Ezekiel for Solomon

The Temple of Jerusalem in Seventeenth-century Leiden and the Case of Cocceius

Jeroen Goudeau

The Temple of Jerusalem, one of the most important building sites for Jews, Christians, and Muslims, has been a permanent topic of theological, historical, and political discourse. The Temple is also one of the most archetypal buildings in the history of architecture.¹ It was not just one building but referred to various successive building complexes, one of which was seen only in a vision by the prophet Ezekiel. Speaking of the Temple in general is problematic. After a necessarily lapidary overview of some historical data, in this contribution the context of the discussion will be limited to the work of a geographically delineated group of scholars who offered an interpretation of the Temple at one particular period in time. In order to grasp some of the peculiarities of the multifaceted phenomenon, this paper will concentrate on the situation in Leiden in the second half of the seventeenth century, from an architectural-historical point of view. A special focus will be on Johannes Cocceius (1603–69) and his interpretation of the Temple as described in Ezekiel's prophecy. It took this verbose Leiden theologian only a few words to explain the Temple vision of Ezekiel: 'It is clear that this sight was shown for the solace of the Israelites, so that those who have not had, nor had seen the Temple, while beholding this Temple, would contemplate on the meaning of this sight'.² Along with his philological, emblematic study of the Temple, Cocceius presented an actual reconstruction of the Temple as contemporary architecture. His attempt can be understood as biblical criticism by visual means, in which text and image are closely intertwined. The engravings of the Temple that accompanied his

- 1 Much has been written on (aspects of) the Temple. A recent general introduction: Goldhill 2004; on the site of the Temple with references to the actual situation: Schanks 2007. As this contribution concentrates on architecture, see especially: Hermann 1967; Busink 1970–80; Rosenau 1979; Vogelsang 1981; Van Pelt 1984; Ramirez 1991; Von Naredi-Rainer 1994.
- 2 't Is klaar, dat dit gesichte vertoond geweest is tot vertroosting van den Israeliten, opdat die, die geen tempel hadden nog sagen, door het beschouwen van desen tempel ondertusschen sig soudén besig houden en overdenken, wat dit gesigte zoude kunnen betekenen'. Cocceius 1691, p. 641.

text can be understood as part of an architectural debate, parallel to theology and biblical chronology, conducted on another level and with other means, but within the same context of criticism.

Biblical Architecture

The question of the Temple can be regarded as closely connected to the history of the People of the Book as a whole – to Jerusalem as well as to the Exile and Diaspora. In the course of the unsettled times, the appearance of the Temple, or, to be more precise, of the successive Temples, evolved fundamentally, as did the meaning. In order to contextualize the seventeenth-century perspective, a few data that played a role in the debates of that era need to be discussed.

The original Temple of Jerusalem on Mount Moria would have been built (according to modern knowledge around 961 BCE) by King Solomon as per God's own instructions to King David. The so-called first Second Temple was erected on the same spot, on the foundations of this earliest construction. The rebuilding was executed (between 536–515 BCE) after the Jewish people had returned from their Exile in Babylon. The first building had been destroyed (in 586 BCE) when King Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem. The rebuilding of the Temple took place under Judah's governor Zerubbabel, during Darius reign, and is also referred to as Temple of Zerubbabel. This second construction was once again partly replaced and was expanded to twice its size under Roman rule by King Herod (started in 20 BCE and only completed after his death).³ The latter complex, also referred to as the Second Temple, was finally destroyed by the Roman commander and future emperor Titus in 70 CE. These structures received a virtual counterpart: the future Temple in the vision of the prophet Ezekiel. Chronologically Ezekiel's was the second documented Temple, envisioned during the Captivity (around 593–568 BCE). On the one hand, Ezekiel's version was a prophecy of a Temple yet to come but, on the other hand, the description clearly recalled Solomon's divine and archetypal example in Jerusalem.⁴

All these Temples and their supposed historical existence were known from texts. In the late sixteenth and seventeenth century the Temple aroused new interest, as did other biblical physical structures and locations, such as the

³ See e.g.: Edelman 2005.

⁴ The interpretation of Ezekiel's visionary Temple is an ongoing debate. This is also the case with the biblical Temple descriptions. See for instance: McCormick 2002.

Tower of Babel, Noah's Ark, and the Garden of Eden.⁵ Prelates, princes, biblical scholars and architects began to study anew the Temple of Jerusalem in the Old Testament, and in addition to that in the Jewish rabbinical commentaries. The most studied passages were in the historical Bible books I Kings 6 and 7, II Chronicles 3, and the Mishnah passages Middoth II and IV. Biblical scholars also consulted the account of the Temple by the Romano-Jewish historian Flavius Josephus in *Antiquities of the Jews* (ca. 94 CE) and the chronicle of the final destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 70 CE in *The Jewish War* (ca. 75 CE).⁶ Ezekiel's Temple vision was described in chapters 40–48 of his prophecy. The main reference to the original Tabernacle, the heart of the Temple, was found in Exodus 25–31 and 35–40. Josephus's report was about the Temple building he had actually seen, whereas Ezekiel saw something that might come in the future. Then there was also another view – that of the end of time, beyond Ezekiel and beyond the Temple. The New Testament ends with pages of John's Apocalypse in which the New Jerusalem is imagined in chapter 21. This was again a symbolic view but with mention of exact formal characteristics that in some respects were considered to resemble those of Solomon's Temple.

These texts contain a mix of references to characteristics and fairly exact measurements of the Temple complex. Today, scholars emphasize the differences in character, age, and aim of the accounts, while early modern biblical critics and theologians were mainly concerned with the fact that multiple data in the texts vary. Scholarly debate was devoted to the reconciliation of all the apparently incompatible indications, as well as to the question of how to fit the inconsistencies into one theological narrative. In their meticulous discussion of the exact physical qualities of the various Temple descriptions and the spatial relationships between the buildings and their surroundings, the early modern scholars differed essentially from their medieval predecessors.⁷

One way of arranging all the directions into a meaningful whole was to reconstruct the verbal Temple visually – in scaled drawings or by way of a well-proportioned model. Here artists, architects and architectural theorists became involved. They not only translated words into images but in addition transferred certain characteristics of the Temple to new buildings, and – in part unintentionally – transferred characteristics of contemporary architecture to the Temple. For the first time visualization was more than schematic, allegorical or typological interpretation – it entered the domain of the architect.

5 See: Bennet and Mandelbrote 1998.

6 Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, esp. VIII 61–129, XI 8–17, 57–83, XV 380–424; idem, *The Jewish War*, esp. V 136–247, VI 249–356. Neither Josephus's apparent ideological point of view, nor the dependability of his account were questioned at the time.

7 See e.g.: Delano-Smith 2012, pp. 42–44.

Protestant Tendencies

Having been destroyed in Jerusalem and projected as a future state, the Temple could just be detached symbolically from its original context and be transferred to other times and other places.⁸ Moreover, with regard to the Temple, in early modern Europe the travel reports from the Holy City were considered far less reliable than the accounts in the Bible, because after Josephus they could only describe what was no longer there, and even then in fragmentary detail. In the sixteenth, but mainly in the seventeenth century, in the wake of the new biblical criticism, the theme of reconstructing the Temple gained importance. Despite the irreconcilable differences between the Roman Catholic Church and Protestantism and the vehement controversies between the two, the Temple received a great deal of scholarly attention from both sides. The Catholic countries kept their focus primarily on Catholic sources.⁹ Two very influential reconstructions of the Temple were conceived at the Spanish court of King Philip II (1527–98). The first was the result of the rational approach of the librarian of the Escorial Benito Arias Montanus (1527–98), who studied the historically successive Temple constructions. In sharp contrast to this, the Jesuit Juan Battista Villalpando (1552–08) developed a comprehensive and very detailed classicist reconstruction in collaboration with his colleague Jerónimo Prado (1547–95). This reconstruction was primarily based on the prophetic Temple of Ezekiel.¹⁰ Published only after the death of Philip II and Prado, in three volumes between 1596 and 1605, it was Villalpando's impressively visualized architecture that would definitely combine the reconstruction according to Ezekiel's vision with the notion of Solomon's first Temple.

While the weight of Villalpando's intimidating scholarly reconstruction had almost settled the discussion in Catholic circles in the South, with France in a somewhat indefinite middle position, his work challenged the studies in the North. Unlike Italy and Spain, the religiously fragmented territories of Northern Europe took many different available Temple reconstructions and interpretations into consideration. Yet even there the monumental work by Prado and Villalpando would become the benchmark of Temple literature, especially in the Protestant states of Germany and in the Dutch Republic. It did not matter that the Northern Netherlands had freed themselves from the Spanish

8 On the translocation of holy sites such as the Holy Sepulchre, see for example the contribution by Bram de Klerck in this volume.

9 Of course this holds for the more strictly Catholic theological circles. A counter example is the Jewish physician Abraham ben David Portaleone (1542–1612). See: Miletto 2004.

10 Prado-Villalpando 1596–1705; Ramirez 1991.

crown only shortly before. What is striking is that in the countries of the Reformation the scholarly debate on the Temple was both broad and intense.

In the Dutch Republic, the Temple appears to be etched in the memory of theologians, poets, playwrights, painters and architects alike. The painter-architect Salomon de Bray (1597–1664) sought the origin of architecture in God's instructions to Solomon, just as Villalpando had done previously.¹¹ The Jewish scholar and rabbi, Jacob Jehuda Leon (1602–75) from Middelburg made an almost obsessive study of Solomon's architecture, earning himself the nickname 'Templo'. He constructed a large wooden scale model with which he travelled round as far as London and published a series of engravings and descriptions of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem based on Villalpando and Jewish sources such as Middoth.¹² The circle around the Stadtholder's secretary and erudite diplomat Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687) took a keen interest in the subject as well, especially in relation to architecture. In his discussions with the architect Jacob van Campen (1596–1657) on the characteristics and importance of the new classicist architecture, Huygens included the Temple reconstructions by Villalpando and the Frenchman François Vatable (d 1547). In 1637, Huygens obtained a fine copy of Villalpando's Ezekiel commentary himself (Fig. 4.1).¹³ Van Campen must have become greatly fascinated by the Temple, as he integrated aspects of the Temple in his own architecture. He made explicit formal references to the Temple with, for instance, the imposing outward curving buttresses (derived from Villalpando's engravings), ornaments such as the pomegranate (common emblems of the Resurrection and the community of the faithful) and, less obvious, the Temple dimensions that were derived from the scattered Bible passages. A fine example is the Nieuwe Kerk in Haarlem (1645–47), which contains all these elements, both on the exterior and the interior.¹⁴ The magistral Portuguese Synagogue of Amsterdam of 1671–74 designed by Elias Bouman (1635–86) is another attempt to integrate the Temple into Dutch Classicist architecture.¹⁵ Van Campen went further than applying the Temple to his church architecture. He even used the less common Palace of Solomon as a model for the prestigious Amsterdam Town Hall.¹⁶ Both the architectural

11 [De Bray] 1631, p. 2.

12 Between 1642 and 1675 nine different editions appeared in seven languages. See: Offenbergh 1976; Offenbergh 1993; Offenbergh 2004.

13 On Huygens and Villalpando, see: Ottenheim 1999, pp. 94–95; Vlaardingerbroek 2011, pp. 71–72. Huygens's own copy can be identified in the library of Radboud University Nijmegen, sign. OD a 30. The three frontispieces contain his autograph: 'Constanter'.

14 Ozinga 1929, pp. 59–66; Van der Linden 1990.

15 Portugese Synagoge 2012, pp. 55–72.

16 Vlaardingerbroek 2011, pp. 68–76.

FIGURE 4.1 *Hieronymus Prado and Juan Battista Villalpando, In Ezechielem Explanationes [...] (Rome 1596-1604), vol. 3 Juan Battista Villalpando, Apparatus Urbis Ac Templi Hierosolymitani [...], Rome 1604, title page with autograph of Constantijn Huygens, engraving.*
 NIJMEGEN: RADBOUD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

and intellectual references to biblical architecture in which Van Campen mixed Solomon's and Ezekiel's Temple – as did many others – had a strong influence on the most important architects of Dutch Classicism around him, such as Pieter Post, Daniël Stalpaert, Adriaan Dortsman and, not least, Arent

van 's-Gravesande (ca. 1610–62). After his training with Van Campen, Van 's-Gravesande was to become city architect of Leiden.¹⁷

The Rapenburg Constellation

For some time the heartland of Temple study in the Dutch Republic must have been Leiden. The Dutch Calvinist tradition of Hebrew and rabbinical studies rooted in and around the new state's first university, which was founded in this second largest city of the Republic. Like the interest in more or less modern classical philology in general, the interest in Hebrew also started there with Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609).¹⁸ It was further established by the Hebraist Johannes Drusius Sen., who soon left Leiden in 1584 for a position in Franeker. This brand new university then would become the second centre of Hebrew studies. In Leiden the jurist and antiquarian Petrus Cunaeus (1586–1638) set a standard with his *De Republica Hebræorum*, a three-volume study on Jewish polity in the Old Testament, which appeared in 1617 and ran through fourteen reprints as well as translations in Dutch, French, and English.¹⁹ The highly detailed treatment of the old legislation and of the many Jewish customs, as well as those of ancient gentiles, was illustrated by evocative prints.

With regard to architecture, Cunaeus's ground plan of Jerusalem, for which he had looked closely at Villalpando's example, is of interest (Fig. 4.2). The irregular city consists of more or less square housing blocks that have been adapted to the hilly terrain. The public, religious and state buildings are placed on squares and, what is essential, they all have elementary geometric volumes. David's Palace is situated in the centre of the circular fortress of his city, whereas the building itself is built on a square plan. The square or rectangular ground form with cubic corner pavilions is the basic type for nearly all the other large structures, like the Fortress of Antiochus, the Palace of Annas and the House of Pilatus. The special shape of the Palace of Solomon is remarkable, with its double inner courts that would become the example for Van Campen's Amsterdam Town Hall.²⁰ Semicircular and elliptical theatres are also present, referring to the Roman period. The city is dominated however, by the cubic Temple mountain and the square Temple complex on top of it, consisting of three concentric courts with the inner court again divided in nine inner squares. Cunaeus was

¹⁷ Steenmeijer 2005.

¹⁸ Katchen 1984, esp. part I.

¹⁹ I have consulted the Dutch edition by Willem Goeree: Cunaeus 1682–83.

²⁰ First observed by Guido Steenmeijer. See: Vlaardingbroek 2011, p. 254 n. 190.

before.²¹ In the façade of the almshouses of the Hofje van Brouchoven (1639–41), Van 's-Gravesande made reference to the frontispiece of Villalpando's second volume of Ezekiel's Temple vision.²² In this case the source was not a particular reconstructed ancient building, but the classicist imaginary architecture of a title page – a purely intellectual citation.

Cunaeus and his generation had only started a discussion that also spread to Franeker and Amsterdam. Nevertheless, the Calvinist scholarly discussion culminated in Leiden with the two most influential Christian Hebraists of the time, Constantijn L'Empereur and Johannes Cocceius. Constantijn L'Empereur van Oppyck (1591–1648) became professor of Hebrew studies in 1627. He met Van 's-Gravesande when they both became involved in the project of the Bibliotheca Thysiana (1654–57) at Leyden's most prominent canal the Rapenburg.²³ In 1630, L'Empereur published the first Latin translation of the Mishnah treatise Middoth.²⁴ The choice for this text is not clear and even raises some questions. Moreover, it cannot be explained by L'Empereur's official university commitment to refute rabbinical exegesis (*adversus judæos*).²⁵ The text deals mainly with the proportions of the Temple – Middoth means 'measurements' – and therefore is at some distance from theological key problems of the time or of rabbinic studies in general. However, the book did complement or correct known information about the dimensions of the Temple given in the Old Testament. L'Empereur mentions in his preface to the book that his close friends Daniel Heinsius and Gerard Johannes Vossius in Leiden had encouraged him to carry out this enterprise. The book was dedicated to the States of Holland, which suggests that it filled a certain need, or at least that there was an intellectual audience for it. Maybe the audience was indeed the Stadtholder's court or the Huygens circle.²⁶ More important is the phenomenon that on many occasions and in art, politics and theology the new Dutch state was advertised as the New Israel – the concept of *Neerlands Israel*.²⁷

21 Steenmeijer 2005, pp. 182–87, esp. p. 183.

22 Steenmeijer 2005, pp. 217–21. Prado had died in 1595 so Villalpando delivered the last two volumes of the study alone.

23 Steenmeijer 2005, pp. 255–56.

24 L'Empereur 1630; Van Rooden 1985, pp. 137–40.

25 Van Rooden 1985, p. 174.

26 L'Empereur knew Huygens from a distance and once wrote to him, reminding him that they had common family ties. See: Van Rooden 1985, pp. 231–32.

27 Bisschop 1993; Van Campen 2006, *passim*. Dunkelgrün 2009 provides an erudite overview of interpretations of this 'abundance of Hebraic imagery, Old Testament themes, biblical analogies, and other expressions of Israelite self-perception in Dutch Golden Age culture'.

In Leiden, the Temple theme proved to be far more than an incidental whim or private matter of isolated theorists. The people involved came from different directions and operated more or less independently on their own projects, but geographically they were concentrated around a small spot in Leiden, the Rapenburg. The university was located around this canal, as were several publishing houses like Elsevier's. Nearly all the professors of importance lived on or near this centre of learning. At the same time as the rise of the intellectual and social status around the canal, the townscape of this quarter developed at a brisk pace. Its medieval character acquired a new décor, an architecture according to the latest classicist standards with the 'learned' ionic pilaster façades. Mathematician and private lecturer Nicolaus Goldmann (1611–65) taught architecture and fortification in a block of houses at the Rapenburg.²⁸ By now it will come as no surprise that the comprehensive and highly systematic architectural theory he developed was ultimately founded on the Temple. His main source was Ezekiel's vision, and his main example Villalpando. On this canal, also, lived the second renowned Hebraist of the era, Johannes Cocceius.²⁹

Under the Spell of Ezekiel

Like L'Empereur, the theologian Johannes Cocceius (Koch or Cock; 1603–69) was born in Bremen.³⁰ He was trained as a philologist in Latin and Greek, as well as in Hebrew and Arabic. In Hamburg he was taught by a rabbi. In 1626 he moved to Franeker where he came under the influence of the Hebraist Sixtinus Amama, who by that time had succeeded Drusius. There Cocceius skilfully translated Sanhedrin and Makkot, two treatises from the Mishnah, into Latin, an achievement that won the admiration of Hugo Grotius, Heinsius and L'Empereur.³¹ Eventually, in 1650, his fame brought him to Leiden, where he became professor of theology. There he further developed his federal theology, claiming a covenant of grace to all true Christians.³² Although a famous theologian, it was for his Hebrew Lexicon that he became renowned after his

28 Goudeau 2005. Goldmann lived in the Hof van Zessen, i.e. Rapenburg 28F, now the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden.

29 'Coccejus, professor, weduwe en erven, Noord-Rapenburg'. *Leidse Lasten* 1674.

30 On Cocceius: Van Asselt 1997; Van Asselt 2001[a] and [b]. In Dutch his name is written as Coccejus, in Latin as Cocceius or Coccejus.

31 Cocceius 1629.

32 Developed in his main publication: *Summa Doctrinæ de Fœdere & Testamento Dei explicata*, Amsterdam 1648.

death.³³ The Countess Palatine Maria Eleonore of Brandenburg (1642–88) at Kaiserslautern urged him to this immense project; he was able to finish it only shortly before his death in 1669. His strong philological inclination and his almost exclusive focus on the Bible, combined with his more or less prophetic exegesis, brought him at the end of his life to delve into the vision of Ezekiel.³⁴

The book *Prophetia Ezechielis, Cum Commentario* appeared in Amsterdam in 1669. It consists of three parts: forty-eight richly annotated chapters of the Bible book ('Ezechiel Propheta', 372 pp.); an elaborate commentary on the chapters 40–48 that deal with the description of the Temple ('Significatio Templi Ezechielis', 42 pp.); and in between, nineteen full-page engravings that visualize Cocceius's interpretation of Ezekiel's Temple, accompanied by a short description ('Typus Sanctuarii'; 4 pp.). The treatise was reprinted in Cocceius's *Opera Omnia* of 1673–75 by his son Johannes Henricus Cocceius, who also published a Dutch translation in 1691: *De Prophetie Van Ezechiel, Met de Uitleggingen Van Johannes Coccejus*.³⁵ For this edition the illustrations were engraved anew, differing only in minor details.

Cocceius argued that Ezekiel's vision was about the Third Temple and could not be the one built by Zerubbabel. He maintained that this Second Temple, which looked very different from Ezekiel's version, had been corrupted in the past and had subsequently been destroyed. Moreover, Christ had come to the Second Temple, and according to the prophecy of Daniel 9:24, the Holy City and its Sanctuary had been ruined. Jerusalem was no longer the place where God could be found.³⁶ Finally, Ezekiel saw a Temple in the south, outside a city, whereas the measurements were far too large to fit on the plateau anyway.

The Third Temple would be *immaterial*, stated Cocceius, because God could not dwell in a House made by man. To understand the significance of this imagined building was to search for its *hidden meaning*. The vision prophesied the Kingdom of God, a *spiritual reality* with a spiritual significance.³⁷ Cocceius's whole commentary, in fact, is an argument to prove these points. It is strange that to this end Cocceius undertook a meticulous reconstruction of the Temple vision, both in words and in architecture (Figs 4.3–4.6). Although in

33 On Cocceius's relation to the study of Jewish sources, see: Van Campen 1992; Yoffie 2004.

34 On Cocceius and Ezekiel, see: Vogelsang 1981, pp. 241–43; Van Pelt 1991; Van Asselt 1996; Van Campen 2006, pp. 299–307.

35 Cocceius 1669; Cocceius 1673–75, vol. 3 1673, pp. 9–215; Cocceius 1691, pp. 1–627 – 'De Propheet Ezechiel'; pp. 628–40 – 'Afbeeldinge des Heyligdoms, soo der Voorhoven, als des Tempels, welke Ezechiel gesien heeft'; pp. 641–711 – 'De betekenisse van Ezechiel'. The title page of the Dutch edition states 1691 as publication date, the frontispiece 1692.

36 Cocceius 1691, p. 642.

37 Cocceius 1691, p. 642.

this he was anything but an exception, his rather hands-on approach to the architectural design seems at first sight incompatible with his emphasis on the intangibility of the structure. He took his project seriously and involved two specialists in it. The first of these was Samuel Kechelius, or Samuel Carl Kechel ab Hollensteyn (1611–68).³⁸ Kechelius was a mathematician and astronomer from Prague and worked as a private lecturer in Leiden. He became known for first observing the comet ('staert-ster') of 1664, which he described both to Christiaan Huygens and in a short tract.³⁹ Cocceius asked Kechelius because of his knowledge of mathematical problems and of architecture.⁴⁰ He could help with the conversion and interpretation of the biblical textual indications to a three-dimensional architecture. It is unknown if the two were already acquainted, but both were connected to the university.⁴¹

Curiously, the Czech Kechelius was the direct Rapenburg neighbour of the Silesian mathematician and architectural private lecturer Nicolaus Goldmann, who had presented his reconstruction of the Temple in 1659 or even earlier, so they must have exchanged ideas on this and other architectural topics.⁴² Cocceius had begun his Ezekiel commentary before 1665, the year Goldmann died. It is possible that Kechelius, as his neighbour and colleague, then became the nearest specialist at hand.⁴³ Kechelius, in his turn, died in 1668. Possibly the work was not wholly finished at that time. Meanwhile, a second specialist was added to the team. Cocceius's Amsterdam publisher, Johannes van Someren,

38 Cocceius writes: 'Wij hebben dan ook, na dat wy de woorden des Propheten, soo nauw als mogelijk ondersocht hadden, alles aangewend, op dat volgens de Prophetische maten, alle de plaatsen en deelen des Heyligdoms, door den Edelen en Vermaarden Wis-Konstenaar Samuel Karel Kechel goeder gedachtenisse, soudén afgeschetst werden, op dat selfs de oogen mochten sien en oordeelen van de seer gevoegsame bestellinge en bouw-orden'. Cocceius 1691, p. 628.

39 Jorink 2007, pp. 157–58. Passages on Kechelius: Goudeau 2005, p. 94 and 339; Goudeau 2012, pp. 227–29.

40 In a letter to Constantijn Huygens the Leiden mathematician Franciscus van Schooten Jun characterized him as very renowned for his knowledge in arithmetic, geometry, fortification and perspective, and as loved by all his colleagues: 'so heeft de voorsz. persoon groote renommée in de konst [...] ende hy verders van ijder seer bemint sy'. Briefwisseling Huygens 1911–17, vol. 4 (1915), 1644–49, GS 24, p. 317, letter 4369, 4 June 1646.

41 On 8 February 1666 Kechelius received an annual salary of 200 guilders by the senate of the university for 32 years of service in the study of mathematics. In 1667 he was not appointed as the successor of Golius but instead obtained permission for astronomical demonstrations at the university observatory. See: Molhuysen 1913–24, vol. 3, pp. 204 and 212.

42 Both lived at Rapenburg 28F. See: Lunsingh Scheurleer 1986–92, vol. 4b (1989), p. 653.

43 Cocceius makes no mention of Goldmann, nor explains his choice for Kechelius.

recommended a skilled architect of the Roman Catholic confession. Although he is not mentioned by name, it is almost certain that Philips Vingboons (1607–78) was the architect in question.⁴⁴ Vingboons was in great demand by the elite on the new canals in Amsterdam, for whom he also designed a fine series of country estates.⁴⁵ The preparation for the book and the illustrations were sent by mail and each stage of the visualization was discussed.⁴⁶ Initially there had even been plans to build a wooden model of the Temple as well, as Jacob Jehuda Leon and others had done. After 1665, this expensive and labour-intensive plan must have been abandoned.⁴⁷

According to Cocceius

On the whole, Cocceius interpreted the Bible historically. He developed a precise doctrine of seven successive stages of the liberation of the Church as described in the Revelation of St John and prophesized in Deuteronomy. These

-
- 44 Later, Cocceius's son Johannes Henricus did not come up with a name either, but spoke of 'one of the most eminent architects of Amsterdam'. Cocceius Jun 1692, p. 30. I thank Robert Jan van Pelt for this additional information. His explanation for this anonymity is that there arose a conflict between Cocceius and Vingboons. Van Pelt 1991, p. 105.
- 45 'Ook heeft de Boekverkoper, een treffelik Man, sich niet ontsien, met geen weinig kosten een seer ervaren Bouw-meester en ook diergelijken Plaat-snyder te huiuren; die met alle vlijd getracht hebben, 't geen wy in ons verstand bevat hadden, met alle neerstigheid afgetekend, den Leeser in eenige Taferelen te vertoonen'. Cocceius 1691, p. 628. On Vingboons, see: Ottenheym 1989.
- 46 Cocceius wrote about the progress in some letters to his friend Johannes van Dalen, the Calvinist minister of the Palatine court at Kaiserslautern. While the typesetting progressed to chapter 38, Cocceius received the drawing of the Temple façade from the Amsterdam artist, he reported at 3 September 1667: 'Ezechiel ad cap. 38. processit. Amsterodami Templum incidetur æri. Artificem nacti sumus Pontificium, qui orthographiam ejus exhibeat', Cocceius 1673–75, vol. 6 (1673), p. 67, Epistola CXLIV; 'Sex tabulæ sunt caulatæ [...] Pleraque hæc jam sunt formata ab Architecto Amstelodamensi, homine Pontificio, sed industrio, cælatura restat. Editor meus non parcit sumtibus'. Cocceius 1673–75, vol. 6 (1673), p. 74, Epistola CLXI: On 22/12 May 1668 the architects' drawings were ready. Apart from the first six illustrations, all the engraving had still to be done, for which the publisher reached into his pockets willingly.
- 47 This is mentioned in a letter again to Van Dalen in 1665, but Cocceius is not very convinced about the chance of success: 'Cæterum idem artifex [i.e. Kechelius/ Vingboons?] cogitaverat structuram hanc erigere è ligno. Sed, quia è manu laborat, & non habet, qui eum adjuvet, ab ipso nihil spero. Et nonnullius sumtus id foret'. Cocceius 1673–75, vol. 6 (1673), p. 57, Epistola CXVIII.

stages were taken as seven successive and *actual* historical periods (*curriculum regni*).⁴⁸ The first stage spanned the period from Christ's Ascension to the destruction of Jerusalem. The fifth period was marked by the Reformation, while the Thirty Years' War (1618–48) made the sixth. God's Realm was eventually to be fulfilled in the seventh stage. According to Cocceius's multi-staged, dynamic and eschatological expectation, the end of time would take place around 1667. His belief in the restoration of Israel in the countries of the Reformation, with far-reaching theological consequences, puts Cocceius's simultaneous involvement with Ezekiel's Temple vision in an imperative context. As the end of time, the present day acquired pregnant biblical dimensions. Therefore, for Cocceius the spiritual Temple must have been of highly topical interest. He must have felt strongly about his reconstruction project.

While becoming real in these very years, the Temple could not be visualized other than by the apex of contemporary architecture. This becomes evident in the nineteen engravings that accompany the text. They show the ground plans of the terrain, the complex and individual buildings, the façades, the cross-sections, and some special architectural elements such as the Solomonic columns, cherub decoration and the altar for burnt offering (*holocaustum*) (Figs 4.3–4.6). Besides the Temple building in the centre of the complex, Cocceius devoted a great deal of space to the annexes, such as the entrance gates and the houses of the priests. All buildings, with their specific position, measurements and decoration come together in a persuasive bird's-eye view of the complex with the Temple in the middle of a symmetrical lay-out (Fig. 4.3). The accuracy of the reconstruction is represented by the dominating grid. Moreover, the effect of the one-point perspective is intensified by axonometric projection, in this case the absence of a perspectival shortening. This drawing method also stresses the important role of the exactitude of the measurements. All in all, this perspective is more than an attractive addition to the traditional set of drawings required in architectural design: plan, elevation, and section. It is the recapitulation of an interpretation, emphasizing that all the parts and all the biblical instructions fit together.

One of the standing points of criticism in most reconstructions of the Temple was the determination of the unit of measure, that is, the interpretation of the biblical terms 'cubit' and 'palm' and the exact length of the measuring rod, as in Ezekiel 40:5. Villalpando and many others had opted for a rod of six cubits plus one palm. Cocceius read instead that every sacred Cubit measured an ordinary cubit plus a palm.⁴⁹ The consequences for the overall dimensions were

48 Van Asselt 1997, pp. 232–46; Van Asselt 1996, pp. 205–25.

49 Cocceius 1691, p. 646.

FIGURE 4.3 Johannes Cocceius, *Ezechiels Prophetie* [...], Amsterdam 1691, Tab. XVIII, bird's-eye view of the Temple complex, engraving. LEIDEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

enormous, as Cocceius's later critics would adduce. In fact, almost the whole project of the Temple is about measurements. The problem now is about how to bring these measurements together for the purposes of architecture, or, perhaps more accurately, how to fill in the parts that were not specified. The way Cocceius speaks about architectural detail shows his keen interest in the matter and reveals his contact with architectural specialists. He writes with ease about the detailing of mouldings or the arrangement of rooms. A large part of his philological enterprise concerns the interpretation of the text in architectural terms. However, at every turn Cocceius uses his architectural enunciations for a theological, emblematic interpretation.⁵⁰ So for example, the seven steps of the entrance gates to the courts symbolize the seven biblical periods. The Temple gate refers to Christ; the three thresholds represent the three witnesses. The incidence of light was telling – the windows representing the enlightenment of the eyes of intellect, as were all sorts of symbolic numbers (for instance 3, 7, 8, 12, 30, 60) and measures of rooms. The elementary proportions 1:1 and 1:2 dominated, just as the round biblical dimensions (for instance 500, 100, 50 and 25 rods; the square with sides of 500 rods = 3,000 Cubits → a

50 On Cocceius's emblematic exegesis, see: Faulenbach 1973, pp. 66–79; Van Asselt 1996, pp. 193–98.

circumference of 12,000 Cubits). The wind directions were also significant: the Antichrist came from the south; the Temple was situated in the west of the complex. Three steps reminded of the Trinity. Between the gates of the courts was a straight line as an allegory of the path to perfection. The outer court was one hundred by one hundred rods, 'meaning a large number'. The Holy of Holies represented the heavenly state on earth by way of the Church of the New Testament, and so on.⁵¹ Especially telling is the asymmetrical location of the house of the priests on the north side of the Temple. For Cocceius this proves that the (Church of the) North was predestined to lead the South – the Protestant Church would eventually lead to Salvation.⁵²

The reconstruction contains some striking architectural features. It involves a square plan (following Villalpando), but here divided in two concentric courts and the Temple connected against the inner quadrant (Fig. 4.3). The asymmetrical setting of the gates in the ring-walls is noteworthy. Cocceius's Temple building lacks the common higher front part, a characteristic of Ezekiel's vision. Furthermore, Cocceius does not follow the T-shaped ground plan with a broader front part, as in Josephus. Other reconstructions of Ezekiel's Temple, including Villalpando's, preferred Solomon's type with the tall entrance hall. The typical curved buttresses are applied to the walls around the courts and they also support the Temple nave. The flat roofs of the Temple and the gates are exceptional. This is also the case with the ressaults of the Temple side walls and the unusual application of the lowest, Tuscan order at the entrances. Most peculiar, however, are the asymmetrically positioned and set-back priests' housing blocks which are provided with large buttresses. The lay-out of the fronts strongly resemble the contemporary Dutch house building practice, especially the northern façade in the austere style, which would become the ideal in the later seventeenth century (Fig. 4.4). With respect to the decoration, the palm leaves on the outer walls of the Temple building, the palm trees on the gates and the crowning pomegranates are characteristic.

Although much more can be said about the architecture, in this context two remarks are especially relevant. First, that text and illustration do not always correspond exactly. This is salient in the case of the two Solomonic columns, Jachin and Boaz, which are made much smaller than in Cocceius's description. Another striking detail concerns the positioning of the buttresses of the Temple building in relation to the pilasters (Figs 4.3 and 4.5). In comparing the elevation drawings, the only way to solve this question is to assume that the pilasters are at the same time buttresses – a very odd architectural solution.

⁵¹ Cocceius 1691, p. 664.

⁵² Cocceius 1691, p. 670.

FIGURE 4.4 *Johannes Cocceius, Opera Omnia [...], Amsterdam 1673-75, vol. 3, Tabs XIV and XV, elevations of the House of the Priests, southern and northern façades, engraving. TILBURG UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.*

The clever projection in which the Temple side walls are not visible conceals the inconsistency almost perfectly, only betrayed by the curved shadows of the pilasters on the side walls (Fig. 4.5). On this point the theologian and the architect must have disagreed strongly.

This incongruence leads to the fundamental difference between the textual and visual reconstruction of the Temple. The key problem is that in philology one can omit or avoid certain gaps that a drawing cannot. Architectural reconstructions demand that *every detail* is considered meticulously and aligns with all the other instructions. The architect or artist has to remedy the deficiencies and for that he has to make many choices. In the end, the interpretation could be determined by features on which the textual sources were silent. One of

FIGURE 4.5 *Johannes Cocceius, Ezechiels Prophetie [...], Amsterdam 1691, Tab. VIII, elevation of the Temple building, southern side wall, engraving. LEIDEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.*

these things can be the choice of a specific architectural style. Not infrequently critics of certain Temple reconstructions stressed the aspects that were the consequence of filling in these lacunas. As such, apart from a theological stand, the reconstructions also became part of an architectural debate.

Images of Biblical Criticism

As one of the most influential theologians of his time, Johannes Cocceius became involved in various debates. Apart from the controversy with the theologian Gisbertus Voetius, he was, unwillingly, and to a certain extent, undeservedly classified as a Cartesian.⁵³ His theology thus was perceived as having philosophical and even scientific dimensions. This had its effect on the position of the so-called Cocceians, many of whom in some way engaged in Ezekiel's vision.⁵⁴ With his Temple reconstruction Cocceius also entered the

53 Broeyer and Van der Wall 1994; Vermij 2002, pp. 318–21; McGahagan 1976, pp. 274–76, 307–11, 364–69.

54 For example Jacobus van Ostade, David Flud van Giffen, Fredericus Van Leenhof, Friedrich Adolf Lampe and Salomon van Til. See: Van Campen 2006, *passim*.

domain of architecture. In his architectural translation of Ezekiel, the future was not only a projection of religious desire, but also a place where one actually could and would want to live. The architecture was both ideally distant and familiar, referring to the best examples of the new classicist architecture in the Dutch Republic. Cocceius's commitment had two dimensions that mutually interacted. On the theological level, the architecture functioned as a *medium*, by which the immaterial was visualized and by means of which the spiritual meaning could more easily be grasped. This theological and learned reconstruction was at the same time a *manifestation* of thinking about the foundations of true architecture.

It is not surprising that dissenting opinions came from both sides. Cocceius's opponent Campegius Vitringa (1659–1722) interpreted Ezekiel's Temple as a material building and rejected Cocceius's chiliastic inclination. The antiquarian, bookseller and architectural theorist Willem Goeree (1635–1711) criticized the reconstruction in architectural terms; the basic rod, for instance, was misunderstood.⁵⁵ These combined attacks were countered in 1692 by Johannes Henricus Cocceius (1642–1712), son of Johannes, in the comprehensive defence *Naeder Ondersoek Van het Rechte Verstand Van den Tempel*.⁵⁶ This publication in its turn provoked a second argument by Vitringa in the form of a 'letter' of a few hundred pages.⁵⁷ In architectural publications, Johannes's original reconstruction was noted several times, for instance in a treatise on the Temple by the German architect and theologian Leonhard Christoph Sturm (1669–1719), whose father, the Cartesian mathematician Johann Christoph Sturm (1609–70) once had studied in Leiden. Sturm was also in the possession of the manuscripts of the Leiden theorist Nicolaus Goldmann, including his Temple reconstruction. In 1696, Sturm was to publish the latter's architectural theory in which he included the unabridged text of Ezekiel 40–46.⁵⁸

Cocceius's Temple engravings were biblical criticism by visual means. Generally the term biblical criticism is reserved for textual operations, in which the Bible counts as the universal, and only reliable and incontestable source – the adage *sola scriptura*. As a consequence, the Bible had to be taken literally and the true meaning of God's word could only be revealed through the correct source. Apart from the text of the Bible containing obscure tracts and conflict-

55 Vitringa 1687; Goeree's criticism esp. in: Goeree 1690. On Goeree and architecture, see: Van den Heuvel 1997.

56 Cocceius Jun 1692.

57 Vitringa 1693. The discussion between Cocceius Jun, Vitringa and Goeree in relation to the interpretation of Cocceius Sen is outside the scope of this paper.

58 Sturm 1694; Goldmann 1696, pp. 32–40 and 42–46. Goudeau 2005, ch. 14.

ing information, there was also the question of which counted as the basic authoritative text. Therefore people such as Hugo Grotius started to compare the most important Bible sources, those being the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Masoretic Tanakh, in their most reliable versions. To do so, one had to master the three languages of Antiquity: Greek, Latin and Hebrew – the ideal of the *eruditio trias lingualis*.⁵⁹ Cocceius was one of those scholars in the heyday of biblical criticism. In scholarly circles, the problematic character of corrupted transcripts, translations and editions caused a vehement discussion on the right interpretation of the Bible. Perhaps less obvious, but certainly less studied in the context of this debate, is the impact of the image.

The theme of the Temple can serve as a good example. The visualizations of the reconstruction are more than a supplementary illustration to a source text. As stated, the engravings also caused a debate, theologically as well as historically, albeit conducted on another level and with other means, but within the same context of criticism. The examples of the pair Prado-Villalpando and the alliance Cocceius-Kechelius-Vingboons show that text and image are strongly intertwined. In his written commentary on Ezekiel, Cocceius took the classic course – from the reproduction of the source text, through an extensive philological commentary on grammar and semantics, to a specific theological interpretation. To that he added the visual translation of the text by way of a reconstruction that he thought of as accurate. Actually, with the illustrations he went in the opposite direction: he used the insights gained by his criticism, via an architectonic translation to a visual representation of what he thought of as the original Temple – from the interpretation back to the source.

Vanishing Points – Jerusalem and the Temple

Cocceius was convinced that if all the biblical information on the Temple was correct then Ezekiel could not have seen the Temple of Jerusalem, although it shared some features with Salomon's First Temple. Villalpando, among others, had striven to combine the two (Ezekiel $\approx$ Salomon). Other authors, such as Vatable, considered them entirely different structures (Ezekiel $\neq$ Salomon). For Cocceius, at the end time Ezekiel's Temple would replace the once perfect Sol-

59 The three languages were gradually extended to four, with Arabic. In the course of the seventeenth century Hebrew became more and more subsumed under theology and in the eighteenth century the Hebraists would be eventually replaced by the broader-based Orientalists. See: Katchen 1984, p. 18.

omonic Temple (Ezekiel ← Salomon). Most of the seventeenth-century authors saw Ezekiel's vision in one way or another as a point of reference.

When evaluating the different Temple reconstructions, one has to be aware of the connection between the two real Temples and the envisioned third one. In the case of Cocceius, the Temple was a purely spiritual one that nevertheless would be realized in a short space of time – as a state of being in which the visualized building acted as the emblem. Cocceius was convinced that the end of time was at hand around 1667.⁶⁰ Hence, the Dutch Republic was only the last – and best – phase of world history. Although Cocceius cannot be regarded as a chiliast *pur sang*, it is remarkable that in some respects his expectations coincide with other chiliastic prophecies, such as the turmoil around the self-proclaimed messiah Sabbatai Zevi (1626–76) around 1666, which affected especially the Sephardic community in Amsterdam.⁶¹ Cocceius's strong conviction that Ezekiel's vision was topical is revealing with respect to the choice for a Temple reconstruction by one of the leading contemporary architects. Cocceius related the architecture of Ezekiel's Temple to the contemporary situation in the Republic. The Dutch classicist architecture was the *décor* of the young self-confident Republic that showed its newly gained prosperity through it. The foundation of contemporary design principles on true biblical architecture connected the Republic, not only in a metaphorical way but also in a physical sense, to the land of the Bible. This theoretical connection had practical architectural applications. Explicit references to the Temple were made in emblematic ornamentation such as the curved buttresses, palm leaves, pomegranates and cherubs mentioned (Fig. 4.6). Less obvious were design schemes following the measurements or proportions of the Temple, indirectly readable but directly related to God's own architecture. What is remarkable is that in the built examples, eclecticism was more common than the restriction to one interpretation. Apart from the better-known references that could be understood by anyone, a more scholarly interpretation was reserved for a small audience. With references to the Temple, the patrons, scholars and architects debated by means of stone; they showed their knowledge and status to the educated beholder. Similar to Cocceius's goals on a theological level, in this architecture the immaterial became tangible. In real buildings, the Temple reconstruction as an historical and philological operation, acquired a meaning

60 Van Asselt 1996, p. 211. Moreover, for Cocceius the broad interest by scholars in the study of Hebrew sources was an indication that the restoration of Israel would be imminent. See: Van Campen 2006, p. 290.

61 Kaplan 2004, pp. 152–54.

FIGURE 4.6 *Johannes Cocceius, Ezechiels Prophetie [...], Amsterdam 1691, Tab. IX, longitudinal section of the Temple building, engraving. LEIDEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.*

for the society of that time, with an implicit view to a future end state – the *eschaton*, the new heaven and new earth.

And Jerusalem? In the Dutch Republic, the distance to the Jerusalem of the Second Temple was great – geographically, in time, but above all ideologically. The destruction of the Temple was irreversible. The two successive buildings had been lost, as had the Old Covenant. The New Testament would eventually lead to the fulfilment of the Scripture, including the Temple, the visionary meaning of which prevailed. The Temple was lost in Jerusalem but was projected onto the Republic in a civil society steeped with Calvinism, and in different ways now regarded as the New Jerusalem.⁶² With Ezekiel, the exclusive bond with Jerusalem had been removed, as Cocceius stressed with reference to the last verse of the vision.⁶³ To search for the physical remnants of the Temple in Jerusalem was no longer relevant. The certainty of the twofold destruction surpassed the knowledge of remains still to be seen in the Holy City. The Temple belonged to a closed period of history. Thus the building became a double vanishing point in memory – back to Solomon, ahead with Ezekiel. For Cocceius the Temple of Jerusalem had become a place of the absence of God, a

62 Cocceius 1691, Voor-reden; Dunkelgrün 2009.

63 Cocceius 1691, p. 711.

divine dwelling but now an empty one. Ezekiel's Temple took its place – both immaterial and material, spiritual and even eschatological, a revaluated Christian concept of a quintessentially Jewish promise.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- [De Bray, Salomon], 'Aen den Leser', in: Hendrick de Keyser, *Architectvra Moderna ofte Bouwinge van onsen tyt* [...], Amsterdam 1631, pp. 1–5.
- Cocceius, Johannes, *Duo Tituli Talmudici Sanhedrin et Maccoth cum versione, et commentarius*, Amsterdam 1629.
- , *Prophetia Ezechielis, Cum Commentario* [...] *Accedunt XIX Typi æri incisi, qui exhibent Sanctuarium, quod vidit Propheta ejusque partes & mensuras earum*, Amsterdam 1669.
- , *Opera Omnia Theologica, Exegetica, Didactica, Polemica, Philologica* [...], 8 vols, Amsterdam 1673–75.
- , *De Prophetie Van Ezechiël, Met de Uitleggingen Van Johannes Coccejus* [...] *Getrouwelijk uyt het Latijn Vertaald*, Amsterdam 1691.
- Cocceius, Johannes Henricus, *Naeder Ondersoeck Van het Rechte Verstand Van den Tempel die den Propheet Ezechiël Gesien en beschreven heeft in zijn Laetste Gesichte, En des Jesuits Villalpands bevattingen daer omtrent: Voorgesteld aen den seer Eerwaerden en Geleerden Heer Campegius Vitringa* [...] *Verçierd met de nodige Afbeeldsels*, Amsterdam 1692.
- Cunaeus, Petrus, *De Republyk Der Hebreëen, Of Gemeenebest der Joden. In drie boeken*, ed. by W. Goeree, 3 vols, Amsterdam 1682–83.
- L'Empereur, Constantijn, *Masekhet midot me-Talmud Bavli; hoc est, Talmudis Babylonici codex Middoth, sive De mensuris Templi, unà cum versione Latina* [...] *Additis commentariis*, Leiden 1630.
- Goeree, Willem, *Voor-Bereidselen Tot de Bybelsche Wysheit en Gebruik der Heilige en Kerkelijke Historien* [...], Amsterdam 1690.
- Goldmann, Nicolaus, *Vollständige Anweisung zu der Civil Bau=Kunst* [...], ed. Leonhard Christoph Sturm, Wolfenbüttel 1696.
- Prado, Hiëronymus, and Juan Bautista Villalpando, *In Ezechielem Explanationes Et Apparatus Urbis, ac Templi Hierosolymitani. Commentariis Et Imaginibus Opus Tribus Tomis Distinctum*, 3 vols, Rome 1596–1605.
- Sturm, Leonhard Christoph, *Sciagraphia templi Hierosolymitani ex ipsis ss. literarum fontibus, præsertim ex visione Ezechielis ultima Architectonice quidem* [...], Leipzig 1694.

Vitringa, Campegius, *Aanleydinge tot het Rechte Verstand van den Tempel, Die de Propheet Ezechiël gesien en beschreven heeft*, Franeker 1687.

———, *'t Rechte Verstant van den Tempel Ezechiëlis, Verdeedigt en Bevestigt, in een Brief, dienende tot antwoord, aen den Ed. en Wel-geleerden Heer, Johannes Henricus Cocceius [...]*, Harlingen 1693.

Secondary Literature

Asselt, W.J. van, 'Ultimum tempus nobis imminet. Eschatologische structuren van de theologie van Johannes Coccejus', *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis/ Dutch Review of Church History* 76 (1996), pp. 189–226.

———, *Johannes Cocceius. Portret van een zeventiende-eeuws theoloog op oude en nieuwe wegen*, Heerenveen 1997.

———, 'Chiliasm and Reformed Eschatology in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in: *Christian Hope in Context, Studies in Reformed Theology* 4, ed. by A. van Egmond and D. van Keulen, Zoetermeer 2001[a], pp. 11–29.

———, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669)*, Leiden and Boston MA 2001[b].

Bennet, Jim, and Scott Mandelbrote, *The Garden, the Ark, the Tower, the Temple. Biblical Metaphors of Knowledge in Early Modern Europe*, Oxford 1998.

Bisschop, Roelof, *Sions Vorst en volk. Het tweede-Israëlidee als theocratisch concept in de Gereformeerde kerk van de Republiek tussen ca. 1650 en ca. 1750*, Veenendaal 1993.

De briefwisseling van Constantijn Huygens (1608–1687), ed. by J. Worp, 6 vols, The Hague 1911–17.

Broeyer, F.G.M., and E.G.E. van der Wall, eds, *Een richtingenstrijd in de Gereformeerde Kerk. Voetianen en Coccejanen 1650–1750*, Zoetermeer 1994.

Busink, Th.A., *Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes*, 2 vols, Leiden 1970–1980.

Campen, Mathijs van, 'Voetius en Coccejus over de Joden', *Documentatieblad Nadere Reformatie* 16, no. 1 (1992), pp. 2–16.

———, *Gans Israël. Voetiaanse en coccejaanse visies op de joden gedurende de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw*, Ph. D. diss., Leiden 2006.

Delano-Smith, Catherine, 'The Exegetical Jerusalem: Maps and Plans for Ezekiel Chapters 40–48', in: *Imagining Jerusalem in the Medieval West*, ed. by Lucy Donkin and Hanna Vorholt, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 175, Oxford 2012, pp. 41–76.

Dunkelgrün, Theodor, '"Neerlands Israel": Political Theology, Christian Hebraism, Biblical Antiquarianism, and Historical Myth', in: *Myth in History, History in Myth*, ed. by Laura Cruz and Willem Frijhoff, Leiden and Boston MA 2009, pp. 201–36.

Edelman, Diana, *The Origins of the 'Second' Temple. Persian Imperial Policy and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem*, London and Oakville CT 2005.

- Faulenbach, Heiner, *Weg und Ziel der Erkenntnis Christi. Eine Untersuchung zur Theologie des Johannes Coccejus*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche 36, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1973.
- Goldhill, Simon, *The Temple of Jerusalem*, Cambridge MA 2004.
- Goudeau, Jeroen, *Nicolaus Goldmann (1611–1665) en de wiskundige architectuurwetenschap*, Groningen 2005.
- Goudeau, Jeroen, 'Safe Strongholds. Mathematical Fortification and the Fortress of Mathematics', in: *Festungsbau. Geometrie – Technologie – Sublimierung*, ed. by Bettina Marten, Ulrich Reinisch, and Michael Korey, Berlin 2012, pp. 219–35.
- Hermann, Wolfgang, 'Unknown Designs for the "Temple of Jerusalem" by Claude Perrault', in: *Essays in the History of Architecture presented to Rudolph Wittkower*, ed. by D. Fraser, H. Hibbard, and M.J. Lewine, Bristol 1967, pp. 143–58 and ill. xvii.
- Heuvel, Charles van den, 'Willem Goeree (1635–1711) en de ontwikkeling van een algemene architectuurtheorie in de Nederlanden', *Bulletin KNOB* 96, no. 5 (1997), pp. 154–76.
- Jorink, Eric, *Het Boeck der Natuere. Nederlandse geleerden en de wonderen van Gods Schepping 1575–1715*, Leiden 2007.
- Kaplan, Y., 'De joden in de Republiek tot omstreeks 1750. Religieus, cultureel en sociaal leven', in: *Geschiedenis van de joden in Nederland*, ed. by J.C.H. Blom, R.G. Fuks-Mansfeld, and I. Schöffner, 2004², pp. 129–73.
- Katchen, Aaron L., *Christian Hebraists and Dutch Rabbis. Seventeenth Century Apologetics and the Study of Maimonides' Mishneh Torah*, Harvard Judaic Texts and Studies 3, Cambridge MA and London 1984.
- Leidse Lasten 1674. Twee belastingcohiëren uit 1674*, Regionaal Archief Leiden, sign.: SA Leiden SA 11, 4387. Retrieved from: http://www.janvanhout.nl/leilas/gjp_frame.htm (accessed December 2012).
- Linden, C.J.R. van der, 'De symboliek van de Nieuwe Kerk van Jacob van Campen te Haarlem', *Oud Holland* 104, no. 1 (1990), pp. 1–31.
- Lunsingh Scheurleer, Th.H., C. Willemijn Fock, and A.J. van Dissel, *Het Rapenburg. Geschiedenis van een Leidse gracht*, 6 vols in 11 bindings, Leiden 1986–92.
- McCormick, Clifford Mark, *Palace and Temple. A Study of Architectural and Verbal Icons*, Berlin and New York 2002.
- McGahagan, Thomas Arthur, *Cartesianism in the Netherlands, 1639–1676. The New Science and the Calvinist Counter-Reformation*, Ph. D. diss., Philadelphia PA 1976.
- Miletto, Gianfranco, *Glauben und Wissen im Zeitalter der Reformation. Der Salomonische Tempel bei Abraham ben David Portaleone (1542–1612)*, Studia Judaica 27, Berlin and New York 2004.
- Molhuysen, P.C., *Bronnen tot de geschiedenis der Leidsche Universiteit*, 7 vols, The Hague 1913–24.

- Naredi-Rainer, Paul von, *Salomos Tempel und das Abendland. Monumentale Folgen historischer Irrtümer*, with a contrib. by Cornelia Limpricht, Cologne 1994.
- Offenberg, A.K., 'Jacob Jehuda Leon (1602–1675) en zijn Tempelmodel', in: *De Tempel van Salomo. Een terugblik in het nabije en verre verleden ter gelegenheid van de feestelijke opening van de Synagoge bij de Prinsessegracht in Den Haag*, ed. by J.F. van Agt et al., The Hague 1976, pp. 54–75.
- , 'Jacob Jehuda Leon en zijn tempelmodel: een joods-christelijk project', *De zeventiende eeuw* 9, no. 1 (1993), pp. 35–50.
- , 'Dirk van Santen and the Keur Bible: New Insight into Jacob Judah (Arye) Leon Temple's Model Temple', *Studia Rosenthaliana* 37 (2004), pp. 401–22.
- Ottenheim, Koen, *Philips Vingboons (1607–1678) architect*, Zutphen 1989.
- Ozinga, M.D., *De protestantsche kerkenbouw in Nederland. Van Hervorming tot Franschen Tijd*, Amsterdam 1929.
- Pelt, Robert Jan van, *Tempel van de wereld. De kosmische symboliek van de tempel van Salomo*, Utrecht 1984.
- , 'Coccejus y el templo sin arquitecto', in: Ramirez, Juan Antonio, *Dios Arquitecto. J.B. Villalpando y el Templo de Salomón*, Madrid 1991, pp. 104–08.
- De Portugese Synagoge in Amsterdam*, ed. by Pieter Vlaardingerboek et al., Zwolle/Amersfoort/ Amsterdam 2012.
- Ramirez, Juan Antonio, *Dios Arquitecto. J.B. Villalpando y el Templo de Salomón*, Madrid 1991.
- Rooden, Peter Theodoor van, *Constantijn L'Empereur (1591–1648), professor Hebreuws en theologie te Leiden. Theologie, bijbelwetenschap en rabbijnse studiën in de zeventiende eeuw*, Ph. D. diss., Leiden 1985.
- Rosenau, Helen, *Vision of the Temple. The Image of the Temple of Jerusalem in Judaism and Christianity*, London 1979.
- Shanks, Hershel, *Jerusalem's Temple Mount. From Solomon to the Golden Dome*, New York and London 2007.
- Steenmeijer, Guido, *Tot cieraet ende aensien deser stede. Arent van 's-Gravesande (ca. 1610–1662), architect en ingenieur*, Leiden 2005.
- Vermij, Rienk, *The Calvinist Copernicans. The Reception of the New Astronomy in the Dutch Republic, 1575–1750*, Amsterdam 2002.
- Vlaardingerboek, Pieter, *Het paleis van de Republiek. Geschiedenis van het stadhuis van Amsterdam*, Zwolle 2011.
- Vogelsang, Bernd, 'Archaische Utopien'. *Materialien zu Gerhard Schotts Hamburger 'Bühnenmodel' des Templum Salomonis*, Ph. D. diss., Cologne 1981.
- Yoffie, Adina M., 'Cocceius and the Jewish Commentators', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 65, no. 3 (2004), pp. 383–98.