

## THE TEMPLE MOUNT IN THE LOWLANDS

*Gary Schwartz*

*For Adri Offenber*

On 6 June 1646 the town government of Haarlem passed a resolution that was recorded in these words: “De Jode is toegestaan in de St. Jans kermis de Temple Salomons te mogen laten sien” [the Jew is allowed to show the Temple of Solomon at the Fair of Sint Jan].<sup>1</sup> There can be no doubt as to the identity of “the Jew.” It was, of course, Jacob Jehudah Leon, who in the same year also showed his model of the Temple of Solomon at the fair of The Hague (fig. 1).<sup>2</sup> Leon had been working in Middelburg since about 1639 and was to remain for several years thereafter, under the patronage and at the expense of the millenarian Christian theologian Adam Boreel. Their collaboration included the construction of a model of the First Temple, the publication of a book on the subject,<sup>3</sup> and bringing out an edition of the Mishnah in vocalized Hebrew, with Spanish and Latin translations. This fruitful and fascinating cooperation was termed by Adri Offenber “a Jewish-Christian project.”

Over and above its intrinsic importance, the Temple of Solomon as reconstructed by Jacob Jehudah Leon (fig. 2) provided inspiration for an even more striking manifestation of Jewish-Christian cooperation in early modern Europe, the great synagogues of Amsterdam. Jonathan Israel wrote of the Ashkenazi Grote Synagoge (1669–1671)

---

<sup>1</sup> C. J. R. van der Linden, “De symboliek van de Nieuwe Kerk van Jacob van Campen te Haarlem,” *Oud Holland* 104 (1990), p. 25 n. 36, with source: Gemeentearchief Haarlem (now Noord-Hollands Archief), Archief Stad Haarlem, inv. no. 14: burgemeestersresoluties 1645–1647. Van der Linden’s outstanding article was based on a graduate paper for Gerrit Vermeer of the Vrije Universiteit. It is very regrettable that this gifted researcher and scholar did not continue to work in the field of art history.

<sup>2</sup> A. K. Offenber, “Jacob Jehudah Leon en zijn tempelmodel: een joods-christelijk project,” *De Zeventiende Eeuw* 9 (1993), p. 38.

<sup>3</sup> Iacob Iehvda Leon Ebreo, *Afbeeldinghe vanden Tempel Salomonis...* (Middelburg: Erfgenamen Symon Moulert, 1642).

and the Sephardi Esnoga (1671–1675), one of the largest buildings in Holland, that they “were not only the first imposing synagogues built in the Republic, but the first in western Europe.”<sup>4</sup> The architects, Elias Bouwman and Daniël Stalpaert, were officials of the city of Amsterdam. The inaugurations of the buildings were presided over by the burgomasters themselves, in an exceptional sign of favor. Moreover, the buildings and their surroundings became and remained models of interconfessional accord. They immediately became tourist attractions for Christians as well as Jews. Abraham Rademaker’s 1772 view of the square on which the buildings were located, depicted with visible pride, shows all faiths, nationalities and classes sharing the rather glamorous space of the Muidergracht equally (fig. 3). All revisionist relativizing aside, we should not lose sight of this nor underestimate its significance in not only Dutch, but also European, history.

However, this striking success should not deceive us into thinking that Jews and Christians assigned the same meaning to the Temple in Jerusalem, or that Temple symbolism in Dutch architecture emanated a unifying message to the two faiths. Looking more closely into the background of Temple symbolism in Dutch architecture before the building of the synagogues, we shall see that this was far from being the case.

In 1929, Jac. Zwarts pointed out the resemblance between a characteristic feature of the Portuguese synagogue and Leon’s model.<sup>5</sup> The flying—or at least hopping—buttresses in Leon’s reconstruction of the colossal base of the Temple Mount come close to the even more massive buttresses of one side of the Portuguese synagogue (figs. 4–5). This comparison is impressive, but in the key regard it is misleading. The buttresses of the synagogue were not part of the original construction of 1675. They were added a hundred years later in the second half of the 1770s.

A comparison of Leon’s reconstruction with buttresses of the Portuguese synagogue that were not rebuilt in the 1770s shows that a more modest solution was adopted (fig. 6). In formal terms, it does not resemble Leon’s print very closely. The curve does not begin at the top

---

<sup>4</sup> J. I. Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806* (Oxford 1995), p. 867.

<sup>5</sup> Van der Linden, “De symboliek,” p. 22 n. 5, with reference to Zwarts’s articles.

but near the bottom of the pilaster, which must have been a cheaper alternative. But the basic idea—that the pilasters projected outward at their base—is respected. Understandably, Zwarts assumed that the builders had installed this feature to give expression in the architecture to the Jewishness of the building. The officials of the Jewish community who commissioned the synagogue, he reasoned, would have told the Christian architects with whom they worked that all synagogues partake of the nature of the Temple. They would have shown them Leon's print or model, which was housed a few blocks away. This is an attractive proposition, and it cannot be eliminated as a possibility. However, as we shall see, this likelihood is weakened considerably by the fact that the feature in question was not uniquely Jewish at all.

In Haarlem in June 1646, at the very time that Jacob Jehudah Leon was proudly displaying (for a modest charge) his model of Solomon's Temple at the Sint Jans kermis, another version of the Temple of Solomon was being constructed a few blocks away (fig. 7). On the site of the former church of St. Anne on the Annekerkhof, a new church was being built, called simply the Nieuwe Kerk. The name referred to the fact that this was the first church to be built in Haarlem for Protestant worship, replacing the former Catholic church. The architect was the renowned Jacob van Campen (1595–1657), who had already built the Mauritshuis in The Hague and had begun work on the new town hall for Amsterdam. A quarter of a century before the construction of the Portuguese synagogue, van Campen provided the Nieuwe Kerk with receding pilasters even more pronounced than those in the Jewish place of worship (fig. 8). Since architectural articulation is kept to a bare minimum in the Nieuwe Kerk, the pilasters play quite an important role in the total impression of the building.

Jacob van Campen may or may not have known Jacob Jehudah Leon's publication on the Temple of 1642. As we happen to know, however, the architect was certainly acquainted with the far more glorious and better illustrated publication that had also served Jacob Jehudah as a source. In 1634, van Campen was working intensively in The Hague with Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687) on the construction of Huygens's house on the Plein and also on the Mauritshuis, not a hundred yards away. Both buildings are full of architectural symbolism. On December 5, 1634, Huygens wrote to a friend in Rome, the diplomat and scholar Joachim de Wicquefort, that van Campen was helping him in his study of Vitruvius, the Roman author on architecture. Huygens writes with a

request: “Mr. van Campen knows that you own Villalpando on Ezekiel and would like to borrow it.” The request was honored.<sup>6</sup>

Villalpando’s commentary on Ezekiel is an extraordinary book. Between 1595 and 1604, the Spanish Jesuits Jeronimo Prado (1547–1595) and Juan Bautista Villalpando (1552–1608) published a Latin commentary on the book of Ezekiel, in which the prophet Ezekiel describes his vision of the new Temple that would be built in Jerusalem to replace the one that was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in the early sixth century BCE. The authors assumed that the replacement was to be identical to the lost Temple, and that Ezekiel’s vision therefore adumbrated a precise description of the Temple of Solomon. As the title print to vol. 3 shows, the connections go further. The prophet’s vision of the Temple in Ezekiel 40–41 was linked to his image of the *merkavah* in chapter 1, the chariot that was the central symbol of early kabbalah (fig. 9).<sup>7</sup>

Villalpando’s volume on the Temple was related to an older and even more monumental project. It was tied up intimately with the design, construction, and iconography of the Escorial, the great palace of Philip II outside Madrid (1559–1584; fig. 10). Philip II saw himself as the successor of, among others, the ancient kings of Judah. The Patio de los Reyes is governed by David and Solomon. He also saw himself as the successor to Christ, and his palace was to show that. The cruciform ground plan of his power center allowed Philip to live and die in imitation of Christ. Not the pastoral Christ of Thomas à Kempis, but Christ as Ruler of the Universe. The research of Villalpando into the architecture of the Temple in Jerusalem added luster to this enterprise, and Philip subsidized it lavishly, paying 3,000 scudi for the engraving of the prints.

A comparison of Villalpando’s Temple reconstruction (1604) with a print of the Escorial by Abraham Ortelius from 1597 (fig. 11) shows both to have the same basic horizontal and vertical divisions and over-

<sup>6</sup> “Il [i.e. Jacob van Campen] a scuu que vous possédez Vilalpandus sur Ezechiel et vous le demandera par emprunt . . .”; J. A. Worp, *De briefwisseling van Constantijn Huygens (1608–1687)*, vol. 2, 1634–1639 (The Hague 1913), pp. 36–37 (letter no. 1046) and 215 (letter no. 1509).

<sup>7</sup> Hieronymi Pradi and Ioannis Baptistae Villalpandi, in *Ezechielem explanationes et apparatus urbis, ac templi Hierosolymitani: Commentariis et imaginibus illustratus . . .*, 3 vols. (Rome: Typis Illelonsi Ciacconij, excudebat Carolus Vulliettus, 1596–1605). Villalpando was responsible for the third volume, which contains the prints of the Temple. Hereafter I refer to the book by his name alone.

all proportions. The latter was essential, since Villalpando located the sanctity of the Temple not in its topographical position but in its proportions, which reflected the divine order. The elevation of the Temple in fig. 11 is a detail of Villalpando's conception of the Temple Mount as a whole, a stunning image (fig. 12). The Temple is poised on top of what would have been the most massive man-made structure ever built, had it existed. The sheer visual power of Villalpando's illustrations captivated audiences all over Europe for centuries to come. They also carried conviction among scholars like Jacob Jehudah Leon, whose Temple Mount is nearly identical to that of the Spanish Jesuits.

Architects, too, were enthralled by the vision of Villalpando. The response of Jacob van Campen, to return to our main man, is evident not only in the Nieuwe Kerk in Haarlem but also in two earlier churches. In 1639, before the Jewish Leon began *his* project in about 1640, in collaboration with the Protestant Boreel, the Catholic van Campen designed Protestant churches in the villages of Renswoude in Utrecht province (fig. 13) and Hooze Zwaluwe in North Brabant (fig. 14; restored twice in the twentieth century after a fire in 1910). The details and the precise line of the curve may differ, but the spirit of Villalpando is captured unmistakably by van Campen (fig. 15).<sup>8</sup>

The references in these churches to the Temple in Jerusalem are not limited to formal properties. They extend to liturgical and spiritual features as well. The church of Hooze Zwaluwe stood on hereditary grounds of the House of Orange. That is the reason why van Campen, one of the leading architects of the Netherlands at that moment and architect to the court, was called upon to design this village church. The foundation stone alludes to his patronage in these terms: "Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange, elevated this sanctuary from its foundations, dedicated to God Almighty and to the blessed community of the people of Zwaluwe, 1641." This is followed by a verse from the First Epistle of Peter, "Thus will you as living stones be built into a spiritual house" (2:5). The full verse, in the Revised Standard Version, reads: "and like living stones be yourselves built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God

---

<sup>8</sup> Photographs by Jan Derwig, 1995, for the exhibition catalogue *Jacob van Campen: het klassieke ideaal in de Gouden Eeuw*, ed. Jacobine Huisken et al. (Amsterdam 1995), pp. 181, 183. The comparison with Villalpando was made by Ottenheim and earlier by W. Kuyper, in *Dutch Classicist Architecture: A Survey of Dutch Architecture, Gardens and Anglo-Dutch Relations from 1625 to 1700* (student edition; Delft 1980), p. 15.

through Jesus Christ.” This refers unmistakably to the Temple, with its stone building, its priesthood, and its sacrifices. Rather than paying homage to the Jewish place of worship, however, or even acknowledging its sanctity, the apostle proclaims that it is being replaced by a new structure, consisting of the community of the faithful. This, too, can be termed a Jewish-Christian project, in the sense that the source of sanctity referred to originated in Judaism. The Epistle of Peter is addressed to Diaspora Jews, proposing the Christian faith as a medium for long-distance participation in the holiness of the Temple. Frederik Hendrik’s inscription speaks to non-Jews only, in a way that co-opts the holiness of the Temple, eliminating the Temple of Solomon in favor of the Reformed Christians of the prince’s domain in Brabant.

In the Nieuwe Kerk in Haarlem, too, major Jewish symbols are appropriated in ways that eliminate Jews from the equation. The side elevation of the church has a general resemblance to that of the Temple in Villalpando’s reconstruction (figs. 16–17), with six bays and a tower.<sup>9</sup> (The tower of the Nieuwe Kerk was preserved from the previous church on the site; it was built by Lieven de Key.) Another feature of the reconstruction that van Campen employed is the ground plan of the entire Temple Mount, a square subdivided into nine smaller squares (figs. 18–19). This borrowing is more than formal. In another figure, the Jesuit provides his ground plan of the Temple complex with symbols pertaining to the cosmos and to the Jewish past (fig. 20). The twelve outside towers refer to the twelve tribes of Israel and the signs of the Zodiac, the four towers of the inner court to the three sons of Levi and Moses and Aaron and also to the four elements. The seven squares between the outer and inner courts are symbolic of the sun, the moon, and the five planets.<sup>10</sup>

It appears to me that van Campen also adapted this feature of Villalpando’s Temple for the Reformed Christians of Haarlem. In his adornment of the ceiling of the Nieuwe Kerk, he places symbols in similar positions to those in Villalpando’s symbolic figure, divided over the diverse vaults (fig. 21). Chief among these symbols were the sword and the cross, emblems of the city of Haarlem conferred to it during the Fifth Crusade, at the beginning of the thirteenth century.

<sup>9</sup> For the works by Saenredam here illustrated, see G. Schwartz and M. J. Bok, *Pieter Saenredam: The Painter and His Time* (Maarssen and The Hague 1990).

<sup>10</sup> R. Jan van Pelt, *Tempel van de wereld: de kosmische symboliek van de Tempel van Salomo* (Utrecht 1984), pp. 235–41.

(This may be seen as an indirect reference to the Temple, as one of the holy places for which the Crusaders were fighting.) Mainly, however, the emblems in the ceiling are the coats of arms of Holland and the city and regent families of Haarlem, who take the place of the tribes of Israel. This was made explicit in the speech with which Dominee Clerquius opened the church on 3 May 1648, where he compared the regents of Haarlem to “pious heroes like Moses and David, who not only provided welfare for the community but also furthered the true religion.”<sup>11</sup> The text for Clerquius’s sermon was Psalm 48:9: “We have thought about your loving kindness, God, in the midst of your temple.” Both the burgomasters and God are thanked for what Clerquius calls “the building of Jerusalem.” The Temple is adduced in numerous passages, with much of its furniture and ritual objects.

Villalpando’s Temple reconstruction became the best-known effort of its kind. However, Jacob van Campen made use of other sources as well. Van der Linden convincingly compares the original wooden model of the Nieuwe Kerk with a reconstruction of the Temple of Solomon from the 1540s by the French Hebraist François Vatable (fig. 22).<sup>12</sup> The resemblance is all the more striking because the solutions are so unusual—the large, square west wall with a simple columned doorway. Notice that van Campen had his own ideas about the tower. The decision to retain Lieven de Key’s landmark, with such a pungent and different architectural taste of its own, will not have pleased him.

The dedication sermon of Clerquius reminds us of another major point. All the Temple projects we have discussed involved worldly as well as spiritual authorities. Solomon, after all, was a king, and it would have been presumptuous of a seventeenth-century church of any denomination to lay claim to his prerogatives. The king of Spain, the prince of Orange, the burgomasters of Amsterdam and Haarlem—they were either the initiators of the Temple projects or invoked them to play the role of Solomon.

The obverse was not true. Worldly individuals who became involved in Temple studies didn’t always feel called upon to bring the church in to bless them. A fascinating example, of which we have only a mere hint, is the building of the Mauritshuis, erected in The Hague for Johan

<sup>11</sup> For Clerquius and his address, see van der Linden, “De symboliek,” pp. 1, 22 (n. 4).

<sup>12</sup> *Biblia his accesserunt schemata tabernaculi Mosaici, & Templi Salomonis, quae praeceunte Francisco Vatable* (Paris 1546).

Maurits van Nassau during his absence as governor of Dutch Brazil. As mentioned, Constantijn Huygens and Jacob van Campen—along with Huygens’s wife Susanne (he called her *Sterre*)—were supervising the project. In a letter of 17 November 1637 to Johan Maurits in Brazil, Huygens writes that he and van Campen were eagerly awaiting the arrival of some rare materials that Johan Maurits was sending from Brazil to adorn his house. With these materials, Huygens wrote, they could “bring the Temple of Solomon back to life on a small scale.”<sup>13</sup> His exact meaning is uncertain, but there is every likelihood that van Campen refers to the mystical side of Johan Maurits’s interests. The count grew up in Heidelberg, where he belonged to the circle of the early Rosicrucians. Robert Jan van Pelt makes a case for interpreting the proportions of the building in a cosmological sense, with Johan Maurits as the semi-divine lord of the domain.<sup>14</sup> “It is [...] reasonable to assume that it was Johan Maurits’ intention to [...] make his house an image of the cosmos, or a microcosmos [...]” On his birthday, van Pelt suggests, the prince received his guests under a pierced ceiling and cupola that admitted a shaft of light shining on himself.

This interpretation finds some support in another Huygens–van Campen project for the House of Orange. Around 1650 they found themselves building a palace for Princess Amalia van Solms, the widow of Frederik Hendrik. This was *Huis ten Bosch* [House in the Woods], now the residence of the queen. The main hall of the palace is the *Oranjezaal*, one of the grandest rooms in northern Europe (fig. 23). The main attraction is a painting by Jacob Jordaens of the apotheosis of Frederik Hendrik, Hendrik in a *merkawah* of his own (fig. 24). One of the allegories in the ceiling vault, designed by Jacob van Campen himself, shows the Union of Architecture, Painting, and Sculpture (fig. 25). It contains a detail, next to the round tempietto, behind Mercury, of a building that has been identified by Eymert-Jan Goossens as the Temple of Solomon in the heavens (fig. 26). Goossens juxtaposes it to the town hall of Amsterdam, which van Campen designed in the very same period. Indeed, the painted image of the Temple bears a general resemblance to the town hall of Amsterdam. If one allows this, one could say that Constantijn Huygens and Jacob van Campen

<sup>13</sup> Worp, *De briefwisseling van Constantijn Huygens*, vol. 2, p. 333, letter no. 1763.

<sup>14</sup> R. J. van Pelt, “The Mauritshuis as *domus cosmographica*,” in *Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen, 1604–1679. A Humanist Prince in Europe and Brazil: Essays on the Occasion of the Tercentenary of His Death*, ed. E. van den Boogaart (The Hague 1979), pp. 191–96.

appropriated the image of the Temple for both the House of Orange and the city of Amsterdam, to add resonance to their power. This move is different only in scale from the scheme of King Philip II in the Escorial. The comparison is not as far-fetched as it may seem at first glance. After all, Amsterdam and Orange were successors to Philip, the Amsterdam government as ruler over the city and Frederik Hendrik as deputy of the abjured king.

Having looked at reconstructions and revivals of the Temple belonging to some of the most glamorous artistic creations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Spain, Rome, and the Netherlands, it is nearly embarrassing to end the row of examples with the plainest, driest—I am tempted to say, most Calvinist—document imaginable: the reconstruction of the Temple in Jerusalem published in 1630 by Constantijn L'Empereur van Oppijck (1591–1648), professor of theology at Leiden University. The reconstruction is found on a foldout sheet in L'Empereur's bilingual edition of Mishnah *Middoth*, in Hebrew and in his own excellent Latin translation (fig. 27). This book was available, and unquestionably known, to Huygens and van Campen in 1634 when they asked to borrow Wicquefort's copy of Villalpando. One would expect that any serious student of the Temple in the Netherlands after 1630 would turn to it first,<sup>15</sup> as an authoritative translation of the book of the Mishnah that deals with the Temple and its measurements. There are indeed resemblances between L'Empereur's reconstruction of the Temple forecourt and van Campen's ground plan of the Nieuwe Kerk (fig. 28). However, the debts to Villalpando and Vatable are so much more visible that one is hard put to find a specific element that van Campen owed to his countryman and contemporary.

L'Empereur's Temple project shares with the others we have seen a low bow to the lords of the land. His book is dedicated to the States of Holland and West-Friesland, the most powerful of the Dutch provinces. The attitude vis-à-vis Jewish history is conventional, with a small personal touch. In the dedication, the Leiden theologian writes: "The Christian church is a living tabernacle. It has traveled through Germany and France, just as the tabernacle of the Israelites traveled

<sup>15</sup> *Masekhet midot mi-Talmud Bawli hoc est, Talmudis Babylonici codex Middoth sive De mensuris templi, unà cum versione Latina, additis, præter accuratas figuras, commentariis, quibus tota templi Hierosolymitani structura... explicatur, variaque Scripture S. loca illustrantur. / Opera et studio Constantini L'Empereur de Oppyck...* (Leiden: Bonaventura and Abraham Elsevier, 1630). The copy in the Amsterdam University Library was consulted.

through the desert. Now it has found a home under your authority in the Netherlands, where it has been transformed as it were into an immovable permanent structure, a temple.” Here the emphasis is on the specific cult of the writer and the government, the Reformed Church in the Netherlands. Thanks to the Dutch government, playing the role of Solomon, the Reformed Church enjoys a Temple-like stability in the Netherlands. Elsewhere in Europe Calvinists had to sleep with their boots on and their bags packed, like the Jews in the desert, with the portable tabernacle in their care.

With the Jews of the Netherlands in his own time, L’Empereur had a complex relationship. He bought books from Menasseh ben Israel and Isaac Aboab de Fonseca and studied Hebrew with one or the other of them. He praised the States of Zeeland for doing away with anti-Semitic legal measures. He did business with Jews in the sugar trade, earning more than his double salary in Leiden. The reason for his double salary is quite interesting. While occupying the chair for Hebrew, he also had one in the refutation of Judaism. He took this responsibility seriously but, according to his biographer Peter van Rooden, without venom. It was his job to prove that Judaism was intellectually and doctrinally incorrect, just as were Catholicism, Socinianism, and Anabaptism.<sup>16</sup> One of his ambitions as a professor of Hebrew was to train his students so well that they would have no need, as he had, of a Jewish teacher. In this he succeeded. Thanks to L’Empereur and several colleagues, from the mid-seventeenth century on the role of Jews like Menasseh, Aboab, and Jacob Jehudah Leon as irreplaceable sources for the knowledge of Hebrew and rabbinics was played out. Even on their own turf, they were replaced by Reformed Christians.

This overview treats only a fraction of the materials that can be included under the heading “The Temple in the Lowlands.” Significant examples abound in the fields of painting and literature. Even the few examples discussed above, however, make it plain that the Temple of Jerusalem played an important part in Dutch architecture, printmaking, stathood, political symbolism, religion, theology, Bible and Mishnah

---

<sup>16</sup> P. van Rooden, “Constantijn l’Empereur (1591–1648), professor Hebreuws en theologie te Leiden: theologie, bijbelwetenschap en rabbijnse studiën in de zeventiende eeuw” (Ph.D. diss., Leiden University, 1985); and his book, *Theology, Biblical Scholarship and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century: Constantijn l’Empereur (1591–1648)* (Leiden 1989).

studies, and antiquarian research. Viewed in terms of the theme of this volume, the intersection of Jews and the Netherlands in modern history, the materials reveal that the Christian Dutch love of the Temple was a one-sided affair. Christians appropriated a prime source of Jewish sanctity and power for their own cult and political legitimacy. In doing so, they pushed living Jews emphatically off to the side or else attempted to deJudaize them through conversion. If postwar anti-Semitism in Europe has been called anti-Semitism without Jews, then in certain realms of seventeenth-century Holland, we might speak of philo-Semitism without Jews.

Fortunately, this was not true for all of Dutch society. Yosef Kaplan has published a unique document concerning the early ownership of a painting of the Portuguese synagogue in Amsterdam by the Dutch artist Emanuel de Witte. Kaplan shows that the painting—either the version in the Rijksmuseum (fig. 29) or one of the other two like it—belonged to a Jewish owner who left it in his will to a Jewish friend.<sup>17</sup> This find establishes the existence, however small it may have been, of a market among Jews for depictions of Jewish subjects by Dutch Christian artists. The subject of the painting is a Lowlands Temple in the form that was so close to the hearts and lives of the Jewish people for two thousand years; it is a synagogue that has become a substitute Jerusalem Temple. May the spiritual tradition of synagogue worship continue to satisfy the need of Jews for a Temple of their own.

### Captions

Fig. 1 Portrait of Jacob Jehudah Leon with an image of his model of the Temple, c. 1652. London, Asher Mayer collection (photo Adri Offenberg). Derived from title plate in Leon's book on the Temple, 1642.

Fig. 2 "Afbeeldinge van den Grooten ende Heerlijken Tempel Salomonis," from Leon, *Afbeeldinghe vanden Tempel Salomonis...*, opposite p. 38.

Fig. 3 "'t Gesicht van de Portugeese, en hoogduy(t)se Joden kerken" [View of the Portuguese and High German synagogues], etching by Abraham Rademaker, Amsterdam, 1772. Amsterdam, municipal archive.

<sup>17</sup> Y. Kaplan, "For Whom Did Emanuel de Witte Paint His Three Pictures of the Sephardic Synagogue in Amsterdam?" *StRos* 32 (1998), pp. 133–43.

Fig. 4 Detail of fig. 2.

Fig. 5 Section of the outside wall of the Portuguese synagogue, Amsterdam, that was reconstructed in the 1770s.

Fig. 6 Section of the wall of the Portuguese synagogue, Amsterdam, in the form of the original construction in the 1670s.

Fig. 7 Nieuwe Kerk, Haarlem, built to the design of Jacob van Campen, 1645–1649.

Fig. 8 Nieuwe Kerk, Haarlem, south exterior wall.

Fig. 9 Title print of vol. 3 of the commentary on the book of Ezekiel by Juan de Prado and Juan Bautista Villalpando, 1604.

Fig. 10 Bird's-eye view of the Escorial from Willem and Joan Blaeu, *Atlas maior*, vol. 9, 1662.

Fig. 11 Details of front façades of the Temple in Jerusalem (above) and of the Escorial in a print by Abraham Ortelius (below).

Fig. 12 The Temple Mount, from vol. 3 of Villalpando, 1604.

Fig. 13 The church of Renswoude, built after a design by Jacob van Campen (photo Jan Derwig).

Fig. 14 The church of Hooge Zwaluwe, built after a design by Jacob van Campen (photo Jan Derwig).

Fig. 15 Details of figs. 12 and 14.

Fig. 16 Side elevation of Temple, from Villalpando, vol. 3, 1604.

Fig. 17 Pieter Jansz. Saenredam, "The Nieuwe Kerk, Haarlem, Looking North from the Southwest Corner of the Transept." Signed and dated 16 August 1653. Budapest, Szépművészeti Múzeum.

Fig. 18 Detail of bird's-eye view of Temple Mount, from Villalpando (1604), vol. 3.

Fig. 19 Ground plan of Nieuwe Kerk, Haarlem (drawing W. Kuypers).

Fig. 20 Symbolic scheme of Temple Mount, from Villalpando (1604), vol. 3.

Fig. 21 Pieter Jansz. Saenredam, "Interior of the Nieuwe Kerk, Haarlem, from West to East." Signed and dated 23 May 1651. Haarlem, Frans Hals Museum.

Fig. 22 Comparison of woodcut from François Vatable, and wooden model of Nieuwe Kerk, Haarlem (Haarlem, Nieuwe Kerk; reproduced from van der Linden, "De symboliek," p. 9).

Fig. 23 The Oranjezaal in Huis ten Bosch, The Hague.

Fig. 24 Jacob Jordaens, *The Apotheosis of Frederik Hendrik*, 1650. The Hague, Huis ten Bosch.

Fig. 25 Anonymous after a design by Jacob van Campen, c. 1650. *The Union of Architecture, Painting, and Sculpture*. The Hague, Huis ten Bosch.

Fig. 26 Detail of fig. 25 (above) compared to side elevation of the south side of the town hall of Amsterdam, published by Johannes Covens and Cornelis Mortier. (From article by Eymert-Jan Goossens in catalogue of Jacob van Campen exhibition, Amsterdam [Koninklijk Paleis] 1995, p. 215.)

Fig. 27 Ground plan of the Temple, from edition of *Middoth* by Constantijn l'Empereur, 1630.

Fig. 28 Detail of fig. 28 (left) compared with fig. 19.

Fig. 29 Emanuel de Witte, Interior of the Portuguese synagogue in Amsterdam, c. 1680. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum.