

1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era

Volume 22

Article 7

2015

RELIGIOUS EXCHANGES Solomon's Temple, Holy Land Travel, and a Georgics of Sacred Space in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century English Writing

Michael Rotenberg-Schwartz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/sixteenfifty>



Part of the [Aesthetics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Michael Rotenberg-Schwartz (2015) "RELIGIOUS EXCHANGES Solomon's Temple, Holy Land Travel, and a Georgics of Sacred Space in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century English Writing," *1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era*: Vol. 22, Article 7.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/sixteenfifty/vol22/iss1/7>

RELIGIOUS EXCHANGES Solomon's Temple, Holy Land Travel, and a Georgics of Sacred Space in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century English Writing

Michael Rotenberg-Schwartz

In the twenty-first section of his poem, *Jerusalem*, 1967, Yehuda Amichai describes the city as a “port city on the shore of eternity” and the Temple Mount as “a huge ship, a magnificent / luxury liner” which is “always arriving, always sailing away.”¹ It is a site where Hasidim “shout hooray, hooray,” but also where “the flags and the high masts of

¹ Yehuda Amichai, *Poems of Jerusalem* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988).

churches / and mosques and the smokestacks of synagogues” mix and are recognized. Though a place of general prayer, Jerusalem is also marked by “fences and the piers / and the policemen.” Eternity may be close, but as Ranen Omer-Sherman notes, Amichai’s Jerusalem is a geography “too complicated to be limited to a narrative of faith, historical closure, or redemption.”² And so, Amichai concludes this section by comparing the holy city and its primary occupation (prayer) to a more worldly locale and endeavor: “And the commerce and the gates and the golden domes: / Jerusalem is the Venice of God.”

Amichai’s language resonates in surprising ways with a passage written some three hundred years earlier by Thomas Fuller in his *A Pisgah-Sight of Palestine*. Describing the city’s distance from water routes, Fuller explains that God situated Jerusalem away from commercial traffic because he intended it for, not a Venice, but “a Royal Exchange of Religion, chiefly holding correspondence with Heaven itself, daily receiving blessings thence, duly returning praises thither.”³ Fuller adds that, according to Eusebius, Plato imitated God’s geography by recommending that his republic be established “some miles from the Sea, lest foreign merchandize should by degrees bring in foreign manners into it.”⁴ Jerusalem is a world depot but, lest it be polluted by foreign, secular goods, for only one (spiritual) product.⁵ Yet it might in that case have been described as a temple, not an exchange. Of course, notwithstanding its distance from waterways, Jerusalem was not far from the King’s Highway and traffic. Moreover, as Achsah Guibbory has shown, English writ-

² Ranen Omer-Sherman, “Yehuda Amichai’s Exilic Jerusalem,” *Prooftexts* 26 (2006): 223.

³ Thomas Fuller, *A Pisgah-Sight of Palestine and the Confines Thereof* (London: 1662), 315. This is a rather purer vision of religious institutions than Fuller, a moderate who argued that the Established Church ought to be accepted even if, like ancient Jerusalem and its temple, it was flawed, generally espouses. On the politics of Fuller’s writing, see: Florence Sandler, “The Temple of Zerubbabel: A Pattern for Reformation in Thomas Fuller’s *Pisgah-Sight* and *Church-History of Britain*,” *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 10.2 (1977): 29–42, and Florence Sandler, “Thomas Fuller’s *Pisgah-Sight of Palestine* as a Comment on the Politics of Its Time,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 41.4 (August 1978): 317–343.

⁴ Fuller, *A Pisgah Sight*, 316.

⁵ An interesting passage in the travels of Arculf describes the miraculous way in which God cleanses Jerusalem after it is dirtied by an annual market: “On the 15th of September, annually, an immense multitude of people of different nations are used to meet in Jerusalem for the purpose of commerce, and the streets are so clogged with the dung of camels, horses, mules, and oxen, that they become almost impassable, and the smell would be a nuisance to the whole town. But, by a miraculous providence, which exhibits God’s peculiar attachment to this place, no sooner has the multitude left Jerusalem than a heavy fall of rain begins on the night following, and ceases only when the city has been perfectly cleansed.” *Early Travels in Palestine*, ed. Thomas Wright (Mineola: Dover Publications, 2003), 1.

ers under the Stuarts recognized that trade “had significance in the Hebrew Bible. Solomon had a ‘navy of ships’ . . . which he sent to Ophir . . . When Isaiah envisioned the glorious future of Israel restored . . . he emphasized that wealth and trade would flow to Jerusalem . . . Isaiah’s vision of a future, imperial Jerusalem, the center of trade and wealth, was adaptable to seventeenth-century England’s commercial and imperial ambitions.”⁶ Thus, for Samuel Purchas, “the English ‘Temple’ James would build with [imperial] riches was not simply spiritual. But neither was it simply the physical churches of England. Rather the ‘Temple’ is Christian England itself. The traffic in material goods and the accumulation of the world’s wealth, now to be centered in the new Israel, is itself the building of the Temple.”⁷ Over a century later, in a defense of church ornamentation, one writer similarly identified Solomon’s Temple with extensive commerce and wealth:

Inexhaustible Sources of Wealth had been opened to this Monarch and his People by his cultivating the Arts of Peace, and by his extending Navigation and Commerce *to the Ends of the Earth*. In a Manner, therefore, corresponding to this great Opulence, he was desirous of erecting a national Temple, which, Excellency of Materials, the Efforts of Art, and Richness of Decorations, should conspire to render the Object of universal Admiration. And such a Structure he no less thought a conspicuous, lasting Monument of his Gratitude and Regard to the Most High, than a powerful Instrument in producing awful, reverential Conceptions of his Perfection in Mens Minds.⁸

So too did William Hodson’s Seatonian Prize-winning poem, “The Dedication of the Temple of Solomon,” where the speaker praises Solmon for his “worthily perform’d” task:

The pride of every Region, every Clime,
Thy pious Care selected for the Work,
And brought to Solyma; whose Magazines

⁶ Achsah Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 46.

⁷ Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, 48. On the use of Solmon’s Temple in the iconography of the Stuart court, see Graham Parry, *The Seventeenth Century: The Intellectual and Cultural Contexts of English Literature, 1603–1700* (London and New York: Longman, 1989), 22–23.

⁸ *The Ornaments of Churches Considered, with a particular View to the late Decoration of the Parish Church of St. Margaret Westminster* (Oxford: 1761), 62.

Th' united Produce of the World contain'd.
 Here might be seen the Treasures of the East,
 The boasted Wealth of Taprobana's Shores,
 With varied Splendour struck the dazzled Eye,
 And sham'd thy radiant Light, oh Sun!⁹

Johnson's definition of an exchange as the "place where the merchants meet to negotiate their affairs; place of sale" further confounds. If for Fuller an exchange can be of different kinds, for Johnson it is a place of sale. And yet Johnson's second proof-text comes from Denham's description of the Thames in *Cooper's Hill* ("—No thing, no place is strange, / While his fair bosom is the world's exchange"), where the Thames has just been described as "God-like" in bounty, both natural and commercial:

No unexpected inundations spoyl
 The mowers hopes, nor mock the plowmans toyl:
 But God-like his unwearied Bounty flows;
 First loves to do, then loves the Good he does.
 Nor are his Blessings to his banks confin'd,
 But free, and common, as the Sea or Wind;
 When he to boast, or to disperse his stores
 Full of the tributes of his grateful shores,
 Visits the world, and in his flying towers

 Brings home to us, and makes both Indies ours;
 Finds wealth where 'tis, bestows it where it wants
 Cities in deserts, woods in Cities plants.
 So that to us no thing, no place is strange,
 While his fair bosom is the worlds exchange. (175–188)

Half a century after Fuller and Denham, Addison waxed cosmopolitan at the Royal Exchange on somewhat similar grounds. Here was a place people of different beliefs could gather for one end, not despite but because of commercial interests.

To exchange is simply to give one thing for another. In Fuller's sense, the idea is that people barter sacrifices or prayers in return for a heavenly

⁹ William Hodson, *The Dedication of the Temple of Solomon: A Poetical Essay* (Cambridge: 1770), 7–8.

return. It would seem that there are religious exchanges and secular exchanges, and never the twain shall meet. But the first three prooftexts in Johnson's *Dictionary* complicate this distinction, indicating that an exchange of one kind implies the other and that both are equally concerned with the issue of use. The first text is from Ezekiel 48.14: "They shall not sell of it, neither exchange nor alienate the first fruits." The second is from Locke's *Second Treatise*: "Exchange his sheep for shells, or wool for a sparkling pebble, or a diamond." And the third is from Atterbury's *A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul's at the Funeral of Mr. Tho. Bennet*: "Take delight in the good things of this world, so as to remember that we are to part with them, and to exchange them for more excellent and durable enjoyments." Johnson's choices seem counterintuitive. One would expect texts on exchange to relate primarily to economic transaction, but here they prioritize religious or moral ends. Cognizant of commercial traffic, the quotations from Ezekiel and Atterbury speak to a separation of worldly and heavenly domains. In a world where fruit is sold, there are fruits one may not sell; likewise, in a world of pleasurable activities, one should keep in mind their eventual substitution for even greater heavenly enjoyments. Johnson even uses the passage from Locke, from the chapter "Of Property," for a moralized end, for in it Locke describes an appropriate use of one's property as that which does not waste what others might benefit from. Though for Fuller Jerusalem as Exchange is free from worldly taint, in this essay I want to explore the juxtaposition of prayer (or religion) and commerce, especially as it relates to notions of the Holy Land or any sacred space, to question the sharp distinction that is often drawn between sacred and secular experience. Although a fundamental element of the sacred is of course its separation from the mundane, I want to suggest that the theoretical disposition of the sacred—the systematic relation of things within space and the interest in the uses of those things—could be and was shared with the secular.¹⁰

My interest in this stems from reading early modern English travel narratives to Palestine, whose authors modern readers typically insist on reading as entirely secular. They were secular because, being post-Reformation

¹⁰ Although the argument here bears similarities with Talal Asad's *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), particularly in its sense that neither the secular nor the religious are "essentially fixed categories," it differs with him where he disclaims that "if one stripped appearances one would see that some apparently secular institutions were *really* religious" (25). In this respect, my argument follows writers like John Milbank and William Connolly, who maintain that secular culture is based on theological beliefs.

travelers, they no longer believed in a Holy Land or the efficacy of pilgrimage for penance. Even in Catholicism, the notion that Palestine was holy had long been subject to debate. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Jerome, for example, both advised against making special pilgrimages to Palestine. For them, as well as for Luther and Calvin, the idea that any land could be holy was rendered obsolete by Jesus, the new Temple whose model everyone should emulate.¹¹ Holiness no longer resided in the stones of a temple, but in the hearts of believers.¹² As George Herbert puts it in “Sion,” a poem about God’s preference for the groans of inner faith: “All Solomon’s Sea of Brass and World of Stone / Is not so dear to thee as one good Groan // And truly Brass and Stones are heavy things, / Tombs for the Dead, not Temples fit

¹¹ When God put an end to the old dispensation, he put an end to holy places, Isaac Watts writes in his sermon on “The Holiness of Places of Worship”: “He removed his dwelling from Places made with Hands, and dwelt bodily in the Man *Jesus Christ* as his noblest Tabernacle.” Isaac Watts, *The Holiness of Times, Places, and People Under the Jewish and Christian Dispensations Consider’d and Compared, in Several Discourses* (London: 1738), 112. For similar sentiment, see Christopher Smart’s “Hymn 6: The Presentation of Christ in the Temple,” where the Temple’s grand and true proportion are yet no match for “. . . another fane [which] arose, / The fabric poor, / And built by hardship midst her foes” (26–28).

¹² Some writers contend that prior to Jesus, the land was holy in particular places only while God remained present in them. For example, in *The History of the Consecration of Altars, Temples and Churches: Shewing The various Forms of it among Jews, Heathens, and Christians, deduc’d from it’s first Origine to this present Age* (London: 1706), James Owen writes: “That which made a Place Holy was some special Presence of God in it. Thus God’s appearance unto *Moses* made the Ground Holy. The Divine Glory of Christ in the Transfiguration made the Mountain Holy. And when this Glorious Presence ceas’d, the Places ceas’d to be Holy, and became common Ground” (13–14). In another anti-consecration pamphlet, *The Gospel-Sanctuary: Or, God’s Name Recorded in Places of Publick Worship. In which The Consecration and Holiness of such Places are rationally considered; and the free and publick Exercise of Religion, supported upon Natural and Christian Principles* (London: 1740), P. Cardale doubts holiness was ever imparted by God: “Nor did the Divine presence itself ever so far alter the nature of things, as to make one place more holy than another in this sense. Even his *glorious* presence in the tabernacle and temple could not be said to communicate any real holiness to those places” (75). Such thoughts are expressed even in consecration sermons. In *A Sermon Preach’d in the New Church of St. Matthew’s, Bethnal-Green, On the 20th of July, 1746. Being the Sunday next after the Consecration of the said Church* (London: 1746), William Gordon writes of an abandoned church: “if the Service of God shou’d no longer be perform’d here, it returns to its original Indifference again, as it was before the Foundation of the Fabrick was laid; the relative Holiness itself is lost, even as the Place whereon *Moses* stood, though it was declar’d to be holy Ground, whilst God was there present, and conversed with him; soon as ever that Presence was withdrawn, it was no longer sacred in itself, but reduc’d to a Level with any other Spot in the Neighbourhood” (22).

for thee.”¹³ Belief in the ongoing holiness of Palestine, Isaac Watts argued, led to the frantic and blameworthy zeal of the Crusades, and to the abuse by Tasso and Casimire Sarbiewski of their poetic muses.¹⁴ (Oddly, though, this did not prevent writers from thinking of present-day Palestine as cursed. For example, William Lithgow recounts that while Canaan once “was the most fruitful land in the world . . . I find now the contrary, and the fruitfulness thereof to be changed, God cursing the land together with the Jews.”¹⁵ Likewise, in his history of the Crusades, Thomas Fuller writes that “to this day [pilgrims] light on parcels of rich ground in Palestine which God may seem to have left, that men may tast the former sweetnesse of the land, before it was sowed for the peoples sinnes . . . But it is barren for the generality: the streams of milk and hony wherewith once it flowed, are now drained dry; and the whole face of the land looketh sad, not so much for want of dressing, as because God hath frowned on it.”¹⁶ Aaron Hill strikes a similar note in his account “Of the Present State of the Holy-Land”: “Nor is, *the once sublime, and Flourishing Condition* of her Ancient Government, the only thing, which time has chang’d to this Surprizing disadvantage, *even the Land itself*, as if a Curse from *Heaven* attended the deserted Climate, has disrob’d her *Surface* of those amiable Beauties, and attracting Excellencies of Fertility and Prospect, which in former times, were wont to Crown, not only the *Vallies*,

¹³ George Herbert, *The English Poems of George Herbert*, ed. Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), lines 17–20. On the difficulty of discerning Herbert’s attitude to churches, see: David L. Orvis, “Thy glorious household-stuffe’: Doctrinal (Re) Inscription in George Herbert’s Church Furnishing Poems” in *The Sacred and Profane in English Renaissance Literature*, ed. Mary A. Papazian (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008). Also see, Samuel Hayes, *Prayer: A Poem* (Cambridge: 1777): “What avails / The splendid Temple, decorated Shrine, / What all the pageantry of labour’d art?” (4).

¹⁴ Watts, *The Holiness*, 112–13. Interestingly, where Watts’s disbelief in the inherent holiness of place leads him to criticize the Crusades, in *The Holy Land: A Poem* (Cambridge, 1800), Francis Wrangham’s confidence in the “inextinguishable flame” of Palestine’s “holy light” (“In the dust / Thy scatter’d relics shine; and radiant still, / By time’s successive billows uneffaced, / The pilgrim tracks the footsteps of his God” [lines 61–68]) moves him not only to praise Richard the Lionheart but to fantasize that either French or Russian armies, though infidel themselves, will scourge Egypt (lines 245–250).

¹⁵ William Lithgow, *Travels and Voyages, through Europe, Asia, and Africa, for Nineteen Years. Containing An Account of the Religion, Government, Policy, Laws, Customs, Trade, &c. of the several countries through which the Author travelled; and a Description of Jerusalem, and many other remarkable places mentioned in Sacred and Profane History: Also A Narrative of the tortures he suffered in the Spanish Inquisition, and of his miraculous deliverance from those cruelties*, 11th ed. (Edinburgh, 1770), 204.

¹⁶ Thomas Fuller, *The Historie of the Holy Warre* (Cambridge: 1639), 2–3.

but the very *Hills* and *Rocks* themselves, with a Productive Gayety.”¹⁷) The motivation for English travelers, then, could only be antiquarian curiosity.

While I agree that such travelers usually were not primarily motivated by religious impulses, especially compared to, say, Jewish travelers of the same period, I believe it is a mistake to eliminate religion altogether from their experiences. Indeed, much work has recently been done that suggests beliefs in the sacred persisted on the ground notwithstanding the theoretical disagreements of theologians and even the violence of civil war. The world of Luther, Robert Scribner has noted, was highly charged with sacrality—only it was a sacrality beyond human control.¹⁸ Likewise, though Calvin wrote against the idea that one place could be holier than another and maintained that individual Christians were the stones of the true church, the 1566 Second Helvetic Confession called for sacred places.¹⁹ “Even in the heart of the Calvinist movement, the ‘new Jerusalem’ of Geneva,” write Will Coster and Andrew Spicer, “what took place was not a process of desacralisation, but rather a rearrangement of space according to a new conception of the sacred.”²⁰ Surprisingly, some architects in Geneva took their inspiration from the Temple of Solomon, or the Temple of Ezekiel’s vision, notwithstanding its popularization by the Jesuit Villalpando.²¹ Villalpando’s influence even spread to New Haven, which was modeled according to his plans of the Temple compound.²² Moreover, though Puritans were free to homogenize time and space in the American colonies, meetinghouses came to seem consecrated by their use for prayer.²³ Initially used for mixed purposes (such

¹⁷ Aaron Hill, *The Present State of Aethiopia, Egypt, Palestine, and the Whole Ottoman Empire* (London, 1707), 276.

¹⁸ Robert W. Scribner, “The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the ‘Disenchantment of the World,’” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 23.3 (Winter 1993): 475–94.

¹⁹ Andrew Spicer, *Calvinist Churches in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), 11.

²⁰ Will Coster and Andrew Spicer, “Introduction: The Dimensions of Sacred Space in Reformation Europe,” in *Sacred Space in Early Modern England*, eds. Will Coster and Andrew Spicer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 6.

²¹ Andrew Spicer, *Calvinist Churches in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), 12.

²² John Archer, “Puritan Town Planning in New Haven,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 34.2 (May 1975): 140–49. On Villalpando’s influence on nine-bay synagogues and churches in Poland and England, see: Sergey R. Kravtsov, “Juan Bautista Villalpando and Sacred Architecture in the Seventeenth Century,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 64.3 (September 2005): 312–39.

²³ James P. Walsh, “Holy Time and Sacred Space in Puritan New England,” *American Quarterly* 32.1 (Spring 1980): 89–91. On Anglican churches in the colonies, see: Louis P.

as town meetings), meetinghouses were eventually deemed inappropriate for secular practices; by the Revolution, the term “church” had been rehabilitated, as had consecrations, for their use.²⁴ In Scotland, too, the Kirk found it difficult to replace traditional attitudes about sacred rites, and by the 1620s reinstituted the practice of consecration.²⁵ Likewise in England, popular attitudes were not necessarily transformed by Protestant teaching or the Westminster Confession of 1647. Congregants still accorded symbolic weight to where they sat in church; and even Quakers came to identify strongly with their meetinghouses, particularly when squeezed out of them by the Established Church.²⁶ As Alexandra Walsham has shown, even the destruction of churches across Britain and Ireland did not necessarily purge locations of religious resonance in the minds of those who lived near their ruins: “Even as they repudiated the notion that sanctity could be localized and stressed its transcendence of tangible forms, they spoke as if its opposite, iniquity, had an irresistibly material quality. In this and other respects, it may be suggested, the sacred was not so much eroded as reconfigured and relocated: the way in which it was present in the world was redefined rather than wholly denied.”²⁷ A crucial distinction here was of use: places were not inherently sacred but sanctified by prayer and worship. Moreover, though no

Nelson, “Word, Shape, and Image: Anglican Constructions of the Sacred,” in *American Sanctuary: Understanding Sacred Spaces*, ed. Louis P. Nelson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006).

²⁴ Gretchen Buggeln, “New England Orthodoxy and the Language of the Sacred,” in *American Sanctuary: Understanding Sacred Spaces*, ed. Louis P. Nelson, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006).

²⁵ Andrew Spicer, “‘What kinde of hourse a kirk is’: Conventicles, Consecrations and the Concept of Sacred Space in Post-Reformation Scotland,” in *Sacred Space in Early Modern England*, eds. Will Coster and Andrew Spicer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 87, 91–92. Also see: Andrew Spicer, “‘God Will Have a House’: Defining Sacred Space and Rites of Consecration in Early Seventeenth-Century England,” in *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, eds. Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer (London: Ashgate Publishing, 2006).

²⁶ Christopher Marsh, “Sacred Space in England, 1560–1640: The View from the Pew,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53.2 (April 2002): 286–311; Simon Dixon, “The Priest, the Quakers and the Second Conventicle Act: the Battle for Gracechurch Street Meeting House, 1670,” in *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, eds. Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer (London: Ashgate Publishing, 2006).

²⁷ Alexandra Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 151. On the power of church ruins over the imagination of Protestants, also see: Margaret Aston, “English Ruins and English History: The Dissolution and the Sense of the Past,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 36 (1973): 231–55.

longer read sacramentally, nature itself came to be read symbolically for signs of God, who was said to communicate to people through natural processes.²⁸ As Walsham notes, the reputedly medicinal waters of mineral springs “helped to perpetuate, even as it subtly transformed, the notion that divine power was concentrated in particular locations.”²⁹ In other words, over time the landscape in Britain was sacralized, desacralized, and resacralized—but it was not disenchanted as Max Weber long ago suggested.³⁰ So that even in Richard Polwhele’s *The Influence of Local Attachment with Respect to Home*, a long pre-Romantic poem which describes local attachment as the effect not of place acting upon the mind but the mind acting upon place, one senses some remainder of power in sacred space:

Lo, by a fine ethereal spirit led,
Mid olive groves we trace Ilyssus’ streams;
Or hail the solemn spot where Cato bled;
Or, where the ruin of Iona gleams,
Cherish, in holy trance, romantic dreams;
Or, with a filial tenderness, recall
Each monument of early youth that teems
With classic thought—the school’s awe-breathing wall,
The bosom-thrilling bench, the academic hall.³¹

Different landscapes appeal to different people, and a person visits a place with particular memories and a particular mindset; yet it cannot be accidental that a person cherishes “in holy trance” not just a random location but Iona, a former center of Irish monasticism. Samuel Johnson had a similar experience of the island, as he records in his *Journey to the Western Isles*: “Far from me and my friends, be such frigid philosophy as may conduct us indifferent and unmoved over any ground that has been dignified by wisdom, bravery, or virtue. That man is little to be envied, whose patriotism would not gain force

²⁸ Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape*, 387, and Alexandra Walsham, “The Reformation and ‘The Disenchantment of the World’ Reassessed,” *The Historical Journal* 51.2 (2008): 508–9.

²⁹ Alexandra Walsham, “The Reformation and ‘The Disenchantment of the World’ Reassessed,” *Historical Journal* 51 (2008): 512.

³⁰ For the idea that this process led anyway to secularization, see: C. John Sommerville, *The Secularization of Early Modern England: From Religious Culture to Religious Faith* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 30.

³¹ Richard Polwhele, *The Influence of Local Attachment with Respect to Home* (London, 1798), 10.

upon the plain of Marathon, or whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona."³² Given this dynamic, to understand how such travelers might have responded to the original space of Christianity, one must consider how writers conceived of religious space in Britain itself, particularly in consecration sermons and in proto-anthropological or architectural treatises on temples in general and the Temple of Solomon specifically.

From an older anthropological perspective, exemplified by Rudolf Otto and Mircea Eliade, sacred spaces are hierophanic, meaning that their bounds contain local irruptions of the holy which are absolutely distinct from the profane.³³ This sense of the reality of the sacred was later critiqued by Jonathan Z. Smith, who in *Map Is Not Territory* argued that already in ancient diasporic cultures a belief in the inextricable relationship of particular deities to particular places was weakened if not entirely given up and replaced by nonlocative rites that offered access to the transcendent.³⁴ For Smith, "there is nothing that is sacred in itself, only things sacred in relation."³⁵ Expounding upon Ezekiel's vision of the Temple, in *To Take Place* Smith writes that holiness does not reside in specific places or objects but is brought into being by people who employ "complex and rigorous systems of power and status with their attendant idioms of sacred/profane and pure/impure."³⁶ Because they are ideational and self-referential rather than material and correspondent to some larger reality, these systems can be replicated and transferred—to temples but also to internalized modes of thought—enabling religions to survive in places beyond their points of origin. Judaism thus lost nothing when the Temple in Jerusalem was destroyed because its synchronic systemization of difference was ready to evolve in the Mishnah; in fact, Smith writes, "if the Temple had not been destroyed, it would have had to be neglected. For it represented a locative type of religious activity no longer perceived as effective in a new, utopian religious situation."³⁷ Christianity likewise moved away from the *loca sancta* of Palestine by prioritizing a temporal set of rituals.

³² Samuel Johnson and James Boswell, *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland and The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, ed. Peter Levi (New York: Penguin, 1984), 141.

³³ Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1987).

³⁴ Jonathan Z. Smith, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), XIV.

³⁵ Jonathan Z. Smith, *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 55.

³⁶ Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 73.

³⁷ Smith, *Map Is Not*, 128.

What came to matter was less being in the spaces where Jesus's life unfolded than the texts one read and the rituals one performed while processing from place to place. In other words, "ritual is not an expression of or a response to 'the Sacred'; rather, something or someone is made sacred by ritual."³⁸ Place matters, then, only insofar as it directs attention: "When one enters a temple, one enters marked-off space . . . in which, at least in principle, nothing is accidental; everything, at least potentially, demands attention. The temple serves as a focusing lens, establishing the possibility of significance by directing attention, by requiring the perception of difference. Within the temple, the ordinary (which to any outside eye or ear remains wholly ordinary) becomes significant, becomes 'sacred,' simply by being there."³⁹ And yet, although such spaces are created, once established they are marked as wholly separate from the world, which is contingent, accidental, and arbitrary.⁴⁰ In the end, for Smith sacred space still bears significance.

In according significance to ritual, Smith sees himself in opposition to Enlightenment writers who denigrate rituals as empty ceremonies. Yet Smith's argument with Eliade in many ways repeats the disagreement over space that took place during what some scholars now call the long Reformation. In a schematic way Eliade's definition of the sacred matches Catholic defenses of sacred space, pilgrimage, and relics, while Smith's critique resembles reformers who were for consecration, such as Hooker, and even those who were not, such as James Owen, who wrote in *The History of the Consecration of Altars, Temples, and Churches* that "the worship of God now rather contributed to the Sanctity of the Place, than the Place to the Sanctity of the Worship."⁴¹

³⁸ Smith, *To Take*, 105.

³⁹ Smith, *To Take*, 104.

⁴⁰ Steven Weitzman, "Reopening the Gates of J. Z. Smith's Temple: *To Take Place* in the Light of New Historicism," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 76 (2008): 770. For a similar historicist critique of Smith, also see Christine M. Thomas, "Place and Memory: Response to Jonathan Z. Smith on *To Take Place*, on the Occasion of Its Twentieth Anniversary," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 76.3 (September 2008): 766–73.

⁴¹ Owen, *The History*, A2. Of course, given Smith's long historical view, what he writes of sacred transferability applied first to Catholicism, then to Protestantism. Indeed, after the Reformation, English Catholics learned to convert ordinary spaces (including barns) into religious spaces by using them in ritualized, imaginative ways. See: Lisa McClain, "Without Church, Cathedral, or Shrine: The Search for Religious Space among Catholics in England, 1559–1625," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 33.2 (2002): 381–99 and Richard L. Williams, "Forbidden Sacred Spaces in Reformation England," in *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, eds. Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer (London: Ashgate Publishing, 2006).

Defining the sacred as he does implies the existence of discrete secular spaces. And while I would like to borrow from Smith his sense that the sacred lies in the systematic relation of things, I would also question whether it must indeed stand apart absolutely from the ordinary world of work. According to Jonathan Sheehan, in fact for all anthropologists of religion "the sacred *needs* a place to inhabit distinct and separate from the space of the profane. True religion exists only in its own place. . . . For the modern human science, religion cannot function without a space for its performance."⁴² This need, Sheehan points out, arose ironically from the work of early modern scholars and religious controversialists who, worried about the infiltration of idolatry into Christianity, developed an abstract, comparative approach to all religious practices, abandoned ideas about theological profanation (that is, about religious truth and error), and discovered that religion could be analyzed in terms of its social function. By identifying a basic human need—equally present in ancient Israel and contemporary England—for religious places, scholars like John Spencer not only restricted the scope of religion but also discovered areas of human life that had nothing to do with religion. Where religion once defined all space, suddenly it was but one of many nonoverlapping spaces.⁴³ But, like Smith, Sheehan overemphasizes the boundaries separating sacred and secular. After all, it has been shown that for hundreds of years (even into the eighteenth century), churchyards were used for a variety of secular purposes, including commerce and leisure; conversely, market places in early modern England were often used for religious purposes.⁴⁴

⁴² Jonathan Sheehan, "Temple and Tabernacle: The Place of Religion in Early Modern England," in *Making Knowledge in Early Modern Europe: Practices, Objects, and Texts, 1400–1800*, eds. Pamela H. Smith and Benjamin Schmidt (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 249.

⁴³ Jonathan Sheehan, "Sacred and Profane: Idolatry, Antiquarianism and the Polemics of Distinction in the Seventeenth Century," *Past & Present* 192 (August 2006): 35–66. For a similar reading of the early modern discovery of religion, see: Guy G. Stroumsa, *A New Science: The Discovery of Religion in the Age of Reason* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

⁴⁴ David Dymond, "God's Disputed Acre," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 50 (1999): 464–97; David Postles, "The Market Place as Space in Early Modern England," *Social History* 29 (2004), 41–58. According to Andrew Spicer, "Before the Reformation, the sanctity of a church was seen to provide protection and lend weight to some secular activities carried out under its roof, so that it was common for churches to be used for swearing of oaths, concluding business deals and even for storing money"; Andrew Spicer, "'What kinde of hourse a kirk is': Conventicles, Consecrations and the Concept of Sacred Space in Post-Reformation Scotland," in *Sacred Space in Early Modern England*, eds. Will Coster and Andrew Spicer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 88. Also see: Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer, "Defining the Holy: the Delineation of Sacred Space," in *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early*

Admittedly, this mixture was objectionable to some. Consecration sermons typically refer to the act of consecration as a sort of property transfer between man and God. And though, as Samuel Hilliard puts it, God does not give special regard to churches “because of any Holiness inherent in the places themselves, as if there were more Sanctity in those than any other Fabricks, but because they are dedicated and set apart from all other uses to his Service,” nevertheless in solemn assemblies “there’s a *Schechinah*, a peculiar manifestation of God.”⁴⁵ Moreover, regardless of whether they favor or reject consecration, writers often speak of the need for places of prayer to remain separate. Thus Hooker deems it unseemly for one to build a house of God “with no other apparance, than if his end were to reare up a Kitchin, or a Parlor for his owne use? Or when a worke of such nature is finished, remayneth there nothing but presently to use it, and so an end?”⁴⁶ Likewise William Hole writes that “Were [prayers] to be offered up in the same Places, where ordinarily the Busy and Gay Scenes of Life are transacted, Ideas of Levity or Business would be oftner associated in the Imagination. The very Places might tempt the Proneness of our corrupted Nature to a Dissipation of Mind. They might invite and encourage such Sentiments, as it would be very difficult to exclude, however unworthy of us to entertain.”⁴⁷ And Isaac Watts constructs an interesting analogy of the misuse of religious space to the misuse of secular space:

Reason and Humanity seem to dictate this Separation or Appointment of Buildings for publick Worship. Should the Senate-house where our Law-givers assemble be used for a Theatre or Droll-house, or for idle Puppet-shews? Should the Council-board be made a drinking or gaming Table when the King is absent? Or the Presence-chamber be an entertaining Room for publick Mimicks and Scaramouches to divert the Mob, as soon

Modern Europe, eds. Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer (London: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 12; and C. John Sommerville, *The Secularization of Early Modern England: From Religious Culture to Religious Faith* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 22.

⁴⁵ Samuel Hilliard, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Consecration of the Chappel of St. Catherine, in Canvy Isle in the County of Essex, on the 11th of June, 1712* (London: 1712), 14, 8–9. Also see: John Leng, *A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of the Chappel of St. Katherine's-Hall, in the University of Cambridge, September 1. 1704* (Cambridge: 1704), 4–5; Thomas Lewis, *An Historical Essay Upon the Consecration of Churches* (London: 1719), 2.

⁴⁶ Richard Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie* (London, 1622), 203.

⁴⁷ William Hole, *A Sermon Preached in the Parish-Church of Werrington, Devon, at the Consecration of that Church, on Wednesday, Septemb. 7. 1743* (Oxford, 1743), 11.

as Majesty is departed? Or is it proper that a Place built for divine Service should be alternately employed for the Fooleries of human Life to appear in when the Worship is ended? This would unite Ideas which are extreamly distant, and blend together Solemnity and Ridicule. This would too nearly join Things divine and jocular, and mingle the Images of such Scenes in the Fancy as should for ever be kept separate.⁴⁸

Nonetheless, churches were not untouched by the profane. Alexander Baillie, a Scottish Benedictine traveling from Germany, had this to say about St. Giles in Edinburgh when he visited it in 1622:

& on every side beholding the restlesse resorting of people treating of their worldly effaires; some writing & making obligations, contracts & discharges: others laying countes or telling-over sowmes of mony: & two & two walking & talking to & fro, some about merchandice or the lawes & too many allas about drinking or courting of woemen, Yea & perhaps about worse nor I can imagine; as is wont to be done al the day long in the common Exchanges of London & Amsterdam & other great cities.⁴⁹

And in the next century writers continued to complain about muddled distinctions between spaces. This is true both for the outward form of churches as well as for the behaviors within. For example, in his *Epistle to Burlington*, Pope counts among the foolish imitators of Burlington those who would “Load some vain Church with old Theatric state” (line 29). On this line, Warburton comments: “For the one being for *holy service*, and the other only for *civil amusement*, it is impossible that the profuse and lascivious ornaments of the latter should become the retenue, reverence, and sanctity of the other. Nor will any examples of this vanity of ornament in the sacred buildings of antiquity justify this imitation; for those ornaments might be very suitable to a Temple of Bacchus, or Venus, which would ill become the sobriety and purity of the present Religion.”⁵⁰ Similarly, in “The Winter Walk at Noon” of *The Task*, Cowper

⁴⁸ Watts, *The Holiness*, 118.

⁴⁹ Andrew Spicer, *Calvinist Churches in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), 82–83.

⁵⁰ Alexander Pope, *The works of Alexander Pope Esq. In nine volumes complete. With his last corrections, additions, and improvements. Published by Mr. Warburton*, Vol. III (London, 1751), 266. In the same lengthy note, Warburton reflects on the origin of Saxon architecture, which he traces back

scoffs at the use of churches for the praise of man, as when “ten thousand sit / Patiently present at a sacred song, / Commemoration-mad” for a performance of Handel’s *Messiah* in Westminster Abbey, which they hear not for God’s but “Handel’s sake,” or when after the battle of Culloden “in the chapel of old Ely House, / . . . The simple clerk but loyal, did announce, / And eke did rear right merrily, two staves, / Sung to the praise and glory of King George.”⁵¹

But such critiques reveal that in actuality lines were often blurred: churches were made to look like secular buildings and people did celebrate mundane things in sacred places. Of course Cowper’s *Task* itself takes religious impulses out into the garden and the winter walk. Dustin Griffin has described this as Cowper’s spiritualizing of georgic poetry.⁵² But even though the georgic has of late been interpreted by scholars as a medium for eighteenth-century empiricism and science, it is problematic to read them apart from religion. After all, why should Virgil’s *Georgics* need spiritualizing when Book IV ends with a story about sacrificial penance? Moreover, in Book I, Virgil takes care to instruct his reader that “Even on holy days the laws of gods / And men permit some tasks.”⁵³ Religious habit is part of the fabric of the *Georgics*; and, as these lines show, Virgil recognizes that holiness admits of gradations. As Will Coster and Andrew Spicer remark, in the early modern era sacred spaces were not thought of by everyone as totally opposed zones: “the division . . . was constantly in flux; sacred objects and sacred places tended to become surrounded by other zones of sanctity that could be different in their character and intensity. The results of these factors were gradations of holiness within sacred sites.”⁵⁴ Nor, they add, should we think of sanctified space as unchanging: “The sanctity of space was not immutable; it could vary between different points in the liturgical calendar, the week or even the day. For example, the sanctity of the shrine was enhanced on the day of commemoration for a saint, or, for some Protestants a church became more intensely a locus of the sacred on the Sabbath.”⁵⁵

to the churches in Palestine. This note later appears in the eighth appendix of *The Ornaments of Churches Considered, with a particular View to the late Decoration of the Parish Church of St. Margaret Westminster* (Oxford, 1761), as well as Grose’s contribution to *Essays on Gothic Architecture by the Rev. T. Warton, Rev. J. Bentham, Captain Grose, and the Rev. J. Milner* (London, 1800).

⁵¹ William Cowper, *The Task and Selected Other Poems*, ed. James Sambrook (New York: Longman, 1994), lines 633–35, 637, 658, 661–63. Also see Watts, *The Holiness*, where he denies the effectiveness of consecration on the grounds that many public churches are used for parish offices, children’s play, and other secular endeavors (121–22).

⁵² Dustin Griffin, “Redefining Georgic: Cowper’s *Task*,” *ELH* 57 (1990): 875–79.

⁵³ Virgil, *The Georgics*, trans. L. P. Wilkinson (New York: Penguin Books, 1982), lines 268–69.

⁵⁴ Coster and Spicer, “Introduction,” *Sacred Space*, 9.

⁵⁵ Coster and Spicer, *Sacred Space*, 13.

The key concern here is not exactly on distinction but the proper use of religious space, which was said by middle-of-the-road Protestants not to have essential or inherent but relative holiness. Even for Milton, whom Joseph Lyle, Barbara Lewalski, and David Quint take as unequivocally antipathetic to the concept of localized sanctity, this seems the case.⁵⁶ Although in Book XI, Michael tells Adam that Paradise will be transformed by the flood into an island, so as “To teach thee that God attributes to place / No sanctity, if none be thither brought / By men who there frequent, or therein dwell,” in Book III when Satan approaches the stairway to heaven’s gate, he sees they are directly above Paradise: “A passage down to th’ earth, a passage wide, / Wider by far than that of after-times / Over Mount Sion and, though that were large, / Over the Promised Land, to God so dear, / By which, to visit oft those happy tribes, / On high behests His Angels to and fro / Passed frequent” (528–34). Recollecting a Jewish midrash about the close proximity of the Temple Mount and the Promised Land to the heavens, this hints that neither the fall nor the flood cut the land off completely from access to the holy. What cuts it off, as Michael says, is when people fail to bring sanctity to sacred places. Often this is a matter of affect. As Hooker explains, Solomon himself sanctified the Temple because he “knew how easily that which was meant should be holy and sacred, might be drawne from the use whereunto it was first provided . . . and right wisely therefore endeauered by such solemnities to leaue in the minds of men that impression, which might somewhat restrayne their boldnesse, and nourish a reuerend affection towards

⁵⁶ Joseph Lyle, “Architecture and Idolatry in *Paradise Lost*,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 40.1 (Winter 2000): 139–55; Barbara K. Lewalski, “Milton and Idolatry,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 43 (2003): 213–32; Quint, David, “Milton’s Book of Numbers: Book 1 of *Paradise Lost* and Its Catalogue,” *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 13 (2007): 528–49. But as Chuck Keim, “Temple Imagery and the Sacred Garden of Paradise Lost,” in *The Sacred and Profane in English Renaissance Literature*, ed. Mary A. Papazian (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), demonstrates, Milton describes Paradise as a sort of naturalized Temple. (In Book V, Section 11 of *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie* [London: 1622], Hooker writes that Adam “euen during the space of his small continuance in Paradise, had where to present himself before the Lord” [201]; in *The Antiquity and Holiness of Places set apart for Publick Worship. A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of St. George’s Chapel, In the Parish of Portsea, Near Portsmouth, In the County of Southampton, On Tuesday, Sept. 17. 1754* [Oxford: 1745], Philip Barton similarly conjectures that “even in *Paradise*, it is probable, that there was some peculiar Place, some Retirement in the Garden, where in the Cool of the Evening, They might pay their Devotions to the Supreme Being” [7].) Milton may be less antagonistic to a concept of holy space than he is suspicious that such spaces will be misused by flawed humans.

the House of God.”⁵⁷ Consecration sermons throughout the period echo this note. Thus, John Broughton writes that consecrations “keep up in our Minds an awful Sense of the most high God when we approach him”; James Lacy, that “The Consideration of *whose House* we are in, minds us of the Business of the *Place*, and strikes a kind of Awe into our Thoughts, when we reflect upon that *Sacred Majesty* we usually converse with there”; R. Newton, that churches “are apt to give Men an awful sense of the Duties they are about to perform, and to put them in mind, that, as Those Places are Separated from common Uses, so they should now Separate their Thoughts from secular Affairs”; Lewis Stephens, that consecration “is a sort of holy Guard . . . it excites a Reverence in the Minds of the People” and that upon entering a church “We approach the Holy Place with Fear; we enter the Door of the Lord’s House with a composed Gesture, and draw near to the Altar with a Religious Silence”; Theodore Waterland, that it creates a right inward disposition, raises, refreshes, and cheers spirits, calms, composes, and sweeten one’s temper, elevates, refines, and ennobles one’s thoughts, and warms, quickens, and enflames one’s affections”; and William Hole, that consecrated churches “tend to raise Men’s Minds from abject Sentiments, and to dissipate vitious ones—to implant and promote a Spirit of Awe and Seriousness, and to excite and enliven every good and pious Affection.”⁵⁸

If one could bring the proper affect to the outside world, as Cowper attempts to do in his georgic, the religious and secular might overlap. And I believe this happens particularly because, notwithstanding the view of its shrinking or lost relevance, in some ways Solomon’s Temple did not disappear but became gigantic in the long eighteenth century. For some, such as William Guild, Samuel Mather, Samuel Lee, and John Bunyan, it retained merely allegorical

⁵⁷ Hooker, *Of the Lawes*, 204.

⁵⁸ John Broughton, *Of the House of Prayer. A Sermon Preach’d at the Consecration of the chapel at Kew, Within the Parish of Kingston on Thames, on Wednesday, May 12, 1714, Before the Right Reverend Father in God Jonathan Lord Bishop of Winton* (London, 1714), 17; James Lacy, *A Sermon Preach’d at the Consecration of a Church, in the Parish of Castle-ton, Near Sherborne, Dorset. September 7, 1715* (London, 1715), 9; R. Newton, *A Sermon Preach’d at the Consecration of Hart-Hall Chapell in Oxford* (Oxford, 1716), 18; Lewis Stephens, *A Sermon Preached On the 10th of August, 1727, at the Consecration of Trinity-Chapel, in the Town of Leeds in Yorkshire* (London, 1727), 8; Theodore Waterland, *The Influence or Efficacy of outward Majesty and Beauty in the House of God, to excite and promote true Devotion inwardly in the Minds of Worshipers. A Sermon Preach’d at the Parish-Church of St. Benedict-Fink, London, On Sunday, October 8. 1732. At the Opening of the said Parish-Church, after its being Repair’d and Beautified* (London, 1736), 16; Hole, *A Sermon*, 12.

interest.⁵⁹ However, for others—Villalpando, Isaac Newton, William Stukeley, John Wood—it was the historical blueprint for all subsequent architecture.⁶⁰ Large-scale models of it were made by Rabbi Jacob Judah of Leon in 1628, and by Gerhard Schott in 1692. Schott's model was displayed in the opera house at Haymarket in 1724 (where it was seen by the king and examined by William Whiston, who then constructed and lectured on his own supposedly more accurate version in London, Bath, Bristol, and Turnbridge Wells), and in the Royal Exchange in 1729, in a room opposite the East India Company's tea warehouse.⁶¹ Leon's model, which gained him a visit to King Charles II in 1675, may have influenced Wren, and was exhibited in London in 1759–1760.⁶² According to Jim Bennett, Solomon's Temple was the site "where natural philosophy, practical mathematics, and the possibilities for spiritual, moral, material, and social improvement could be brought into a single discourse. Here the artificial work

⁵⁹ See: William Guild, *Moses Unveiled; Or, Those Figures Which Served Unto the pattern and shadow of heavenly things, pointing out the Messiah Christ Jesus, briefly explained* (London, 1658); Lee, Samuel, *Orbis Miraculum, or The Temple of Solomon, Pourtrayed by Scripture-Light: Wherein All its famous Buildings, the pompous Worship of the Jewes, with its attending Rites and Ceremonies; the several Officers employed in that Work, with their ample Revenues: and the Spiritual Mysteries of the Gospel veiled under all; are treated of at large* (London, 1659); Samuel Mather, *The Figures or Types of the Old Testament* (London, 1685); John Bunyan, *Solomon's Temple Spiritualized: or, Gospel-Light Fetch'd out of the Temple at Jerusalem, to let us more easily into the Glory of New-Testament-Truth*, 8th edition (London, 1727). For the Temple's importance to Masonic and Stuart court culture, see Marsha Keith Schuchard, *Restoring the Temple of Vision: Cabalistic Freemasonry and Stuart Culture* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

⁶⁰ Isaac Newton, *The Chronology of Antient Kingdoms Amended* (Dublin, 1728); William Stukeley, *Stonehenge A Temple Restor'd to the British Druids* (London, 1740), 23–24; John Wood, *The Origin of Building: Or, The Plagiarism of the Heathens Detected* (Bath, 1741). On Villalpando, see: Paul von Naredi-Rainer, "Between Vatable and Villalpando: Aspects of Postmedieval Reception of the Temple in Christian Art" in *The Real and Ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian and Islamic Art*, ed. Bianca Kühnel, *Jewish Art* 23–24 (1997–1998): 218–25 and Lola Kantor Kazovsky, "Piranesi and Villalpando: The Concept of the Temple in European Architectural Theory" in *The Real and Ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian and Islamic Art*, ed. Bianca Kühnel, *Jewish Art* 23–24 (1997–1998): 226–44. On Wood, see: Eileen Harris, "John Wood's System of Architecture," *The Burlington Magazine* 131.1031 (February 1989): 101–7. In *Jewish Antiquities: Or A Course of Lectures on the Three First Books of Godwin's Moses and Aaron*, Vol. II (London: 1766), David Jennings concludes the Temple was "the completest building that was ever erected; and it is no improbable conjecture of those who are for deriving all the Grecian orders, and just ornaments in architecture from this temple" (34).

⁶¹ Each exhibit included explanatory guides, often reprinted. See: *The Temple of Solomon, with all its Porches, Walls, Gates, Halls, Chambers . . . Erected in a proper Model and material Representation* (London, 1724) and Jacob Juda Lyon, *An Accurate Description of the Grand and Glorious Temple of Solomon*, trans. M. P. Decastro (London, 1778).

⁶² On the possible influence of the Temple on Wren's designs for St. Paul's, see Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, 54.

of man in architecture and practical geometry could be as natural as the created world, and the regulation of metrology, measurement, and commerce could be grounded on a geometry that had been stamped on the cosmos itself.”⁶³ Indeed, the cosmos itself did become a blueprint, as perhaps the most intriguing instance of the Temple’s magnification, that found in Addison’s “Essays on Infinity,” shows. While meditating on the nature of God’s omnipresence and omniscience in *Spectator* No. 565, Addison writes that although some consider creation “as the Temple of God, which he has built with his own Hands, and which is filled with his Presence,” and others consider it “as the Receptacle, or rather the Habitation of the Almighty,” he conceives space in Newtonian terms as “the *Sensorium* of the Godhead.”⁶⁴ Here God is everywhere, present in every material and immaterial substance. Yet in No. 580, a continuation of the “Infinity” series, Addison seemingly reverses himself while describing a part of the immensity of space where God “discovers himself in a most transcendent and visible Glory. This is that Place which is marked out in Scripture under the different appellations of *Paradise, the third Heaven, the Throne of God, and the Habitation of his Glory* . . . where the glorified Body of our Saviour resides, and where all the celestial Hierarchies, and the innumerable Hosts of Angels, are represented as perpetually surrounding the Seat of God, with *Hallelujahs* and Hymns of Praise.”⁶⁵ Though God is essentially present everywhere, in this place “he resides in a sensible Magnificence, and in the midst of all those Splendors which can affect the Imagination of created Beings.”⁶⁶ To explain further how this is possible, Addison compares God’s seat in the universe with the mercy-seat in Solomon’s Temple:

As in *Solomon’s Temple* there was the *Sanctum Sanctorum* in which a visible Glory appeared among the Figures of the Cherubins, and into which none but the High-Priest himself was permitted to enter, after having made an Attonement for the Sins of the People; so if we consider the whole Creation as one great Temple, there is in it this Holy of Holies, into which the High-Priest of our Salvation

⁶³ Jim Bennett, “Solomon’s Temple and Solomon’s House” in *Fragments of Memory: The Temple of Solomon in the Dresden Zwinger: Facets of a Baroque Architectural Model and an Early Jewish Museum*, eds. Michael Korey and Thomas Ketelsen (Dresden: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2010), 33. See also: Jim Bennett, and Scott Mandelbrote, *The Garden, the Ark, the Tower, the Temple: Biblical Metaphors of Knowledge in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1998), 136.

⁶⁴ Joseph Addison, *The Spectator*, vol. VIII (London, 1717), 37.

⁶⁵ Addison, 92–93.

⁶⁶ Addison, 92–93.

entered, and took his Place among Angels and Archangels, after having made a Propitiation for the Sins of Mankind.⁶⁷

Addison might have described God's special location as itself the holy temple in otherwise profane space; instead, he expands the temple's precincts to cover the entire universe. At one moment in his *Orbis Miraculum, or The Temple of Solomon*, Samuel Lee says the Temple was once "a compendious Map of the then *Terra Incognita* or the unknown Land of the Gospel: It was Heavens Geographically Table of those Countries, whose shores only did appear to them through a dark mist," but is now no longer since "the greatest part of the Continent, the spacious Plains, the flowry Meadows, the Cedar Mountains, the pearling streams, the shady Vallies, the capacious Prospects, the Eshcol Vineyard, the Balsame Gardens of the Land of *Canaan* are discovered."⁶⁸ For Lee, that the gospel truth has been discovered means that the nature of the so-called Holy Land has also been understood and rendered irrelevant. Where he might similarly dismiss it, Addison rather reimagines the Temple map on the largest scale possible. If the notion that particular locations on earth were sacred was less available after the Reformation, the idea that the universe itself was in some sense sacred still might have held sway. Writing about the loss of faith in a world defined by religious analogy and metaphor, Blanford Parker has characterized the transition from Renaissance to Augustan thought as a spatial rupture: "The attack upon the claims of the inward man and the outer world leads to a new space—an emptiness."⁶⁹ The cultural response to this emptiness was to fill the space randomly with literal things: "the empty space brought on by the erasure of both analogy and fideist theology was . . . filled up with a plethora of novel descriptions. The natural world and the world of incidental appearances . . . burst forth and flooded the scene."⁷⁰ (In certain respects, Parker echoes Foucault in "Of Other Spaces," where Foucault writes that Galileo's discovery of infinitely open space dissolved the medieval space of emplacement; but Foucault senses that "contemporary space is still not entirely desanctified," is in fact "still nurtured by the hidden presence of the

⁶⁷ Addison, 93.

⁶⁸ Lee, *Orbis*, 166.

⁶⁹ Blanford Parker, *The Triumph of Augustan Poetics: English Literary Culture from Butler to Johnson* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 60. About Pope he later writes: "The riddle of Pope is the riddle of a man who can no longer accept the traditional metaphysical and moral definitions of man, and who discovers himself in a world without tragedy but with an undefinable space of experience" (214).

⁷⁰ Parker, *The Triumph of Augustan Poetics*, 18.

sacred.”)⁷¹ To exemplify this sense of loss, Parker refers more than once to Pope’s playfully sacrilegious couplet about Newton: “Nature, and Nature’s Laws lay hid in Night, / God said *Let Newton be!* and All was *Light*.” But here he fails to note that even if the universe may now be explained or revealed by Newton’s mathematics, it is still contained by the Godly space one finds at the conclusion of Pope’s “Universal Prayer”:⁷²

To Thee, whose Temple is all Space,
Whose Altar, Earth, Sea, Skies;
One Chorus let all Being raise!
All Nature’s Incence rise!⁷³

This language resonates with “A Hymn” to Thomson’s *The Seasons*, in which the poet commands nature to “join every living Soul, / Beneath the spacious Temple of the Sky, / In Adoration join.”⁷⁴ Moreover, one hears an interesting echo of it in Canto III of Gloucester Ridley’s *Melampus, or Religious Groves*—a Spenserian attempt (Ridley called it a pagan *Paradise Regained*) to show that Pagan practices, though superstitious and potentially idolatrous, were on the path to Christian truth—where, after twice fending off the evil Anteros, the protagonist Elfenor joins a religious procession and hears a chorus of bards praise the God of creation. As part of their ceremony, a priest burn incense, the odor of which makes Anteros flee:

⁷¹ Michel Foucault, “Of Other Spaces,” *Diacritics* 16 (1986): 23.

⁷² Against Parker, one might consider Michael Allen Gillespie’s *The Theological Origins of Modernity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), which argues that this empty space was filled not with mere things but godly attributes: “The so-called process of disenchantment is thus also a process of reenchantment in and through which both man and nature are infused with a number of attributes or powers previously ascribed to God. To put the matter more starkly, in the fact of the long drawn out death of God, science can provide a coherent account of the whole only by making man or nature or both in some sense divine. . . . Indeed, Enlightenment thinkers repeatedly ‘discovered’ powers and capacities in man and nature that had previously been ascribed to God” (274).

⁷³ Lines 49–52; on the early versions of the poem and Pope’s addition of “Christian coloring,” see Robert W. Rogers, “Alexander Pope’s *Universal Prayer*,” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 54 (1955): 612–24. On Pope’s sense of a present God, but desire for moderation, see: G. Douglas Atkins, “Pope and Deism: A New Analysis,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 35 (1972): 257–78 and Chester Chapin, “Alexander Pope: Erasmus Catholic,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 6 (1973): 411–30.

⁷⁴ James Thomson, *The Seasons*, ed. James Sambrook (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), lines 37–39. On the divinity of nature in Thomson, see: David Reid, “Thomson’s Poetry of Reverie and Milton,” *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 43 (2003): 667–82.

Then on the smoking coals the springs he threw
Of every kind; short snap'd the crackling wood,
Till high to Heaven the pillar'd Incense grew.
The branches wave, the Bards proclaim aloud
Most High! Eternal! Powerful! and Good!
The Mountains echo to the vaulted skies
The loud acclaim.⁷⁵

On the incense, Ridley notes: "That incense was the vehicle of prayer is a very antient idea . . . If this view of the belief and practice of the old Heathen world excite the languid Christian to a due improvement of both, and provoke the infidel to only an imitation of them, in giving honour to our common Father which is in Heaven, and in being careful to do to others, as we would have done unto ourselves, I shall have been no inconsiderable benefactor to mankind."⁷⁶ And if this space is filled with things, the effort at trying to understand and systematize them might yet have religious implications. As much is the point of "The Usefulness of Experimental Philosophy," an essay which favors at its conclusion honoring God by bringing "philosophical devotion into the reputation it deserves" over "erecting buildings for religious uses," where Richard Boyle nonetheless conceives of the world itself as a temple: "Supposing then, the world to be a temple, I would infer that man is the priest to officiate therein; and consequently bound, as being the head creature here, to return thanks and praises to his maker, both for himself and the whole creation."⁷⁷ The immensity of such a project, of space itself, does not lead inevitably to a sense of spiritual loss. Indeed, in a consecration sermon William Roby finds it amazing that notwithstanding the hugeness of space—which he comments upon for a lengthy paragraph—and seeming inconsequence of Earth, God still condescends to leave people tokens of his presence:

The Earth is but an inconsiderable Part of the Creation, tho' its Diameter be above 79 hundred Miles, and its solid Content or Bulk be computed to be near 265 thousand Millions of Miles . . . Should I enter into the distinct Consideration of the immense

⁷⁵ Gloucester Ridley, *Melampus, A Poem* (Hull, 1781), lines 522–28.

⁷⁶ Ridley, *Melampus*, 269.

⁷⁷ Richard Boyle, *The Usefulness of Experimental Philosophy; By Way of Exhortation to the Study of It*, 25, 16.

Space posset by the Heavenly Bodies, this Earth would appear, but as a meer Point, a very inconsiderable Part of the Creation. . . . The nearest of the Heavenly Bodies to us, is the *Moon*, whose Orb is the least of any of the celestial Globes, but yet she takes up a space of near 480 thousand *English* Miles in breadth to perform her monthly Revolution in. . . . This *magnus orbis*, as it is usually called, is a Space of above 540 Millions of Miles Circumference, or 172 Millions breadth. And if to this, we add, the Increment caused by the Sweep of the Moon, or the Excursion of her Orb beyond the *magnus orbis*, we shall have a Space yet broader by near 280 thousand Miles. . . . Saturn is supposed to have a Orb of above 1641 Millions of *English* Miles Diameter, and the rest in proportion. But what is all this, to the nearly infinite *expansion* occupied by the rest of the Heavenly Bodies? . . . So that upon the whole, *Solomon* might very well wonder, that the glorious God should condescend to dwell on the Earth, which is but a Spot, a meer Point to the whole Creation: That he should regard this; that he should reside here below, when he has such vast Dominions above!⁷⁸

The relation of science and belief also appears in Cardale, where despite his dismissal of consecration, he espouses faith in the gracious presence of God among a spiritual congregation. That this presence is real, he says, should be no more doubted than is the physical property of force:

God's gracious presence or influence is something *real*; or, the operations of the Spirit, preparing and assisting men to holy actions, furthering holy habits, &c. is, I think, a doctrine that will stand the test of a sober impartial inquiry, and is as easy to be understood as a great many things in *nature* or common *providence*. Why may not the same rules of logic, reason, and good sense obtain in faith and science, in things spiritual and in things natural? A late ingenious writer has observed, that we may form as clear an idea of *grace* as of *force*: His words are these; [and his reasoning is very evident, and applicable in the *present* case;] 'Excluding body,

⁷⁸ W. Roby, *God's dwelling with Men upon Earth very wonderful. A Consecration Sermon Preach'd at the Opening of the New Meeting-Place in Oxford. September 24th. 1721* (London, 1722), 16–18.

time, space, motion, and all its sensible measures and effects, we shall find it as difficult to form an idea of force as of grace. Grace may certainly be an object of our faith, and influence of our life and actions, as a principle destructive of evil habits, and productive of good ones, altho' we cannot attain a distinct idea of it, separated or abstracted from God the *author*, from man the *subject*, and from virtue and piety its *effects*.' *Minute Philosopher*, vol. ii. P. 156.⁷⁹

Here a material idea is not only carried into but reaffirms the sacred. The sacred may idealize, but it does not necessarily reject, the worldly.

This is even true of the world of commerce and money. In an interesting passage of *Map Is Not Territory*, Jonathan Z. Smith parallels the historical move away from sacred space to a similar evolution in the symbolic value of money: "In an expansive, open culture money becomes an important means of expressing transcendence of place. Through the acquisition of money, social mobility is made possible for the individual or culture group. One may rise above his station, class or place. Similarly, the acquisition of wealth with its attendant phenomena of conspicuous consumption and waste is, at least in part, an expression of transcendence of finitude. . . . On the other hand, in a locative culture money, or more properly, exchange, serves to establish and re-enforce a sense of place. . . . Exchange, the acquisition of foodstuffs or other wealth, is ultimately a means to the keeping of one's place."⁸⁰ Just as a ritualized system enables the portability of religion, an abstracted idea of money allows the transplantation of an economy from place to place. That money and faith work in similar ways should mean at least the possibility of their overlap. On the other hand, looking again at Johnson's prooftexts for "exchange," where the sentence from Locke indicates a locative culture of money and the lines from Denham seemingly indicate the non-locative, one is reminded that Denham's sense of the global is projected onto and dependent on the Thames. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries money and religion are not yet and need not be neatly separable from space.

As much may be seen in William Lisle Bowles's *The Spirit of Navigation*, a poem that locates the origin of civilization in the navigation and commercial traffic of an identifiably pagan Phoenicia and Israel. Significantly, when the poet comes to celebrate "Imperial Tyre," he does so with biblical language:

⁷⁹ Cardale, *The Gospel-Sanctuary*, 105–8.

⁸⁰ Smith, *Map Is*, 141–42.

I see thy kingly merchants' thronged resort,
 And gold and purple gleam o'er all thy spacious port.
 I mark thy glitt'ring gallies sweep along—
 The steady rowers to the strokes incline,
 And chaunt in unison their choral song—
 White through their oars the ivory benches shine—
 The fine-wrought sails which looms of Egypt wove,
 Swell beautiful beneath the bending mast,
 Hewn from proud Lebanon's immortal grove;
 The oaks of Bashan brave the coecian blast!
 So o'er the western wave thy vessels float,
 For verdant Egypt bound, or Calpe's cliffs remote.

Queen of the waters! throned upon thy seat
 Amid the sea, thy beauty and thy fame
 The deep, that rolls low-murmuring at thy feet,
 And all the multitude of isles, proclaim!
 For thee Damascus piles her woolly store;
 To thee their flocks Arabia's princes bring;
 And Sheba heaps her spice and glittering ore;
 The ships of Tarshish of thy glory sing:
 "Queen of the waters! who is like to thee,
 Replenished in thy might, and throned on the sea?"⁸¹

Ironically, these lines paraphrase Ezekiel 27, the second half of which prophesies the destruction of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar as punishment for laughing at Israel's fallen condition. Bowles, however, mutes Ezekiel's elegiac tone, as he does for a passage just a few lines later, where a boat at night passes by the shores of Israel:

When Night descends, and with her silver bow
 The Queen of Heaven comes forth in radiance bright,
 Surveying the dim earth and seas below;
 Why from afar resounds the mystick rite
 Hymned round her uncouth altar? Virgins there
 (Amid the brazen tymbal's hollow ring)

⁸¹ William Lisle Bowles, *Poems by the Rev. William Lisle Bowles*, vol. 2 (London, 1801), 130–31.

And aged priests the solemn feast prepare;
To her their nightly orisons they sing;
That she may look from her high throne, and guide
The wand'ring bark secure along the trackless tide.

Her on his nightly watch, the pilot views
Careful, and by her soft and tranquil light,
Along the uncertain coast his track pursues;
And now he sees great Carmel's woody height,
Where nightly fires to grisly Baal burn.⁸²

A note on "The Queen of Heaven" indicates that these lines allude to Jeremiah 7, where God dooms Judah for hypocritically pretending devotion to the Temple while at the same time offering service to pagan Gods. What bothers God in both instances is not the commercial or money-dealing practices per se of either nation, but their misdirected worship. For Bowles, the goal is to unite commerce with the proper religion (that is, Christianity), as he indicates in his reworking of this material in the longer *The Spirit of Discovery by Sea*. In this poem the ultimate point of world exploration is to justify the ways of God and render the mind of man perfect before the earth's destruction. But before that point, it is to learn of and spread the charity of Jesus. As the argument to the first book, which is framed as a vision of the future given to Noah after the flood, puts it, Noah will learn that "navigation shall be the means of extending the knowledge of God over the globe."⁸³ That Britain should be the modern means of such transmission is indicated in the second book—which initiates the poem's grand historical narrative of exploration that begins with Noah's children, proceeds, in book four, to Da Gama, Camoens, Columbus, and Drake, and finally concludes, in book five, with Cook—where the passages on Tyre above are reworked. Here the reader learns from the narrator not only that Tyre falls for saying to itself, "*I am a God*, and there is none like me," but also that it will be replaced by a "star of glory in the West— / Albion, the wonder of the illumined world."⁸⁴ Following this is a digressive eulogium on England (where one can "hear the voice / Of holy truth amid her cloistered fane, / As the clear anthem swells"), for cultural heroes such as Newton,

⁸² Bowles, *Poems*, vol. 2, 132.

⁸³ William Lisle Bowles, "The Spirit of Discovery By Sea: A Descriptive and Historical Poem," in *The Poetical Works of William Lisle Bowles*, vol. I (Edinburgh, 1855), 228.

⁸⁴ Bowles, *The Poetical Works*, vol. II.281, 306–7.

Herschel, Handel, Purcell, and Shakespeare, and also for military heroes such as Nelson and Richard the Lionheart, the latter of which is celebrated in an inset Pindaric ode that concludes the book.⁸⁵ The patriotism spills into the beginning of the third book, where, before the historical narrative is resumed, the narrator shares his worry with England that it may end up like Tyre. When he has seen “a thousand thronging masts aspire, / Far as the eye could reach, from every port / Of every nation,” the narrator has swollen with pride and also prayer:

. . . and a silent prayer
Would rise to Heaven, that Fame and Peace, and Love
And Liberty, might walk thy vales, and sing
Their holy hymns, while thy brave arm repelled
Hostility.⁸⁶

Far from transcending place, here commerce cohabits with religion of the crusading kind.

In an often cited episode of *Robinson Crusoe*, Crusoe finds, while exploring his wrecked ship, a locker containing “about thirty six Pounds value in money, some *European* coin, some *Brasil*, some Pieces of Eight, some gold, some silver.” Though initially he decides to leave it there—saying to the coins, “Thou art not worth to me, no not the taking off of the ground. . . . I have no manner of use for thee, e’en remain where thou art”—he quickly changes his mind: “upon second thoughts, I took it away.”⁸⁷ Seemingly useless, for Crusoe the coins are, as Eugenia Zuroski Jenkins, borrowing Jayne Elizabeth Lewis notion of “spectral currency,” puts it, “relics, *mementi mori* for the belief in money’s intrinsic value . . . [and represent] the positive existence of something that is *not there*: the abstract, universal value that it represents.”⁸⁸ Crusoe’s experience bears a striking resemblance to two instances in William Lithgow’s narrative of travel to Palestine. The first instance occurs in Tyre, where Lithgow is shown a pillar of the Philistine temple torn down by Samson. Although Lithgow skeptically responds that “Samson died

⁸⁵ Bowles, *The Poetical Works*, vol. II.311–13.

⁸⁶ Bowles, *The Poetical Works*, vol. III.31–33, 38–42.

⁸⁷ Daniel Defoe, *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 57.

⁸⁸ Zuroski Jenkins, Eugenia, “Defoe’s Trinkets: Figuring Global Commerce in the Early Eighteenth Century,” in *Global Economies, Cultural Currencies of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Michael Rotenberg-Schwartz (New York: AMS Press, 2012), 201.

at Gaza, the furthest south west part of Palestine . . . and I think the ancient Tyrians, said I, could not transport that pillar so far hither: But they the more constantly affirmed it, and so did these Armenians that were with me to confirm it also," in the end, he writes, "howsoever it was, I brought home a pound weight of it, and presented the half thereof to King James of blessed memory."⁸⁹ The second instance occurs outside of Bethlehem in the Milk Grotto, the cave to which the holy family fled during the Slaughter of the Innocents, where a drop of Mary's breast milk is said to have transformed the earth into a chalky substance which "hath this miraculous operation, that a little of it drunk in any liquor, to a woman that after her child-birth is barren of milk, shall forthwith give abundance; which is not only available to Christians, but likewise to Turkish, Moorish, and Arabic women, who will come from far countries to fetch off this earth." Rather than ridicule others, as is often his wont, here Lithgow admits some belief: "I have seen the nature of this dust practised; wherefore I may boldly affirm it to have the force of a strange virtue. Of the which earth I brought with me a pound weight, and presented the half it to our sometime gracious Queen Anne of blessed memory, with divers other rare relicks also, as a girdle, and a pair of garters of the Holy Grave, all richly wrought in silk and gold, having this inscription at every end of them, in golden letters, *Sancto Sepulchro*, and the word *Jerusalem*, &c."⁹⁰ Lithgow's "strange virtue" might by others be called more simply "miracle." More importantly, one sees here that, notwithstanding his deep fear of Catholic practices, Lithgow takes not just one but many seemingly valueless relics and puts them back into circulation. One might argue that Crusoe and Lithgow are drawn to such objects only when they are removed from familiar and bound within particularly removed locations, but of course both remain aware of worlds—religious and secular—beyond the immediate.

Throughout the eighteenth century, space remains capacious enough for both the sacred and secular. Thus, where a Charles Perry or Alexander Marcet can approach the waters of the Dead Sea with the eyes of scientific analysis, the anonymous author of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage to the Dead Sea* can end Byron's poem with the eponymous hero discovering a land that does

⁸⁹ William Lithgow, *Travels and Voyages, through Europe, Asia, and Africa, for Nineteen Years. Containing An Account of the Religion, Government, Policy, Laws, Customs, Trade, &c. of the several countries through which the Author travelled; and a Description of Jerusalem, and many other remarkable places mentioned in Sacred and Profane History: Also A Narrative of the tortures he suffered in the Spanish Inquisition, and of his miraculous deliverance from those cruelties*, 11th ed. (Edinburgh, 1770), 212.

⁹⁰ Lithgow, *Travels and Voyages*, 261–62.

not simply match his world-weary affect but that rouses him to restore his faith.⁹¹ Though she discusses French Enlightenment writers in a rather different context, Joanna Stalnaker's sense of an "unfinished Enlightenment" has relevance here. Where others have considered the Age of the Encyclopedia a time when objective taxonomic classification overtook more aesthetic descriptive language, Stalnaker shows how writers of the day held onto a fragmentary, contingent, and multiply perspectival sense of knowledge. In Louis Sebastien Mercier's writing about Paris, for example, one does not discover a single but a kaleidoscopic view of the city and its evolution.⁹² So too for English writers, space did not have to be either sacred or secular.⁹³ In a sense, what the material above shows is that the dynamic interplay between place and spirit Geoffrey Hartman finds in Wordsworth's poetry is active throughout the long eighteenth century.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Charles Perry, "Experiments, by Way of Analysis, upon the Water of the Dead Sea; Upon the Hot Spring Near Tiberiades; and upon the Hammam Pharoan Water; By Charles Perry, M.D., Made on His Journey through the Holy Land, &c." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 42 (1742): 462–71; Alexander Marcet, "An Analysis of the Waters of the Dead Sea and the River Jordan," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 97 (January 1, 1807): 296–314; Anonymous, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage to the Dead Sea: Death on the Pale Horse: And Other Poems* (London, 1818), 5–36.

⁹² Joanna Stalnaker. *The Unfinished Enlightenment: Description in the Age of the Encyclopedia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

⁹³ Walter Reed's sense of Romantic London as a space of multiple chronotopes, the main one of which is characterized by temporal estrangement, holds true for the eighteenth century, though Reed himself maintains that the "Enlightenment chronotope of London emphasizes a reassuring sameness." Walter L. Reed, "London Calling: The Urban Chronotope of Romanticism," *Nonsite.org* (28 December 2011) (retrieved from <http://nonsite.org/feature/london-calling-the-urban-chronotope-of-romanticism>).

⁹⁴ Geoffrey H. Hartman, *Wordsworth's Poetry 1787–1814* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987).