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By I. A. Djenyeffe

Frontispiece to The Open Court.
THE TEMPLE OF SOLOMON.
A DEDUCTIVE STUDY OF SEMITIC CULTURE.

BY PHILLIPS ENDECOTT OSGOOD.

The Temple of Solomon stands nearer the Red Sea than it does to Babylon. Its position is significant. For a few brief moments between the lessening chaos of the nation’s genesis and the increasing chaos of the dissolution, the Temple is the permanent, fixed background of the drama of Jewish life; just as the never-failing temple façade of Mycenae provided the permanent scenery of the Greek theater, in whose fore-courts transpired all the action of tragedy and comedy.

A moment ago the Judges ruled, whose irregular succession runs back into the legendary morning-mist of Egypt and the Exodus:—a few moments yet to come and the “waters of Babylon” sweep in, and with their tide carry away all but the dream-shadow of the glory of the race. Solomon may have no place in the history of Jewish theology, but his reign marks a decisive instant in the history of Jewish religion, for he gave this house to Yahveh. Henceforth the Ark of the Lord abides no more beneath transient curtains, but has a central, permanent abiding-place in the midst of an Israel which is no longer a group of scattered hill tribes, living the patriarchal, unfederated life of the past, but a compact kingdom. Peace had come for the moment. The worldly life of the Hebrew nation was just beginning. The religion of Yahveh was coming into its own. The Temple becomes the precipitant and center of cohesion in the life of the Hebrews.

It is a trite, safe statement to make that the religion of the Jewish people contained the possibility of truth and further revelation be-
cause it carefully and painstakingly abstained from any bias toward anthropomorphic limitation. The limiting of artistic life involved in the rigorous command that there should be no "graven images" in "the likeness of anything in the heaven above, the earth beneath or the waters under the earth" carried other limitations as well. Architecture, simple decorative design, esthetic perception of any kind was thereby stultified. By the fetters thus imposed on them the hands of the artist were paralyzed into the hands of the artisan, whose work henceforth inevitably must be totally devoid of anything but the faintest trace of grace or distinction. There are few more absolutely crude and hideous human creations than the clumsily daubed pottery of Judea, the almost sole relics of its artistic (?) endeavors. "Jewish art" is as nearly a contradiction of terms as can be found. The artistic horizon of the ancient Hebrew was made up of conventional flowers, mythic beasts (whose habitat, being pure fancy, could not be kept organic by sobering contact with reality) and the baldest of architectural lines.

Of course, it is a comfort to know that the ideal of Jehovah, thus not tied down to the level of anthropomorphic representation, was thereby delivered and made ideally free. Perhaps in the first place the fiat of prohibition issued psychologically from a subsense that the Hebrew blood could not produce anything ideal enough to be admired or creative of respect and adoration, however infinite the permission and opportunity. Its birthright-genius was aniconic; a capability for passionate devotion to an abstract ideal.

II.

Be all this as it may, however, human nature seems to have asserted itself, and attempted self-expression in concrete, if imperfect form was the ever-recurring heresy. It was the thing religion had most to fight.

Modern Bible study does not let us believe that the Yahveh-ideal was created full grown and perfect, and revealed to Abraham in his covenant or to Moses at the burning bush; to be no more improved upon forever and a day. Monotheism grew out of henotheism, henotheism out of polytheism. Yahveh was at first far from the all-powerful Lord of the whole world. He may soon have surpassed them, but he was blood-cousin to Chemosh and Baal. He belonged to the same polytheistic-henotheistic family. Abraham and his immediate descendants seem, even in the later, worked-over accounts, to have employed the same religious symbols and forms of worship as did the people of Canaan and Phoenicia, and the era
of the Judges is the logical sequel to this time. Egypt, although it rebaptized the God of Israel, was not a Sundering force in the form of his worship. As Abraham stories depict his erection of an altar wherever he made a residence, his "planting a grove" or pillar in Beersheba as a religious emblem; as Jacob's legend shows him twice setting up a great stone;\(^1\) so, subtracting the point of view of later, more Puritan writers, the pet heresy of Israel in all the following years of the Judges and both united and divided kingdoms appears to be simple reversion to type. The gods of Syria, of Canaan and of Phænicia were the obvious refuge for the child race of the Hebrews when Yahveh-worship transcended their capabilities, because there seems not to have been any great difference of quality in the worship of Baal and Yahveh until the spiritualization of the Deuteronomic code began to show.

In primitive races anthropomorphism is a forgiveable demand. Even to-day our most compelling conceptions of God, say what we may, must be in humanly finite terminology. The crime of worshipping other gods appears to have lain essentially in the treacherous desertion of that God who had made Israel his chosen people out of all the nations of the world; in the breaking of a covenanted troth with the supra-natural benefactor; in the not living up to the human side of the bargain; rather than in the about-face turn to the worship of a principle recognized as inherently evil. Even the later prophets and redactors, in their imaging the relation of the nation to Yahveh as a marriage relation, seem rather to lay stress in their frank metaphors on the desertion-element than upon the essential sinfulness of the new relation. It is the sin of breaking faith, rather than any sin of moral degeneration that is condemned.

The elements of the other worshipatures abound in the worship of Yahveh himself. Ashera, pillars and other rude symbolisms permeate the earlier Hebrew faith. Yahveh has his seat in a burning bush, combining both sun and tree worship elements; the sacred bull appears in all sorts of new forms,—as cherub, even as the symbol of Yahveh himself; the serpent symbol trails deviously from the Garden of Eden through the wilderness into seraphic form and the Holy of Holies in the Temple, there to await Hezekiah's iconoclasm. In so far as Yahvism lifts itself above the spatial limitation of the symbol, that symbol is spiritualized and transcended. All the Semitic nations had passed from mere idolatry; Yahvism simply was the least limited by concrete symbolism to tangible finiteness. The gods of other peoples were hospitable and accepted newcomers to

\(^1\) Genesis xxxv and xxxviii.
their pantheon, but Israel's Yahveh did not. Such new additions and infusions as did come in must do so as his attributes, not as separate entities. Breaking faith with Yahveh, as Yahvism grew spiritualized, meant, therefore, as I have said, a reversion to type. The sin of Solomon in worshiping at the "great stone" or high place of Gibeon, in his building mounds ("high places") for Chemosh, the god of generation, and for Hercules-Moloch, the god of fire; in his second-childhood worship of Venus Astarte is greater than the sin of those who in the lapses of the earlier Judges' period turned to Baalim and Ashtaroth simply because it implies a greater reversion. The ideal has grown a bit farther away from Chemosh, Moloch and Baal, in that the conception of the covenant is a little more drastic; but the breaking troth with him who "abideth faithful" is still the sin. It remains for prophetism to make the covenant a pure and spiritual concept; to free it from the taint and tinge of commercialism and bargaining; to make the worship of the nation realize the moral content of its heritage.

The Temple building, then, was nearer the Red Sea than to Babylon. At the time of Solomon the elements of all-Semitic religion shaped its essence more than did any exclusive tendency toward the later, true religion. Messias-faith was from the very nature of the case an anachronism and impossible. The Temple of Solomon very apparently embodies the common elements of the entire Semitic pantheon. Even its aniconic nature is not absolute, nor is it unique. The Ark of the Lord, the brazen pillars, the cherubim, sacred palm-trees and the like, all show traces of their symbolic origin. In Egypt, in Phoenicia, in Assyria, the first germs of henotheism were quickening, bringing into first being the extension of the previous idea that the symbols merely incarnate the super-symbolic deity into the idea that the various deities in their turn are but the various manifestations of one who comprehends them all. That Moses, in the desert solitude of Midian arrived somehow at henotheism in simple covenant terms seems indubitable, however much we doubt the objective reality of the burning bush theophany. Such speculation can well have originated under the influence of Egypt, where this trend of thought already had most impetus. Here the confederacy of local cults, while proclaiming a certain modicum of jealous and even hostile independence one from another, was gradually, under the fire of political centralization and philosophy, unifying and fusing. This

2 1 Kings iii. 4;
3 1 Kings xv. 23.
4 Judges, ii. 10-19; iii. 6-7; v. 8; vi. 10, 25, 30; viii. 33; x. 6.
was done most of all by the discovery of points of similarity between the local godlets, who were thereupon pronounced to be merely different manifestations of the same deity. The time of David and Solomon represents very little advance over the earlier stage, so far as religion is concerned. The advance in secular importance was great, but the time was not yet again ripe for reflection, when only theology can grow.

This may seem far afield from the Temple of Solomon, but it seems imperative at the outset, since the data is so almost completely inferential, to mark out the underlying temperament and ideas which were its ultimate foundation. It is hard not to believe that in the Temple we find the symbols of the earlier stages of Yahveh-worship, kindred to the contemporary worship of neighboring gods, who have not developed so far as has the outstripping Yahvism towards that henotheism, which in its turn, as reflection comes to those whose deeper insight made them truly prophets of the truth, grows into pure monotheism. It was a selective, natural process by which the Jews developed the religion which was forerunner of the highest; not an inhuman, because solely transcendent, revelation of a faith complete.

But in it we still find the marks of earlier stages. Whether or no the symbolism of the elements of worship germaine to all the Southeast Mediterranean world was conscious is doubtful. Nevertheless it seems sure that apostacy from Yahveh and the worship of a cousin god is little more than the singling out of one of the family characteristics, filling again with meaning a symbol which has its more meaningless place in the orthodox temple, the reversion to the separate deification of an attribute, now merely one out of several modes of manifestation of that God who has more nearly reached monotheistic, assimilating supremacy. The Temple comes at a transitional stage, where the past and the future still are linked in visible symbols of present use. Henotheism is emerging from mere monolatry into monotheism:—the belief in one God is beginning hazily to contain a moral element. The ideal of a just God has its birth.

Thus the significance of the Temple is not to be found in a rigid difference in quality from the religion of other Semitic nationalities, but rather in the degree to which the worship of the polytheistic deities elsewhere has here fused into the worship of a single, inclusive being, whose existence denied that of otherwise and otherwhere concerned powers not at all.
III.

Little more can the Temple’s significance be found in a cause particularly national.

There does not appear to have been any concerted, national demand for a central shrine, no matter how glorious. The first centralization of the worship at Jerusalem was the cause, not the effect, of a powerful priesthood. It became a vantage point for further stringency and organization, but was not created by priestly ascendency. The national predestination to a religious rôle in history is not yet a compelling force.

The establishment of the Ark at Zion had given royalty a tinge of divine right. The king was Yahveh’s lieutenant, the establisher and protector of Yahveh’s abode. The disorganization of David’s old age, when rebellious family quarrels strained the unity of the nation, succeeded by the growing alienation of the north;—all this furthermore precluded concerted action by the people in such a demand. Moreover, if the people were not enough united to think of centralizing their worship, neither were they discontented enough with their local “high places” to dream of abandoning them. This free worship in the open air was orthodox and precious to the pastoral commonalty, in heart half-nomad still. The essence of Yahvism seemed to be the non-localization of its worship. The local pastorate of the priests of the shrines, not a hierarchy at Jerusalem, was the desired thing. There was no innate necessity for a central shrine. Local “high places” were more compatible with the open country life, as well as with the growing disorganization of the nation.

Renan⁶ claims that the Temple was nothing but the plaything of a vainglorious monarch, whose one idea in building it was the political aggrandizement of his dynasty, by making Yahvism thus theatrically appear dependant on the court. With his statement that it was not a national institution we may agree, but the imputation of mere vainglory may be needless. Solomon, however rapacious, capricious and tyrannical he may seem in the obviously unfriendly Bible accounts, need not have had at heart a selfish motive only. To label his motive “political” is not to brand it with the mark of Cain. It may have been the natural thing that his scheme of general and fitting stability and dignity for his government should include, as a matter of course, the building of an adequate house for the Ark. It need not have presupposed the negation of the validity of other

shrines. The fact that it originates as a personal plan rather than as a national one does not prove it a selfish design. To make the conception of a fitting house within the confines of the capital for the symbol of Yahveh into a flaunting blazonry of regal mummy is unnecessary. The Temple may have been (as I think it was) a private court chapel in idea, and as such the most dignified seat of Yahveh's glory; but there are two possible interpretations of the fact. All that is required here, however, is to demonstrate the fact, *that the Temple was not created by a concerted national demand.*

This private court character of the Temple is little evidenced in the Biblical accounts. But 1 Kings cannot completely have been compiled until about four hundred years after the death of Solomon, and Chronicles is at least three centuries later yet. By that time the Temple had the flavor of unrememberable generations of placid acceptation. As years went by, and the weakness of the court, combined with the strength of the priests and prophets, made the Temple the central, unique stronghold of true orthodoxy, the Jews forgot the primitive conditions; and, accepting the innovation, as its innovative character was swallowed up by the growth of custom, began to champion the Temple as the credential of their faith. The erstwhile protested shrine, by the very evolution of compulsory centralization, became the only valid House of Yahveh. The "high places" and all their open-air worship were looked back upon by later times with shrinking abhorrence, so that we naturally find the accounts of those more primitive times obviously colored by inability to enter into their mental equation. We read, therefore, that Solomon loved the Lord, "*only* he sacrificed and burnt incense in high places." His subjects, too, might have been quite impeccable and orthodox ancestors if "*only*" they had not worshiped thus. The historian nevertheless finds enough charity to assign as the reason for this slipshod heresy the undeniable fact that "there was no house yet built unto the name of the Lord."*

If we can rid ourselves of the idea that the Temple was not yet nationally necessary we may appreciate the determined opposition of the simple fieldsmen, especially in the more nature-blessed and distant North with Ahijah the seer as their spokesman. Indeed, for the moment it must have looked like a retrograde step to house

---

*Yet no surprise is expressed when Absalom makes a vow to the Yahveh of Hebron; and Solomon's own regard for Gibeon, whatever palliation and excuse the author may assign in the lack of the Temple, is nevertheless despite the *Ark* in Jerusalem.

1 Kings, iii. 3.

2 Kings iii. 2.
Yahveh within walls, even though those walls were in the capital city and glorious with golden imagery. It was almost the same reversion to the limitations of type which in individuals constituted the outward garb of heresy. The essence of Yahvisim demanded aniconic, natural worship. The remonstrance of those to whom court life meant little more than further arbitrary taxes, foresaw the future abolishment of even religious freedom in the present germ of the Temple, within whose courts orthodoxy most particularly would soon dwell.

IV.

Modern Bible consciousness is prone to place the level of this era's civilization much too high. The Temple, as must be iterated and reiterated, was nearer the Red Sea than to Babylon. It represents a relatively primitive period. Worldly profane importance was in its brief zenith, but the true rôle of Judaism was just beginning its growth into strength and individuality. Spiritualization lay ahead, gained by storm and stress, by disappointment of the secular aim, by prophetic work to do.

It is not in any way a belittling of Judaism's truth to find in what period of that truth's evolution we for the moment are, and perhaps to recognize that it was not yet quite so perfect as at first we thought.

This distinctly comparative stage gives two preliminary presuppositions as basis of more technical data. They are these, as above suggested:

1. Judaism embodies a religious genius as yet not unique. In spite of the superiority over neighboring faiths which comes to the worship of Yahveh from its dawning henotheistic monotheism, there are common elements still retained throughout, proclaiming blood-relationship with the rest of the Semitic world, however polytheistic it may be.

2. The Temple is not created by an essentially national demand, to whose unique genius it must rigorously conform. Solomon himself (or David) is the one by whose initiative the Temple was built. Although in later years it came to be the accepted central shrine of the people; at the time of its construction it was a court shrine, built to house the Ark.

The first premise permits analogy and inference to be drawn from those elements in other Semitic religions whose relics are ar-

*The shrine at Shiloh had doors, and Micah had a house for his image, but this seems not to have separated them from the class of sacred hill-tops, etc.
cheologically sure, wherever in the Temple or in Judaism there are data with which organically to connect them; since Yahweh worship gives ground for such community of ideals and elementary symbolism. The second in its turn still further widens the field on which to draw, since Solomon's own desires were the impelling force, not national prejudice. It allows us to look for plans and architectural skill outside of Judaism, which could itself so ill supply them. By this is not meant that the Temple becomes non-Jewish, but that there is not as yet exclusiveness in its source.

While these two principles have been called presuppositions, nevertheless the argument to come must largely depend for its strength upon their reenforcement, as hypotheses capable of cumulative verification. The reasoning, I frankly admit, is more or less circular, but must necessarily so be.

PHOENICIA.

v.

There are two centers of civilization in the Mediterranean world in the earliest reaches of history.—Egypt and Assyria. Greece was not yet established as the third and apex angle of the old world culture-triangle. Egypt and Assyria (which includes in its generic type Chaldea and Syria) developed, as the outcome of their national individualities, distinctly national arts. They were the motive powers of the inner life-currents of all the rest of the Eastern Mediterranean. Not only the products of art as art, but her products as evidential manifestations of religion traveled backward and forward. But neither Egyptians, Chaldeans nor Assyrians had need or desire to hawk their own goods. Yet their products have been discovered, as far west as Spain (O. T. "Tarshish"), so middlemen there must have been. Whether it was predilection or the stimulus of geographical location that made the inhabitants of Phoenicia the traders and merchants of the era we cannot tell; yet either actually or through their colonists they had an almost complete monopoly of the carrying trade of Asia and Africa. Driven by events which we know only in their effects, as early as the twentieth century B. C. this people had established itself on the narrow strip of coast at the foot of the Lebanon range. They were thus half way between the Nile and the Euphrates, and within easy reach of both. By the time of David and Solomon they were an established state of many centuries standing. From Tyre and Sidon especially, but also from Jaffa, Acre, Gebal and Hanath, auxiliary cities of this one hundred
and twenty miles of narrow coast, fleets of vessels sailed continually over all the basin of the Mediterranean. Cyprus was Phoenicia's colony; so probably was Crete. Even as far west as Carthage in North Africa and Tarshish in Spain the intrepid traders established "coaling stations" for further sailing. Forms and motives invented in Egypt and Mesopotamia were carried to foreign and then barbaric races, who in turn adopted them as bases for their own genetic culture. The shrewd merchants soon grew rich as heart's desire. Factories employing hundreds of artisans turned out figurines, pottery, metal paterae, dyed fabrics (especially of Tyrian purple) and jewelry by wholesale tonnage; all on Egyptian or Assyrian models. The native countries could or would not supply them conveniently, cheaply or fast enough for exportation and dissemination.

Judging, however, from Phoenician monuments and relics as known to us to-day, it seems that these trader-manufacturers were sterile in art of their own. They lacked creative genius; were powerless to make new art. Their skill lay in the manual dexterity with which variously borrowed types and derived ideals were mingled. The mixture was Phoenician, but the elements were Assyrian and Egyptian. In historic comment or in extant relics their skill is everywhere evident, but their genius was obviously mechanical, adaptive and distributive; not national or creative.

VI.

That Solomon continued a friendship and alliance which his father had established, we are assured by the Bible accounts and reassured by historic probability. Tyre was next-door neighbor to Jerusalem; Solomon was a man of peace; Phoenicia was a friend to every one (with an eye wide open for business as the by-product of her friendship). Judah, too, was now a well-organized kingdom, small according to modern standards, but then reckoned moderately large. The Egyptian alliance had enough strengthened Israel's prestige to make it worthy of Hiram's deep respect.

Furthermore the similarity of the Phoenician language to the Hebrew shows in its almost merely dialectical variations a common bond, apparently of origin and blood.

But in the historical and prophetic books of the Old Testament it is not difficult to see that the Phoenicians exercised more influence

---

10 This is, of course, after the power of the Minoan kingdom had been annihilated.

11 Cf. Perrot and Chipiez, Phoenicia and Cyprus for examples.
upon the Hebrews than the Hebrews did upon the Phenicians. It is the Jews, not the Tyrians and Sidonians, who, for instance, borrow names, rites and images from the other, despite the vehement expostulation of the prophets. It is Tyre, not Jerusalem, that is represented as offensively potent. The current of influence flows into Judea out of Phenicia, not the other way.

Tyre, recently separated from Sidon, was in the full zenith of her power in the time of Solomon. Egyptian domination was a thing of the past:—Assyrian still of the future.12 Since 1100 B.C. Tyre had led the way among Semitic countries in temple-building, basing its architecture mostly on that of its recent overlord; for Phenicia’s style was forever chameleon, changing to Egyptian, Assyrian or Greek coloring as its master changed. By now its Beth-elim13 overlaid the little island of Tyre, the great central shrine of Melkarth predominant among them. Within eye-shot of the shore on a clear day, Cyprus likewise shone with buildings sacred to Phenician gods.

Fusing historic probability with the Bible hint of aid in Solomon’s construction, and also with the admitted inability of Jewish art to produce a temple so distinguished as probably this was, the conclusion seems to a high degree inevitable that its architectural form as well as artisan, skilled construction was supplied by Phenician guidance and direction. I heartily believe that Hiram, king of Tyre, supplied the plans and specifications for the Temple at Jerusalem, as well as the wood and labor; as he, not Solomon, was competent to do. If they met with Jewish court approval as sufficiently dignified and magnificent, there could be meagre objection from a source which could not supply plans one-half as good.

This conclusion is further certified by the apparent resemblance of the type of architecture Phenicia produced to the general impression we get from reading the accounts of the Temple at Jerusalem in the Old Testament itself.

VII.

Modern archeological discovery in Phenicia, Cyprus and Crete is almost entirely confined to grave relics. These small paterae, vases, pieces of jewelry etc., are naturally the means of very little

12 The Assyrian power began to reassert itself in the 9th century B.C. It was under Ashurnasirpal that the Euphrates was crossed and all northern Syria came under Assyrian domination (876 B.C.). Cf. Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, E. Schrader, 1, pp. 50 ff.

information about architectural matters. They provide an ever-growing fund of material for the study of the religion and culture of the periods they embody, but the background setting of the life they indicate is still murky and obscure. The study of Phoenician architecture is predominantly analogy and inference; none the less legitimate perhaps, but nevertheless incapable of the tangible verification actual monuments elsewhere supply. "The very ruins have perished." The few buried fragments that have come to light date from a much later period, when Greek influence had begun to mould the supple skill of Phoenicia to its liking. 14

The coast of Tyre and Sidon is the only field of pure Phoenician relics; and there the dearth is most nearly absolute. In Cyprus the additional element of Hellenism is apparent, but it is an unfused, separable quantum in the finished whole, just as Egyptian and Assyrian motives remain distinct, though side by side, in earlier mainland finds. In Crete the relics of Cnossos and its period are pre-Phoenician and of a different genius. In Mycenaean and post-Mycenaean relics the early Greek genius is paramount, yet there are those elements in its art which are inexplicable from within it unless we remember that Crete was once a Phoenician colony; perhaps without much patriotic feeling for its overlord, but submissive to its commercial, manufacturing dictates. Cretan discoveries go back to so early a date that common bonds with Asia and Egypt through Phoenician and pre-Phoenician intermediacy are the necessary hypotheses. This is particularly true in the relics of its most primitive religious form, of its betylae (sacred pillar-stores), its tree-worship etc., which are found in every country reached by the influence of this trader-nation. Of these symbols, this imagery of sacred stores, of mythic and sacred animals, of sacred trees, there is much to be said in connection with early Hebrew ideals, but to its later, proper place such study of these communistic elements must be deferred.

On a number of coins of the Roman provinces of Cyprus, Pergamum and Sardes, on a certain number of gems, rings etc., there are representations of a definite temple-type, whose specific embodiment as given is the Paphos temple of Astarte-Aphrodite. These coins are late (all A. D.) and unless the type they represent can be connected with much earlier examples they go for little. Also the laxity with which architectural types are treated on coins, combined with the limitations imposed by the meagre space at the engraver's disposal, gives wide room for diversity of interpretation. Clearly,

14 Except in Crete, where relics and ruins are largely earlier than Phoenician influence—as, e. g., in the Cnossos ruins.
however, we need not assume that the later, more elaborate types are evidence of more complicated buildings, but rather is the obvious explanation increase of skill.

The Temple of Astarte (Venus-Urania, Mylitta or Isis) at Paphos was the oldest and most honored holy place of ancient times. As the nature-goddess, the embodiment of the secondary principle in generation, the all-mother, her worshipers, though acknowledging her under diverse names, traveled from far and near to reach this her most famous shrine. Its origin is lost in fable-times. By the day of Homer and Homeric songs its supremacy is famous. According to Pausanias its prototype was in Assyria, i. e., in Babylon: Herodotus tells of a second possibility in Askalon, which latter seems more probable, since Assyrian influence on Phoenicia was much nearer Pausanias's day than to that of the Paphian temple's construction. Its date is likewise misty and based on legend. Eusebius in his Chronikos sets it contemporary with Pandion I, king of Athens, who was at least as early as 1900 B. C. All that can be ventured with any show of probability is that the earliest Phoenician colonists in Cyprus were the founders, in a time when racial lines were not yet beyond fluidity.

The site of old Paphos is at Kouklea, about ten miles from New Paphos. The oldest name for this is Golgi, apparently a Phoenician word akin to the Hebrew Gilgal. In the Ptolemaic period old Paphos was the site of the temple. Excavations in its neighborhood have brought to light antiquities of all periods from late Mycenaean to Roman, but the age of the Temple must go back still further. In the Roman period New Paphos became the capital and the coins were issued thence; but it is the temple of old Paphos which is represented on them. The flavor of its great antiquity was the best advertisement New Paphos could put forth.

It is a reasonable presumption that when in 15 B. C. the earthquake destroyed their city and Augustus came to the aid of the Paphians, that some restoration was effected at the temple, and that the shrine on his coins is the restored building. But it is at the

15 Odyssey, Bk. 9 (VIII), 1. 362, and Hymn in Venerem, 1. 58.
16 Herodotus, Bk. 1, Ch. 105: "I have inquired and find the Temple at Askalon is the most ancient of all the temples of this goddess, for the one in Cyprus (Paphos) as the Cyprians themselves admit, was built in imitation of it." (Askalon = 40 miles from Jerusalem. Cf. Judges, i. 18; xiv. 10; also cuneiform inscriptions of Sennacherib, 3d year.)
17 Pausanius, VIII, 5.
18  *
19 Cf. Dion Cassius, Bk. 23 and Obermüller, Die Insel Cyprn, p. 150.
same time doubtful whether he would have made the restorations in any but the pattern of the temple as it had stood so many years before the mishap. Obviously too, if he had ventured to remodel the temple in any but the ancient type, whose ancientness was its chief recommendation to authenticity, he would have used the style of architecture practised by Rome itself, not the (to him) foreign native type of some other land. As we see it on his coins the temple is certainly neither Greek nor Roman but of a genius all its (Phoenician) own.

This type of temple is further authenticated as ancient by the golden models of a shrine found in the royal graves of Mycenae
(Fig. 1). They are apparently very early, at least as early as the twelfth century B.C. and approximate the Paphos representations so closely that it seems legitimate to conjecture that the Paphos shrine is their original, existing practically unchanged until the time of Augustus's renovation.

Therefore, whether the Roman coins we have represent the old or the new temple it makes little difference, since we are justified by its type in tracing back to Phoenicia as its original source.

These coins are no two alike, but the variations are not fundamental and are easily explicable as due to variations of skill, or different schemes of diagrammatic depiction of the same type. The simplest, commonest form, perhaps, is that given below (Fig. 2). Here we merely have two pillars bound together by cross-pieces, a semicircular forecourt, through the simple porch the cone of the goddess surmounted by her sacred dove, and on either side of the uprights conic symbols akin to that within. Between this and later coins the degree of complexity varies much, but these here-given elements persist.

The highest uprights seem to be modified Egyptian pylons. Across the top is often draped what seems to be a garland of flowers, though it is barely conceivable that it is an awning. The flanking cones are omnipresent, being the advertisement of the femininity of the deity within. Later they are also often represented as candlesticks, with flames at the top; which may perfectly well have been their utilitarian adaptation in later times. Their significance as analogous to Jakin and Boaz I discuss later. There seems to be an open court beyond the porch, in whose midst stands the sacred image, symbol of the goddess. Tacitus remarks that this image was never wet by rain, although in the open air.

In an engraved mirror from Cyprus (Fig. 3) this structure is repeated. But here the flanking cones apparently are brought within the

Fig. 2. Coin of Paphos.
Gerhard, pl. XLIII, 17. Perrot and Chipiez III, p. 270, fig. 262.
court; their places outside being occupied by circular-topped uprights, which, nevertheless, are of the same feminine symbolism, being either the *omphaloi* of the goddess Astarte or the moon-disk of the Egyptianized Isis-Aphrodite. Later days may easily have transposed the flanking cones nearer the central object, leaving more definitely collateral emblems outside the fane.

In accordance with the usage of die-engravers of imperial times, the type is probably a combination of façade and section. Its architectural treatment suggests that its upper parts, at least, were made of wood, which may explain the difficulty of establishing any relation between the representations we have and actual remains. The still further articulation of this same thing is shown on the reverse of a silver coin of Vespasian (69-76 A.D.) (Fig. 4) whose later date and larger size allow greater accuracy of constructive drawing. The combination of façade and section is more clearly apparent; it suggests that the sacred cone stood in a rectangular court, whose pylon faces us, its Egyptian resemblance being clear. Here we have side wings shown, at the expense of the usual obelisks. The sectional character is best shown in these side wings. They suggest a colonnade of slender pillars of which we see two, surrounding the

Fig. 3. ENGRAVED MIRROR FROM SALAMIS. THE TEMPLE OF PAPHOS.
A. P. di Cesnola. *Salamis*, p. 59, fig. 56.
courtyard: the windows at the extreme sides may possibly indicate circumferential rooms. Above the cone it would appear that an awning (running from front to back) or arrangement of garlands was hung. But the generality of representation at hand puts garlands across the tops of the pylon-uprights (cf. Fig. 2); if these are garlands they are most peculiarly and inefficiently placed, while

Fig. 4. SILVER COIN OF VESPASIAN (reverse). THE TEMPLE OF PAPHOS. British Museum Cat., pl. XV.

an awning is most naturally to be expected for shade, if not for protection from the rain; especially since we know both Egypt and Assyria used awnings much, and Phœnicia's fabric-manufacture and dyeing was rich and skilful enough to be worthy such a place for its product.

In spite of the cross-beams, which are easily interpreted as

Fig. 5. THE BRITISH MUSEUM GEM. British Museum Cat., Greek Coins of Cyprus, pl. XXV. Fürtwangler, Ant. Gemm., pl. 64.

porch-lintel only, the construction behind must have been hypaethral (open to the sky). Even in the elaborate representation of the very latest coins and gems, when there is a metope-like construction shown above the cone, there is no sign at all of a roof above the central portion. The wings give the whole structure a superficial
resemblance to the primitive (and therefore Phoenician-influencing?) Cnossian fresco at Mycenae, which was also constructed mainly of wood.

In the British Museum Gem (Fig. 5) where an extra storey is added, the side wings have a further growth. The date may be later, but at least the gem shows that the three-storied chambers of Solomon's Temple can be combined with an open-court shrine. This open court is clearly indicated here by the awning above the cone.²⁰

But most clearly of all, a coin of Byblos (Fig. 6) showing the temple there, shows the open court arrangement. The porch-like building on the left can readily be subtracted as the accretion of a later age; but the portion on the right has no resemblance at all to architecture other than Phoenician. The cone is not the sort of

Fig. 6. COIN OF BIBLOS. EMPEROR MACRINUS, 217-218 A.D.
From Donaldson, Archeticture Numismatica; also Perrot and Chipiez Hist. of Art in Phoenicia, Vol. I, fig. 19.

steeple the imperfect perspective ability of the die-cutter makes it look at first sight, but is in the center of the open space, around which a very obvious, though inebriate, peristyle is shown. The addition of rooms outside the peeristylar court would be in perfect keeping with the possibilities of the type, although this shrine need not have had them.

The pseudo-Lucian,²¹ whose credulous account of the Syrian goddess contains a description of this temple or one in its close vicinity, mentions many details not given on the coin, but supplies us with nothing more believable than the story of the two pillars (Priapi) "standing in the porch"—believable, that is, if we take of

²⁰This does not seem to be the moon-crescent of the goddess, for its ends are attached to the pylon-uprights at the sides. The sitting doves are symbols enough to show whose is the represented shrine.

²¹De Dea Syria, (pseudo) Lucian.
the height he assigns a tithe at most. Probability reassures us of their presence. But when he labels the form of the temple he describes "as those of Ionia," that same probability laughs at his pedantic erudition: for the only Ionic forms that penetrated Phœnicia were details, which late accretions (such as Ionizing capitals and metope-facades) affected the generic nature of the architecture not at all. Its genins remained unchanged throughout all its history, yet that type itself was by its very nature in essence nothing but composite. In the formula by which the heterogeneous mixture was made homogeneous lay Phœnicia’s knack.

VIII.

So much for the general outlines provided by such pictured relics as can be connected with our argument. Now for the meagre deductions to be gained from the few actual ruin-fragments.

Most noticeable of all characteristics to-day is the colossal size of the stones used in the walls. This may be seen in the excavations of the foundation plateau of the Jerusalem Temple, as well as on the sites of Paphos and other Cyprian temples. But this argues nothing of the construction of the actual shrines within the walls, whose detailed ornamentation and manipulation would demand finer stone construction. We have also seen above that the coins suggest a light structure, possibly of wood in parts.

The calcareous tufa of the Phœnician territories is not susceptible of delicate ornamentation; so other material had to be used to supplement the lack. Casings of wood or of metal are the obvious inference, though almost all signs of such have disappeared. In the curved volutes and leafy decorations of (later) Cypriote capitals we seem to recognize motives suggested to the ornamentalist by the malleable elasticity of bronze. Added to this indirect evidence, one or two small sections of bronze sheathing have been found, though again dating from a later period. From the Biblical accounts we also hear more infallibly of sheathing, where the overlaying metal and wood covered all the interior so that not a bit of stone-masonry was visible. So far as we can tell Phœnicia’s architecture was based on Egyptian models. Certainly the "Tower of Babel" style of the Assyrian temples exerted no plastic force over Tyre and Sidon shrines. Egyptian forms, simplified for reasons of economy and ability, were decorated with largely Assyrian motifs; this was the method of hybridization. The result was severe in its ensemble.

* Cf. Perrot and Chipiez, Phœnicia.
elegant in its detail. "Smooth walls very carefully built, friezes of

carved and gilded wood, chargings of bronze, pictured symbolic

animals and trees in vigorous polychromy and rich hangings fused

in a unique and picturesque result."[23]

So far as minute decorative details go, I shall leave them as data

for the minutiae of the temple of Jerusalem itself.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

[23] Cf. Renan, History of Israel, ad loc.