facilitate Jewish worship and establish a school for the instruction of the young in “the Hebrew religion as well as general branches of knowledge.”

Rodef Shalom Congregation’s first home was a rented hall on St. Clair Street in Allegheny which it occupied beginning in 1859. At this time, it had about 35 members and 50 pupils. Shaare Shamayim merged back together with Rodef Shalom in 1860. Since Shaare Shamayim never obtained an official charter, the congregation kept the name Rodef Shalom.

**Eighth Street Temples and the Pittsburgh Platform, 1861-1904**
Also in 1860, the congregation started a day school and purchased property on Hancock Street (now Eighth Street) between Penn Avenue and Hancock Way in downtown Pittsburgh. The location placed Judaism prominently in the center of the city and proclaimed that Jews were in Pittsburgh to stay. The congregation hired the German architect Charles Bartherberger to design the first of two temples there (Figure 1). At its dedication in 1862, this was the only synagogue in western Pennsylvania. Its members prayed and sang in their native German.

In the late nineteenth century, Rodef Shalom established itself as a leader in a transition from Orthodox Judaism to a more liberal observance of Jewish law, known as Reform Judaism. The Reform movement started in Germany as an Enlightenment effort to reconcile ancient texts and traditions with modern reason. In the United States, its less demanding system held appeal as a blend of Jewish ethical tradition and American democratic ideals. In 1863, a majority of Rodef Shalom’s congregation voted to realign its practices with Reform Judaism: services were shortened, women were permitted to sit with men in the temple, men were not required to wear skull caps or prayer shawls, and an organ was introduced to accompany traditional songs. The minority, who were mainly from Poland, Lithuania, and Holland, broke off and formed the Orthodox Tree of Life congregation.

In 1885, Rabbi Lippman Mayer, leader of the congregation from 1870-1901, hosted a national convention of like-minded rabbis that led to the Pittsburgh Platform, an enduring articulation of the definition of Reform Judaism. It held that Judaism was a religion, not a nation; that the Bible was an ethical guide, not the infallible word of God; and that American Jews need not keep kosher. The Pittsburgh Platform guided Reform Judaism until 1937, when the movement adopted a different platform.

For the first decades after the Civil War, the congregation had a stable membership of between 100-150 families, most of whom still resided across the river in Allegheny and spoke German as their daily language. But at the end of the nineteenth century, surging immigration from central and eastern Europe diversified the congregation and caused its membership to outgrow its first sanctuary. Rodef Shalom demolished this and built a second, larger temple, designed by architect Charles Bickel, on the same site in 1901 (Figure 2). It raised the funds, in part, through the sale of pew certificates entitling the holders to assigned pews in desirable locations in the sanctuary. This mode of organizing the worship space, and the
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congregation, by financial position would follow the congregation through its next twenty years of physical and social history (Figure 3).

Under Rabbi J. Leonard Levy, who succeeded Rabbi Lippman in the same year the new temple was dedicated, the congregation continued to swell. It reached 300 families by the time the 1901 temple opened. By 1905, 450 families were members. While many were new immigrants, others were the children of established members. They had been born in the United States and spoke English as their native tongue. Rabbi Levy was an Englishman who been deliberately selected, in part, for his ability to lead an Americanizing congregation in English. As a result, the congregation began to transition from services in German and Hebrew to services in English and Hebrew. This congregation sold the Eighth Street property to its neighbor, the Second Presbyterian Church, and sought a new, still larger home.

Planning and Construction of Rodef Shalom in Shadyside, 1905-1907
For its next move, the congregation looked beyond Allegheny and Downtown Pittsburgh, east to the burgeoning neighborhoods of Oakland and Shadyside. Oakland’s bucolic, non-industrialized character had made it a desirable country retreat before the Civil War. Oakland was annexed to Pittsburgh in 1868, and in the late nineteenth century, a series of improvements in public transit made the area increasingly accessible for residential and commercial development. Just beyond Oakland, Shadyside developed as a leafy upper-middle to upper-class streetcar suburb, with Fifth Avenue the spine of so-called Millionaire’s Row. In the decades just before and after the turn of the twentieth century, the establishment of Schenley Park, Schenley Farms, and the unparalleled concentration of cultural and educational institutions in the Oakland Civic Center cemented the area’s attractiveness to Pittsburgh’s social elite.

These wealthy new residents of Schenley Farms and Shadyside brought their religious institutions with them, building new, monumental houses of worship in Oakland and eastward. Bellefield Presbyterian Church, already established in the area, worshipped in a new stone church designed by Frederick Osterling beginning in 1889; the next year, Shadyside Presbyterian moved into a large, Romanesque church by Shepley, Rutan, and Coolidge amid the mansions of Amberson Avenue. First United Presbyterian Church moved from its original home downtown into a new building by Thomas Boyd in Oakland in 1896; the Roman Catholic Diocese of Pittsburgh began construction of a new St. Paul’s Cathedral to the design of Chicago architects Egan and Prindeville in 1903; and the First Congregational Church by Thomas Hannah (now St. Nicholas Greek Orthodox Church) was completed in 1904.

In this context, “[a]n architectural statement was in order.” Rodef Shalom Congregation brought comparable wealth and aspiration to the site it chose for its new synagogue at the juncture between Oakland and Shadyside. In 1905, it paid $60,000 for the lot fronting Fifth Avenue in the middle of the block between Devonshire Street and Morewood Avenue from the estate of Bernard Rafferty. The lot was vacant; Rafferty had cleared it of the house of its previous owner, Samuel Keys, but died in 1891 before building on it himself. The property was one of three fronting Fifth Avenue in this block. To its west stood the large brick Queen Anne Style mansion of the Pinkerton family. To the east, the former E.M. Ferguson estate, which extended through the block from Fifth Avenue to Castleman Street, had been subdivided into three residential lots along Morewood Avenue ca. 1895. William R. Holmes had purchased two of the lots, building on one and leaving the other, at the corner of Fifth and Morewood, vacant (Figure 4).

Rodef Shalom formed a building committee headed by Marcus Aaron and held a competition for the architect of its new sanctuary. It provided a “Programme” stipulating an auditorium to seat 1450 with no more than 350 in a rear gallery; space for a full pipe organ and choir gallery; and provision for “other functions in the fields of educational, charitable, and social work.” The Programme specified the nature and size of Sunday school classrooms, a Sunday school auditorium, and a rabbi’s study, and called for the incorporation of four stained glass windows, known as the Memorial Windows, salvaged from the 1901 temple on 8th Street. It called for construction and finishes to be inexpensive—not to exceed $150,000—but elegant, with exterior walls of local brick and terra cotta, interior walls of tinted plaster with hardwood trim, leaded glass windows, and steam and forced air heat. The area of the building was not to exceed one million cubic feet, and it was to be designed for the contingency that the adjoining lots would someday be occupied by buildings built by others—perhaps a reason for the skylighted inner dome.

The committee invited six architecture firms to submit designs, for which they were paid $250 each. The six were: Allison & Allison of Pittsburgh; Charles Bickel of Pittsburgh; Albert Kahn of Detroit; Palmer and Hornbostel of New York; Pilcher &
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Tachau of New York; and George Post & Sons of New York. It awarded the project to Palmer & Hornbostel. Henry Hornbostel was a New York architect educated at Columbia University and the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris. Hornbostel had been brought to Pittsburgh by Andrew Carnegie to serve as the first Dean of Architecture at the Carnegie Technical Institute, precursor to Carnegie Mellon University, and had designed the school’s campus. From the 1890s through 1921, Hornbostel worked in partnership with George Carnegie Palmer. For the design of the sanctuary’s vaulted dome, Hornbostel originally specified a steel frame structure. Just before construction, he changed the structure from steel to Guastavino tile for a savings of $11,000.\(^48\) To design the new structure of the dome, he engaged Rafael Guastavino himself, a Spanish builder who pioneered the modern use of strong, weatherproof, fireproof terra cotta tile in the Catalan vault.

The building committee had asked for a design “fitting … for a synagogue in some style other than Moorish or Roman adaptation,” which it believed were cliche and overdone. It wanted a design both traditional and modern: “[T]he appearance of the building should be that of a house of worship for Jews and of modern aspect.”\(^49\) At Rodef Shalom, Hornbostel employed the same material vocabulary of buff brick and glazed terra cotta that distinguished his campus buildings for Carnegie Tech. The vividly-colored glazes used at Rodef Shalom were among the earliest applications of this process to produce polychromatic terra cotta ornament.

Built by contractor Thomas Reilly, the sanctuary and adjoining Sunday school and administration wing were completed in time for Rosh Hashanah services in 1907. (Figures 6-9; see Construction Chronology: Original Building). The cost of the building, $250,000, was substantially more than what the congregation had budgeted and placed it into debt. At the request of Rabbi Levy, it was not dedicated until the debt was cleared in 1917. Rabbi Levy died only three days after the final payment was made, resulting in the temple’s dedication during his funeral.\(^50\)

**Beginnings of a Campus, 1911-1937**

In the first decades of the twentieth century, Rodef Shalom Congregation continued to grow and diversify along with the Jewish populations of Pittsburgh and the United States. The move to Shadyside allowed the congregation to develop not only a new temple, but a multi-purpose campus to serve the broad needs of its large congregation. In 1911-12, it again commissioned Palmer & Hornbostel to design an addition to the rear Sunday school/administration wing. Known as the Fanny Edel Falk Memorial, this consisted of a swimming pool and library behind the existing building and a third floor over the eastern portion of the wing containing a gymnasium and caretaker’s apartment (Figure 10; see Construction Chronology: Fanny Edel Falk Memorial).

As the twentieth century progressed, many members of the congregation began to question the assigned pew system which had helped fund the second Eighth Street temple, but organized Rodef Shalom’s worship space by an aristocracy of wealth. This system had been effectively transferred to the Shadyside temple, where it was overseen by a Pew Committee. In the early 1920s, the Board of Trustees formed a new, special committee to study the issue of assigned pews. The outcome, issued in 1922, abolished the assigned pews system. By allowing all members to seat themselves in the sanctuary on a first-come, first-served basis, it democratized the worship space of Rodef Shalom. Membership soared from 549 in 1920 to 1,128 in 1922.\(^51\)

With this extraordinary growth came a large increase in school enrollment, and the congregation redoubled its efforts to purchase the properties adjacent to the temple. In 1928, it was able to acquire the former Pinkerton estate to the west from its then-owner, Edward F. Jackman. However, plans to build were put on hold when the country plunged into the Great Depression the next year. Instead, the congregation converted the existing house on the lot into makeshift classrooms. In 1933, the financial crisis at the temple was so dire, closure loomed as a real possibility, but the congregation eked by.

By 1937, circumstances had improved to the point where a special committee was able to raise $325,000 to raze the former Pinkerton house and build a religious school on the property.

**The Religious School, 1938**

Founded in 1938 to the design of the reputable local firm of Ingham & Boyd, the school has a symmetrical design facing Devonshire Street (Figure 12; see Construction Chronology: Religious Education Wing). Its plan consists of two classroom wings flanking a central 320-seat auditorium (Levy Hall). Interior to the complex, the congregation modified its former Sunday school auditorium into a small chapel, the Cohen Chapel. S.M. Seisel Company was the contractor.
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For this commission, Ingham & Boyd partnered with Alfred M. Marks, a Carnegie Tech-educated architect and Rodef Shalom congregation member whose contribution appears to have been the design of Levy Hall within the school. Marks went on to design, with partner Elkan Avner, the sanctuary for Tree of Life congregation in Squirrel Hill (1963).

The Falk Memorial addition was diminished in the course of this new work and ultimately removed with the subsequent addition of Freehof Hall (see below). In 1926, the construction of the Young Men’s and Women’s Hebrew Association (the “Jewish Y”) nearby on Bellefield Street provided swimming and athletic facilities to Jewish patrons, making it unnecessary for Rodef Shalom to maintain its own. Accordingly, the congregation removed the third-floor gymnasium and infilled the swimming pool on its campus to create a social hall. To this, it added a kitchen.

**Solomon B. Freehof Hall, 1954-1956**

World War II delayed further expansion plans. It was not until 1949 that the congregation was finally able to acquire the key corner property long held by William R. and Nathaniel Holmes at Fifth and Morewood (Figure 13). In 1954, the congregation purchased an additional lot just north of the Holmes property fronting Morewood. Like many of the congregation’s previous land purchases, this one was made through an intermediary. In his 1996 study of the physical spaces of Rodef Shalom, Rosenzweig suggests that the wealthy gentile property owners of west Shadyside might have been unwilling to directly facilitate the expansion of the Jewish synagogue.52

However, amid the general prosperity and baby boom of the 1950s, expand it did. By June of 1954, the congregation had raised over $708,000 and set a goal of $900,000 toward the construction of a new addition to its campus, Solomon B. Freehof Hall (Figure 14). Architects Alexander Sharove and Harry Lefkowitz fully embraced a powerful but minimalist Modern aesthetic in the design of this wing, which was completed in 1956 facing Morewood Avenue (see Construction Chronology: Social Hall Wing). A new classroom wing was also constructed at the north of the complex, connecting the new Freehof Hall to the 1938 school and expanding the school’s capacity to 1200 students. Along with Freehof Hall and the social hall, this framed an open courtyard, Aaron Court. At the time of Freehof Hall’s dedication the congregation counted over 2000 members.

**Modern Development, 1961-Present**

The final property acquisition, a lot fronting Devonshire just north of the school, was recorded in 1961, completing the present site of the Rodef Shalom Congregation. The present parking lot was constructed north of the temple and through the block from Morewood to Devonshire shortly afterward (Figure 14). An entry vestibule was added on the parking lot side in 1979, and the Biblical Garden was created on the Pinkerton-Jackman lot in 1986. The fencing of this part of the property likely dates to that time. A comprehensive exterior and interior restoration of Rodef Shalom by the New York firm of Ehrenkrantz, Eckstut, & Whitelaw took place in 1989-1990. In 2000-03, a porte-cochere and stair/elevator tower on the parking lot side of the complex replaced the 1979 entry vestibule; Aaron Court was enclosed; and Deaktor Court was created along the south side of Freehof Hall (see Construction Chronology: Porte Cochere and Interior Renovations).

Rodef Shalom was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1977.

9. **SIGNIFICANCE**

According to that legislation in Section 1.4 of the Pittsburgh Historic Preservation Ordinance, *Criteria for Designation*, a building must meet at least one of the following criteria in order to be designated:

1. Its location as a site of a significant historic or prehistoric event or activity: *Rodef Shalom does not meet this criterion for designation.*

2. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the cultural, historic, architectural, archaeological, or related aspects of the development of the City of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States: *Rodef Shalom does not meet this criterion for designation.*

3. Its exemplification of an architectural type, style or design distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship: *Rodef Shalom meets this criterion for designation.*
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Temple Rodef Shalom is significant as a skillfully designed example of Beaux Arts and Modern French design principles uniquely and creatively adapted to the specific program needs of a progressive, early-twentieth-century Jewish congregation. As noted, Henry Hornbostel had been educated at the École des Beaux Arts in Paris, which espoused the combining of classical architecture from ancient Greece and Rome with Renaissance ideals. The result being an "elaborate, historic, and eclectic architecture, designed on a monumental scale."53

The Pennsylvania Architectural Field Guide developed by the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission indicates that the Beaux Arts style was utilized in Pennsylvania largely during the time period from 1885 to 1930:

The Beaux Arts style, named for the premier French school of architecture, the École des Beaux Arts, was introduced to the United States by American architects like Richard Morris Hunt [1827-1895], who attended the prestigious school in the late nineteenth-century. Hunt designed the Newport, Rhode Island mansion of Cornelius Vanderbilt, "The Breakers," in this style in 1892. The Beaux Arts style was most often seen in places where turn-of-the-century wealth was concentrated, major urban centers, and resort communities. The popularity of this style was advanced by the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893. With its grandiose treatment of classic architectural forms, the Beaux Arts style was seen as an ideal expression of both corporate wealth and civic pride. Buildings of this style are both formal and monumental with abundant and opulent decorative details. The Beaux Arts style is especially suited for public buildings designed to deliver a strong symbolic message, such as libraries, museums, court houses, train stations, and government offices. Privately owned Beaux Arts style mansions delivered a message as well, one of personal wealth. This style was popular in an era of great American palace-building marked by eclectic use of historic architectural themes and elements.

For Hornbostel, his formal education served merely as a starting point. For the design of Rodef Shalom, he stripped the Beaux Arts style back to its essential elements and compositional strategies—like symmetry, monumentality and order—and deliberately omitted the near-requisite classicism of the 1893 Exposition’s White City, which architects before him had felt compelled to apply to earlier American synagogues. Instead, he provided the Rodef Shalom Congregation with originality and responsiveness to their desired architectural Programme, believing that the classical Beaux Arts tradition was not dogmatic, but rather was alterable to suit contemporary needs. This more flexible adaptation of the style has come to be known by architectural historians as Modern French Architecture.55

Hornbostel scholar Charles Rosenblum states that “Hornbostel . . . used classical orders and other historical motifs only when they suited his purposes, and he could just as easily stray from the use of canonical historical form. He was fascinated by the forms and materials of industry, and he was eager to incorporate them prominently into his architecture, whether or not they directly conformed to architectural tradition. He embraced bridges and skyscrapers—new, technological construction types—that his more conservative colleagues sometimes refused even to acknowledge as architecture. He enjoyed inventing new forms of ornament. Hornbostel saw Beaux Arts training not as a narrow set of historical forms to be applied to all building, but as a set of principles to be reworked to suit contemporary materials, conditions and building types. His permutation of the Beaux Arts was formally progressive rather than anachronistic."56

Hornbostel’s design for Rodef Shalom, which was widely and repeatedly published, is significant for directly reflecting the principles of the Pittsburgh Platform, which articulated “a view of the Hebrew Bible that is distinctly inflected by Enlightenment philosophy in an effort to reconcile ancient texts and practices with the views of a Progressive age.”57 The Platform concluded, "We recognize in Judaism a progressive religion, ever striving to be in accord with the postulates of

---

56 Rosenblum, 3.
57 Ibid., 191, 197.
reason. We are convinced of the utmost necessity of preserving the historical identity with our great past.” These final words of the Platform could easily have described Hornbostel's approach to Beaux Arts architecture and the design of Rodef Shalom, “in which a belief system with roots in an almost impossibly ancient past willingly changed to accommodate the reason and culture of the contemporary age.”

The result is a building that stands out as a unique visual and architectural landmark on Fifth Avenue—amidst all of its other Beaux Arts designs—and that continues to serve its congregation well, allowing it to grow and adapt more than a century after it was conceived. Walter C. Kidney, the late architectural historian of the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Foundation, praised Hornbostel's originality: “Using his favorite materials, cream-colored brick and terra cotta, he created a compact, massive structure that appears as a simple enclosure of the inner spaces. To dramatize the skyline of the building, yet emphasize the space within, he covered the temple itself with a great Louvre dome of cream-colored terra cotta ribs and green roof tiles. To enliven the brick wall surfaces, he inserted bands of terra cotta that serve as well to tie together details that might otherwise have seemed to drift in such large plain areas. At the entrance he put a pediment with a menorah against a stained-glass window of leaping flames.”

In 1980, the late Franklin Toker, then a noted architectural historian at the University of Pittsburgh, called the Shadyside landmark “one of the most monumental and interesting buildings in Pittsburgh.” Within a few years, he intensified his praise, concluding in 1986 that “This may be the best synagogue in the United States, competing works by Peter Harrison, Frank Lloyd Wright, and other luminaries notwithstanding. Hornbostel won the commission in competition against the much better-known Albert Kahn, and the result is one of his two or three best works.

When constructed, the building was noteworthy for a number of design features, including the following:

- **Innovative use of polychromatic terra cotta ornament, or architectural faience.** Architectural historian and scholar of synagogue architecture Samuel D. Gruber notes that “One of the significant innovations in the [building’s] design was the introduction of color—both inside and out. The architectural press of the time stated that the work was ‘so artistically accomplished as to present an attractive and harmonious effect. The entrance feature and the frieze that encircles the building executed by the Atlantic Terra Cotta Co., may be regarded as one of the most successful attempts in this direction that has been accomplished in this country. The entire building, with its green dome, buff brick, the polychromatic effect of the terra-cotta, presents an effect highly creditable to the architect and a delightfully restful spot in what would otherwise be a monotonous and uninteresting thoroughfare.” Walter Kidney noted that “The terra cotta architectural polychromy was among the earliest in the United States. Indeed, the application of several colors of glaze to the same piece of architectural terra cotta seems to have just been introduced in the country. Stanford White’s Madison Square Presbyterian Church, dedicated in 1906, when the Rodef Shalom competition was decided, is credited by the Atlantic Terra Cotta Company for having led the way with a scheme of yellow, blue, green, white and gold.”

- **Massive scale of the domes designed and fabricated by the Guastavino Company.** A significant number of sources—both contemporaneous with construction and in the intervening years—have noted that the Guastavino domes at Rodef Shalom were the largest such vaults built by the firm at the time of their completion. Drew Armstrong, head of the University of Pittsburgh’s Architectural Studied Program, notes that this feat of engineering would figure prominently in Guastavino’s subsequent promotional materials.
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• Stained glass by major American studios. Both Willet and Schladermundt had well-established national reputations by the time that their windows were being created for the 1901 and 1907 Rodef Shalom temples, respectively. The Willet windows, as stated above, were particularly noteworthy for their inclusion of figural compositions, reflecting a marked break from more Orthodox traditions. Their relocation from Eighth Street into Hornbostel’s Fifth Avenue building demonstrated a continued expression of the progressive principles of the Pittsburgh Platform.

• A prominent site on par with other new East End places of worship. Drew Armstrong notes that “The prominent location and novel architecture of the synagogue made a statement about the position of Pittsburgh’s Reformed Jewish community in the local and national contexts which, like the Catholic diocese, the universities and Andrew Carnegie himself, were staking out positions as leaders in civic beautification and social betterment that affected the city as a whole and the outlying region.” Gruber adds that the location of the temple amidst the Beaux Arts buildings of Oakland and affluent residences of Shadyside was an important example of a “second settlement synagogue” of the period, “erected as a public building around parks and newly designed civic centers.”

4. Its identification as the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder whose individual work is significant in the history or development of the City of Pittsburgh, the State of Pennsylvania, the Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States: Rodef Shalom meets this criterion for designation.

Over the course of three historic building campaigns between 1907-1954, Rodef Shalom is notable as the work of four major architects at work in Pittsburgh during the first half of the twentieth century: Henry Hornbostel, Ingham & Boyd, Alexander Sharove, and Harry Lefkowitz.

Henry Hornbostel: Henry Hornbostel (1867-1961), primary designer of the 1907 sanctuary, was born in Brooklyn and received his architectural education at Columbia University in New York and the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris. In the 1890s, he began working for the New York firm of Wood and Palmer, becoming a partner in 1897. George Wood left the firm shortly thereafter, but the partnership of George Carnegie Palmer and Hornbostel—in various permutations, sometimes including other partners—lasted until 1921. Hornbostel excelled at large-scale building projects, such as campus master plans and monumental government and institutional buildings, and at working creatively within Beaux Arts paradigms to give architectural expression to modern building types, such as skyscrapers, and works of engineering, such as bridges. Hornbostel designed architectural treatments for the Williamsburg, Manhattan, Queensboro, and Hell Gate bridges in New York; campus plans and buildings for Carnegie Tech (now Carnegie Mellon University) and the University of Pittsburgh; a monumental city hall for Oakland, CA, and state education building for New York; and B’nai Israel Synagogue at 327 N. Negley Avenue.

Hornbostel was not a conservative designer of traditional houses of worship, and this shows in Rodef Shalom, “a massively reposeful building” which gives “an impressive feeling of shelter and permanence” without resorting to Moorish or Classical cliches.

Ingham & Boyd: Ingham & Boyd was a Pittsburgh firm well-known for its conservative period revival designs, but in its 1938 work on Rodef Shalom’s religious school, delivered a treatment that responded to Hornbostel’s originality. Charles Tattersol Ingham became a draftsman in the Boston offices of Peabody & Stearns in around 1897, and worked in Pittsburgh on that firm’s largest local commissions: Horne’s Department Store and the East Liberty Market House. Early in the twentieth century, Ingham returned to Pittsburgh permanently to work for the firm of Rutan & Russell. In 1911, he formed a partnership with William Boyd, Jr., who left design responsibilities largely up to Ingham while handling the financial and public relations sides of the business. The Pittsburgh Board of Education Building on Bellefield Street and The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania are the best-known Ingham & Boyd designs, while the Frick Teacher Training School (now Pittsburgh Science and Technology Academy) also displays the firm’s elegant touch. Ingham & Boyd also designed all of the public elementary schools in Mt. Lebanon township and the row houses of Chatham Village on Pittsburgh’s Mt. Washington.
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Ingham & Boyd’s treatment of the Rodef Shalom religious school is less conservative and restrained than many of the firm’s designs, yet its originality is in its marriage of Art Deco, then the height of architectural fashion, with the material and design vocabulary established by Hornbostel for the sanctuary 30 years before. In the religious school, Ingham & Boyd showed themselves to be exceptionally responsive to their client’s ongoing desire for a modern expression of Jewish tradition.

Sharove & Lefkowitz: Alexander Sharove (1893-1955), a Squirrel Hill-based architect who specialized in Modern synagogue design in the 1950s, was the architect of Solomon Freehof Hall along with Harry H. Lefkowitz. Sharove was born in Virginia to Russian immigrant parents. The family observed Orthodox Judaism. Sharove graduated from the Carnegie Tech (now Carnegie Mellon) School of Architecture in 1919 and made his permanent home in Pittsburgh, where he was a member of Rodef Shalom. Sharove designed commercial buildings, apartment buildings, and single-family houses, but came to specialize in houses of worship, especially synagogues.

In the 1920s and 30s, Sharove designed synagogues in a loose interpretation of the Classical Revival Style executed in pale buff brick, seemingly inspired by Hornbostel’s work on Rodef Shalom and the campus buildings of Carnegie Tech. Examples include Congregation Poale Zedeck (6318 Phillips Avenue, Squirrel Hill: 1929), Beth Shalom (5915 Beacon Street, Squirrel Hill: 1931), and Temple Beth El in Richmond, VA (1931), in red brick and with a more restrained Colonial Revival touch.

By the 1950s, Sharove had adopted the International Style. In this decade, until his death in 1955, Sharove seems to have been in demand as a designer of Modern synagogues. Commissions include the community building addition to B’nai Israel in East Liberty (1948); Tree of Life (Shady and Wilkins avenues, Squirrel Hill, with Charles and Edward Stotz, 1952), Temple Beth Sholom in Johnstown, PA (ca. 1951), Beth Am in Monessen (1954), Knessett Israel in Kittanning (1954), Beth Israel in Washington (1955), and Agudath Sholom in Lynchburg, VA (1955). Sharove’s buildings from this period share certain characteristics: low-slung massing, flat roofs, a mix of stone and brick veneer to differentiate volumes, and, often, integral reliefs and/or frieze bands inscribed with one of the ten Commandments or with the name of the temple.

Sharove spent most of his career in independent practice, but he occasionally partnered with others for specific projects. For Freehof Hall, Sharon worked with Harry Lefkowitz (1901-1973). Lefkowitz was, like Sharove, a local Jewish architect from Squirrel Hill, graduate of Carnegie Tech, and member of Rodef Shalom. His obituary states that he was also a member of Congregation Beth Shalom, for whom he designed the classroom building. Lefkowitz was a committed and accomplished practitioner of Modern design. His other major commissions include the Ohringer Home Furniture Store in Braddock (1941), Quentin Roosevelt Elementary School in Carrick (1959), and Chatham Center (with William Lescaze, 1964).

5. Its exemplification of important planning and urban design techniques distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness, or overall quality of design or detail: Rodef Shalom does not meet this criterion for designation.

6. Its location as a site of an important archaeological resource: Rodef Shalom does not meet this criterion for designation.

7. Its association with important cultural or social aspects or events in the history of the City of Pittsburgh, the State of Pennsylvania, the Mid-Atlantic region, or the United States: Rodef Shalom meets this criterion for designation.

Rodef Shalom is associated with the Jewish history of Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania. Since 1907, its campus on Fifth Avenue in Shadyside has been the permanent home of the oldest, most established Jewish congregation in western Pennsylvania, known for its leadership in the philosophy and practice of Reform Judaism. “As the leading congregation [in Pittsburgh], it represented Judaism in the broader community and participated in the issues that faced the Pittsburgh community,” such as immigration, assimilation, Zionism, and Nazism. Throughout its history, Rodef Shalom provided for the changing religious needs of its members through successive waves of immigration, the Great Depression, two world wars, the Baby Boom and middle-class exodus to the suburbs, and the changing demographics and economic base of the Pittsburgh region.

Through immigration, Pittsburgh’s Jewish population grew substantially from fewer than 100 in 1850 to over 40,000 at its peak in around 1920. This population was far from monolithic, but has been diverse since its beginnings.

---
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Like other immigrant groups, Jews arriving in Pittsburgh sorted themselves into communities in which they shared commonalities, such as their native cultures and dialects, religious rituals, and social traditions. Family ties also played an important role, as many new arrivals settled near family members who could help them find work, community connections, and marriage partners. Many of these factors also affected the new arrivals’ economic status, which in turn influenced their choices of residence and synagogue. Thus, Pittsburgh’s Jewish population was comprised of many ethnic communities in which immigrants banded together to share their cultural pasts and, moving forward, established their own religious, social, and relief organizations to help assimilate newcomers.

To say “Pittsburgh” today is to include the North Side, but prior to 1907, when it was annexed, the independent city of Allegheny was home to an early wave of central European, German-speaking Jews. It was, in fact, the first community of western Pennsylvania Jews to organize into a congregation, Shaare Shamayim, the precursor to Rodef Shalom, in the 1850s. As German immigrants poured in to Allegheny in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, they formed a strong ethnic enclave. They spoke German in their businesses, banks, schools, and churches, had their own German language newspaper, and participated in German singing, social, and cultural societies. A small but substantial number of these immigrants were Jewish, and they, too, spoke German in their synagogue.

Over time, the German Jews of Allegheny became an established middle class of, mostly, prosperous merchants who owned handsome houses on the tree-lined streets of Manchester and Allegheny West. Rabbi Lippman Mayer of Rodef Shalom lived on Western Avenue, just two blocks from Ridge Avenue, Allegheny’s Millionaire’s Row. From their beginnings in neighborhood dry goods and grocery stores, some successful Jewish merchants expanded into department stores, such as Kaufmann’s and Frank and Seder’s. Others built wealth through investment. The wealth of Allegheny’s Jewish community allowed it to begin to build synagogues and other Jewish institutions, such as the Concordia Club, founded on Stockton Avenue in 1874.

In her book Steel City Jews, Barbara S. Burstin notes that the Allegheny River “separated an acculturating, middle class, central European Jewish immigrant group and their children from newly arriving, impoverished Jewish immigrants primarily from Eastern Europe. The lifestyles, ideals, habits, and traditions of each Jewish population differed dramatically.” It was the former group of more established German Jews which founded and sustained Rodef Shalom through its early decades. When the congregation moved to Shadyside in 1907, it placed further distance—physical and social—between itself and more recent immigrants from Eastern Europe and Russia who lacked their wealth and sophistication. These differences were not only based on socioeconomic class, but also on religious observance. More recent immigrants tended to be Orthodox Jews, whereas Rodef Shalom had been proudly Reform since 1863.

The Jews who arrived in Pittsburgh later in the nineteenth century came from Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Russia, most seeking to escape religious persecution and pursue economic opportunity. Many settled in the Hill District. These so-called “Hill Hebrews” often lived in tenements without running water, indoor sanitation, or central heat. Barred by discrimination from working in Pittsburgh’s steel mills, Jewish workers found jobs as unskilled laborers in bakeries and cigar and textile factories. Yet they found time, energy, and funds to establish and participate in a number of Jewish institutions. In the 1910s, the Hill was home to 11 synagogues, all Orthodox; several Hebrew schools, English-speaking Jewish Sunday schools, and institutions perpetuating Yiddish language and culture; the Irene Kaufmann Settlement House; Montefiore Hospital; and the Labor Lyceum, a Jewish union hall and socialist community center.

Not coincidentally, at a national level, this age of immigration gave rise to the Progressive Movement, which sought to make urban life safer and healthier for new arrivals and to help them assimilate as Americans. From its temple on Fifth Avenue, Rodef Shalom Congregation embraced Progressive goals as part of its Reform view of Judaism as a progressive religion with a mission of social justice. While maintaining their own cultural identity and liturgical practices rooted in Reform Judaism, members of Rodef Shalom engaged with the poorer, Orthodox Jews of the Hill by supporting the institutions that helped and uplifted them at a time when social services were almost entirely provided by religious groups. “In this area, the Jewish community made significant contributions for the general community as well as taking care of its own.” Members of Rodef Shalom either founded or heavily supported the Jewish Home for the Aged, Montefiore Hospital, the Irene Kaufmann

---
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Settlement, the Hebrew Institute, and the Gusky Orphanage. Rodef Shalom also directly supported Pittsburgh’s Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, various overseas relief agencies, and a number of immigrant synagogues in the small towns of western Pennsylvania.

Over time, separate immigrant identities merged into a common, yet still multi-faceted, history and culture of Pittsburgh Jews. In the early twentieth century, the children of the original “Hill Hebrews” grew up. Driven by desires for economic success and social acceptance, many of them attained education, entered the middle class, and moved to areas further east, such as Squirrel Hill and East Liberty. Some formed new congregations, such as B’nai Israel in East Liberty, while others joined established ones such as Rodef Shalom. This period of Jewish middle class attainment coincided with Rodef Shalom’s elimination of the assigned pew system, which had sorted its congregation in the sanctuary according to its financial means and status before 1922. Membership in Rodef Shalom had always been open to all Jews, regardless of language, citizenship, or country of origin, but now, a taint of elitism dropped away. Accordingly, the congregation’s membership soared in the 1920s with new members from various backgrounds who embraced the democratization of Pittsburgh’s historically most patrician temple. “Changes at [Rodef Shalom] Temple, in its facilities, its rabbis, and its own administrative policies directly and indirectly fostered growth and integration.”

Many of Rodef Shalom’s new members were also likely drawn by its Reform practices, which resonated with 1920s progressivism and modern, democratic American culture. The congregation’s vote to adopt Reform Judaism in the 1860s evolved into leadership of the movement in 1880s and beyond. Rabbi J. Leonard Levy (served 1901-1917) promoted assimilation of immigrant Jews to American culture during a time when the Jewish presence in the United States was rapidly expanding, and he urged immigrant members of his congregation “to replace what they had known and practiced in Eastern Europe” with “a new and vital American Judaism.” In 1909, President Taft visited Rodef Shalom, the first time an American president ever delivered an address from the pulpit in a Jewish house of worship in “a stunning recognition of the successful acculturation of Judaism into the mainstream of American life.”

In the mid-twentieth century, under the leadership of Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof (served 1934-1966), Rodef Shalom supported the expansion of the Reform movement in southwestern Pennsylvania through the establishment of new Reform congregations elsewhere in Pittsburgh and its expanding suburbs: Temple Sinai in Squirrel Hill, Temple Emanuel in the South Hills, and Temple David in Monroeville. The congregation’s decision to invest in the restoration of its Shadyside temple in 1990 instead of merging with one of these congregations or moving itself to the suburbs demonstrates its commitment to remaining the anchor of Reform Judaism in Pittsburgh, even as the city faced the need to rebuild itself in the face of devastating economic collapse and population loss at the end of the twentieth century.

With origins in a particular enclave of middle-class German Jews from Allegheny, Rodef Shalom’s long history is fundamental to the larger story of Jewish religious and architectural expression in Pittsburgh.

8. Its exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development or settlement significant to the cultural history or traditions of the City, whose components may lack individual distinction: *Rodef Shalom does not meet this criterion for designation.*

9. Its representation of a cultural, historic, architectural, archaeological, or related theme expressed through distinctive areas, properties, sites, structures, or objects that may or may not be contiguous: *Rodef Shalom does not meet this criterion for designation.*

10. Its unique location and distinctive physical appearance or presence representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the City of Pittsburgh. *Rodef Shalom meets this criterion for designation.*

Rodef Shalom’s location at the gateway between residential Shadyside and the City Beautiful-inspired institutional district of Oakland, along with its imposing size and light, polychromatic building envelope, make it a landmark of unmistakable prominence on Fifth Avenue.

---
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10. INTEGRITY
Temple Rodef Shalom at 4905 Fifth Avenue in Pittsburgh meets the criteria for integrity as it applies to location, design, materials, and workmanship.

Location
The building remains in its original location, where it continues to be a prominent visual anchor on Fifth Avenue, connecting Oakland and Shadyside in Pittsburgh’s East End. It also continues to reflect the formal, monumental, civic and institutional architecture of its surrounding neighborhood, which was a significant part of Pittsburgh’s expression of the City Beautiful movement at the turn of the twentieth century.

Design
The 1907 sanctuary retains most of its original exterior design features, including its Beaux Arts and Modern French style; monumental, square-planned auditorium with chamfered corners, convex mansard roof and two-story entry vestibule; brick and granite entry plaza flanked by Rookwood electroliers; fenestration patterns, including numerous stained glass windows; method of construction, especially the double vaults of Guastavino tile; and materials. Similarly, the wings from 1938 and 1956 (now historic in their own right) retain most of their original exterior design features, including their rectangular massing; architectural styles (minimalist Art Deco and Modern, respectively); and materials.

The sanctuary and vestibule retain a high degree of interior design features, including the two-story design of the vestibule with its cantilevered balcony and the voluminous space of the auditorium; the four arches that perforate the ceiling vaults; the four groins of the ceiling vaults with their decorative recessed caissons; the rows of individual theater-style seats, with no center aisle, and unobstructed views to the bima; and the ornate ark with organ loft above. While the 1938 and 1956 wings have seen greater modifications, they still retain many interior design details, including the Josiah Cohen Chapel, the vestibule and general form of Levy Hall and the arrangement of spaces around them, and the cavernous uninterrupted volume of Freehof Hall.

Materials
Original materials remain largely intact. On the exterior, cream-colored brick continues to unify all four building campaigns. The sanctuary retains its granite foundation, polychromatic terra cotta accents (though faded), green Ludowici tile roof, and central skylight. The religious education wing retains its Blumcraft railings and window grilles; Art Deco limestone entry piers, parapet caps and accents; terra cotta and marble entry accents; the majority of its terra cotta frieze; and clerestory stained glass windows. Though simpler in design from the outset, the social hall wing retains its rectilinear limestone accents.

On the interior, a wide range of materials retain integrity. In the sanctuary/vestibule, these include terrazzo, marble and wood flooring; carved plaster crown molding; cast iron transom grilles; Kalameined entry doors (though painted) and leather-clad vestibule doors; mahogany wainscoting with gold leaf; and Dutch metal detailing. Among the details retaining integrity in the religious education wing are the terrazzo flooring, white marble walls and decorative plaster ceiling of the lobby. In the social hall wing, important materials include the richly paneled walls, decorative plaster cornice and marble-clad ark of the Josiah Cohen Chapel and the relocated woodwork of the Falk Library.

Workmanship
Decorative art and craft skills continue to be expressed in the building’s ornate exterior electroliers and adjacent cast iron gates with their stylized menorahs and antelope heads; the then-innovative polychromatic terra cotta decorative elements; the six-armed wood chandeliers in gilt and blue finishes (along with their matching wall sconces and vestibule ceiling fixtures); the numerous stained glass windows and skylight; mahogany columns with gilt capitals of the ark in the main sanctuary and the marble details of the ark in the Cohen Chapel; the complex W.W. Kimball Company organ (and the fact that it is still operational); the carved stone, terra cotta and aluminum details on the religious education wing; and the three dramatic oval lighting coves in Freehof Hall.

11. NOTIFICATION/CONSENT OF PROPERTY OWNER
**The nomination of any religious property shall be accompanied by a signed letter of consent from the property’s owner. See attached.
Temple Rodef Shalom

Historic Nomination Form

Bibliography
Bibliography

American Architect and Building News, 18 March 1908, 97

“Architectural Exhibition,” Real Estate Record and Builders Guide, 77, no. 1978, 10 February 1906


“Arnold Bank,” obituary, Pittsburgh Press, 18 February 1986

Berg, Martha. Rodef Shalom Archivist. “Bimah Alterations Dates,” email to Jeff Slack, 6 May 2021


“Famous Art Studies at Falk Library.” Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. 17 February 1913, 2


“Handsome Edifice Nearing Completion,” Pittsburgh Press, 14 May 1907; “Imposing New Synagogue is Ready for Opening Friday,” Pittsburgh Press, 1 September 1907

“Huge Dome is Finished.” Pittsburgh Press. 14 May 1907


National Register of Historic Places: Rodef Shalom Temple, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania


“One of the Most Beautiful and Costly Jewish Synagogues in the United States, Soon to be Dedicated. . . ,” *Pittsburgh Daily Post*, 1 September 1907

“The Past We Inherit, The Future We Create: Rodef Shalom Congregation.” Pittsburgh: *Jewish Chronicle of Pittsburgh*, 1989


“Pittsburg’s Magnificent Temple,” *Pittsburgh Press*, 8 September 1901, 9; “One of the Most Beautiful and Costly Jewish Synagogues in the United States, Soon to be Dedicated. . . ,” *Pittsburgh Daily Post*, 1 September 1907


*Rodef Shalom Congregation: 150 Years of Living by Jewish Values*. Pittsburgh, PA: Rodef Shalom Congregation, 2007

“Rodef Shalom Congregation: 1856-1956: Centennial and Dedication Festival.” Event program in Rodef Shalom Archive, 1956

“Rodeph Shalom Edifice Formally Dedicated During Funeral Service of Rabbi.” *Pittsburgh Dispatch*, April 30, 1917


“Rodef Shalom Synagogue,” *American Architect and Building News*, 93, no. 1682, 18 March 1908

“Rodef Sholem [sic.] Synagogue, Pittsburg, PA,” *Architects’ and Builders’ Magazine*, 9, no. 11, New Series, August 1908


https://www.rodefshalom.org/restore


Temple Rodef Shalom

Historic Nomination Form

Photo Log
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Note: For security reasons, and since the purview of Pittsburgh’s Historic Review Commission is limited to building exteriors, interior floor plans are not provided. The camera locations shown here are intended to provide only general details. References to floor levels are intentionally omitted.
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12. PHOTO LOG
All photos were taken by Time & Place LLC between May and September 2021 and accurately reflect current conditions.

Photo 1. Rodef Shalom, looking west, showing the entry vestibule and sanctuary on the north side of Fifth Avenue. In the distance are building's in Pittsburgh’s Oakland neighborhood.

Photo 2. East gate and electrolier, looking northeast, with the 1956 social hall wing in the background.

Photo 3. Morewood Lawn, looking northwest from the intersection of Fifth and Morewood Avenues.

Photo 4. Deaktor Terrace, extending across the front of the social hall wing, looking northeast.

Photo 5. Procession I sculpture by Elbert Weinberg in the northwest corner of Morewood Lawn.

Photo 6. The Biblical Botanical Garden, looking northeast, showing the garden pavilion (center) with the religious education wing in the background (left).

Photo 7. Playground, looking north, with the religious education wing in the background.

Photo 8. Parking lot, looking west from Morewood Avenue.

Photo 9. Entry vestibule and sanctuary, looking northeast, with the brick and granite entry terrace in the foreground.

Photo 10. Front/south facade of entry vestibule, looking northwest.

Photo 11. Front/south facade of entry vestibule, looking north.

Photo 12. Polychromatic terra cotta, or architectural faience, at the front entrance, looking north.

Photo 13. East facade of the entry vestibule, looking west.

Photo 14. Sanctuary (left) and vestibule (right), looking northeast, showing the southwest chamfered corner of the sanctuary.

Photo 15. Sanctuary (left) and vestibule (right), looking northeast, showing the southwest chamfered corner.

Photo 16. Main entry lobby, looking east.

Photo 17. Sanctuary, looking north from the balcony.

Photo 18. Sanctuary, looking southwest.

Photo 19. Religious education wing, west facade, looking northeast.

Photo 20. Religious education wing, front entry stairs, looking southwest, showing one of the Blumcraft Company railings (left) and one of the Art Deco limestone piers (right).

Photo 21. Religious education wing, front entry, looking northeast, showing terra cotta and marble details.

Photo 22. Religious education wing, north facade (right).

Photo 23. Religious education wing, auditorium lobby, looking west.

Photo 24. Levy Hall, looking northeast.
Photo 25. Social hall wing, east facade, looking northwest.

Photo 26. Social hall wing, south facade, looking northwest.

Photo 27. Wechsler Gallery, south facade, looking northwest, showing Kent Bloomer’s sculpture, Relief, above the front doors.

Photo 28. Social hall wing, north facade, looking southwest.

Photo 29. Commons Area, looking south toward the sanctuary, with Aaron Court to the left.

Photo 30. Freehof Hall, looking southeast, showing the large open assembly space with lighting coves in the ceiling.

Photo 31. Wechsler Gallery, looking southwest. The doors to the left provide access from Morewood Lawn; those on the right connect to the Commons Area.

Photo 32. Aaron Court, looking north from Wechsler Gallery.

Photo 33. Porte-cochere, looking east.

Photo 34. Porte-cochere, looking southwest.
Photographs—Existing Conditions

Unless otherwise noted, all photos were taken by Time & Place LLC between May and September 2021 and accurately reflect current conditions.

Photo 1. Rodef Shalom, looking west, showing the entry vestibule and sanctuary on the north side of Fifth Avenue. In the distance are building’s in Pittsburgh’s Oakland neighborhood.
Photo 2. East gate and electrolier, looking northeast, with the 1956 social hall wing in the background.

Photo 3. Morewood Lawn, looking northwest from the intersection of Fifth and Morewood Avenues.
Photo 4. Deaktor Terrace, extending across the front of the social hall wing, looking northeast.

Photo 5. Procession I sculpture by Elbert Weinberg in the northwest corner of Morewood Lawn.
Photo 8. Parking lot, looking west from Morewood Avenue.

Photo 9. Entry vestibule and sanctuary, looking northeast, with the brick and granite entry terrace in the foreground.
Photo 10. Front/south facade of entry vestibule, looking northwest.

Photo 11. Front/south facade of entry vestibule, looking north.
Photo 12. Polychromatic terra cotta, or architectural faience, at the front entrance, looking north.

Photo 13. East facade of the entry vestibule, looking west.

Photo 14. Sanctuary (left) and vestibule (right), looking northeast, showing the southwest chamfered corner of the sanctuary.
Photo 15. Sanctuary (left) and vestibule (right), looking northeast, showing the southwest chamfered corner.

Photo 16. Main entry lobby, looking east.
Photo 17. Sanctuary, looking north from the balcony.

Photo 18. Sanctuary, looking southwest.
Photo 19. Religious education wing, west facade, looking northeast.

Photo 20. Religious education wing, front entry stairs, looking southwest, showing one of the Blumcraft Company railings (left) and one of the Art Deco limestone piers (right).
Photo 21. Religious education wing, front entry, looking northeast, showing terra cotta and marble details.

Photo 22. Religious education wing, north facade (right).
Photo 25. Social hall wing, east facade, looking northwest.

Photo 26. Social hall wing, south facade, looking northwest.
Photo 27. Wechsler Gallery, south facade, looking northwest, showing Kent Bloomer’s sculpture, *Relief*, above the front doors.

Photo 28. Social hall wing, north facade, looking southwest.
Photo 33. Porte-cochere, looking east.

Photo 34. Porte-cochere, looking southwest.
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Supporting Documents
1906-07: Original Building

Architect: Henry Hornbostel (Palmer & Hornbostel)
Dome Design: Raphael Guastavino
Contractor: Thomas Reilly

(The Brickbuilder, v. 16, no. 11, December 1907).

---

Number of Stories

Skylight
1911-12: Fanny Edel Falk Memorial

Architect: Palmer & Hornbostel
Contractor: W.B. Bennett

The Fanny Edel Falk Memorial is highlighted in red (Historic Pittsburgh).

Swimming Pool on 1st

Falk Memorial Library on 2nd
Caretaker’s Apartment on 3rd

Gymnasium created on 3rd

New Construction / Alteration of Building Footprint

Number of Stories

Skylight
1938: Religious Education Wing

Architects: Ingham & Boyd with Alfred A. Marks  
Contractor: S.M. Seisel Company

(Pittsburgh Press, 18 December 1938).
1954-56: Social Hall Wing (Freehof Hall, Additional Classrooms, Interior Renovations)

Architects: Alexander Sharove and Harry H. Lefkowitz

(Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, 12 February 1954).

New classrooms and support spaces

Light Well

Gym removed from 3rd

Aaron Court

Solomon B. Freehof Hall

[Roof Plan]

FIFTH AVENUE

New Construction / Alteration of Building Footprint

Number of Stories

Skylight
2000-03: Porte Cochere and Interior Renovations

Architects: The Design Alliance
Contractor: Jendoco

This work followed a major restoration in 1990 by Ehrenkrantz Group & Eckstat PC (Urban Design Associates, local architect; Jendoco, contractor). Scope included five phases: roof, exterior of sanctuary, windows and marble, exterior of school and Freehof Hall, and interior of sanctuary.

The porte-cochere/entry vestibule replaced a 1979 entry vestibule measuring 12 x 18 feet designed by architect Maxwell G. Mayo and donated by Mr. and Mrs. Allen Berkman.
Figure 1. Rendering of first (1862) Rodef Shalom temple on Eighth Street designed by Charles Bartberger (*Pittsburgh Leader*, Oct. 20, 1900)
Figure 2. Second (1901) Rodef Shalom temple on Eighth Street designed by Charles Bickel (Rodef Shalom Congregation)
Figure 3. Pew certificate of Henry Kaufmann, signed by Rabbi Lippman and dated 1901, the year the second synagogue on Eighth Street opened (Rodef Shalom Congregation).

Figure 4. 1904 Hopkins map excerpt showing Rafferty property on Fifth Avenue and neighbors Pinkerton and Holmes. Devonshire Street was then called Bidwell Street.
Figure 5. Longitudinal section of Rodef Shalom by Henry Hornbostel (Matthew Falcone)

Figure 6. 1911 Hopkins map excerpt showing original footprint of Rodef Shalom
Figure 7. Rodef Shalom, undated (ca. 1910) postcard (Rodef Shalom Collection)

Figure 8. Rodef Shalom sanctuary, ca. 1907. The pipe organ was electrified in 1929. (Historic Pittsburgh: Rodef Shalom Collection)
Figure 9. Entrance of Rodef Shalom decorated with bunting for President Taft’s visit, 1909 (Historic Pittsburgh: Rodef Shalom Collection)

Figure 10. 1911 Sanborn map excerpt showing Fanny Edelman Falk addition at rear of Rodef Shalom. The congregation had also purchased the former Boggs property to the northwest.
Figure 11. 1923 Hopkins map excerpt. The block was much the same as it had been 12 years before.

Figure 12. 1939 Hopkins map excerpt showing the religious school on the former Jackman and Boggs properties.
Figure 13. 1951 Sanborn map excerpt. Rodef Shalom owned the lot at the corner of Fifth and Morewood by this time. The Fifth-Morewood Apartments have been built across Morewood Street on the former Ferguson property.

Figure 14. Aerial view of the site in 1967. Freehof Hall and the parking lot have been completed, but the main entrance has not yet been reoriented to the rear of the complex. (Penn Pilot)