

ALTRUISM AND EGOISM: THE GARDEN AND THE CITADEL

ABRAHAM AKKERMAN

ABRAHAM AKKERMAN is Professor of Geography and the past director of the Regional and Urban Development Program at the University of Saskatchewan. His two recent articles in *Journal of Urban Design* and in *Philosophy & Geography* introduce the notion of philosophical urbanism as a historical process of interaction between the mind and the built environment.

Introduction

In his *Scienza Nuova* (1744), the Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico (1668-1744) had made two observations of early Greek sources relating to the origins of civilization. His first reflection related to ancient Greek accounts of the *sons of earth*, early humans of the western Mediterranean. The *sons of earth* “were the most ancient peoples of Italy [...]. And in the fables the Greeks quite properly called the sons of earth ‘giants,’ and the Earth ‘mother of giants.’”¹ Presaging Carl Jung’s archetype of the Earthmother, Vico’s observation was also echoing the biblical notion of the Earth as a founding quality of the shared existence of all humans: The Hebrew for “man” is “Adam” while “earth” is the feminine “Adamah.”²

The second observation Vico had made was that of the origins of the prehistoric city, and it too has a compelling biblical context. The city, he theorized, had emerged as a consequence of alliances formed between fathers of families. These alliances fostered the defences organized by the fathers who “savagely slew any who entered within their confines.”³ This, Vico pointed out, occurred in the Age of Heroes, sometime in the distant past to which Homer refers in his epic *Iliad*.⁴

Indications are that Homer’s civic reflection are of Achaeans, a historical society that populated Greece in a period between the 14th and 12th centuries BCE.⁵ In the Bible cultural conflict between the invading Hebrew tribes and the resident population of Canaan, a narrow strip of land in the eastern Mediterranean, is recounted, at around the same time, also through an urban narrative. While the nomadic Hebrew tribes were technologically unsophisticated, the

indigenous populations represented a developed urban and technological society. The Hebrew tribes saw Canaanite cities as “great and walled up to heaven” and “all these cities were fenced with high walls, gates and bars; beside unwalled towns great many [in] all the region of Argob, with all Bashan, which was called the land of giants.”⁶

In the *Iliad* Homer describes the city’s centre, as well as its origin, as the chieftain’s citadel. When a joined action is required, the chieftain summons the free males of the city to a place of public assembly. There a proposal for action or for a new law is aired, which the assembly of males may accept, reject or, upon advice of some of them, it may propose to amend it.⁷ In contrast, Homer censures the Cyclopes as uncivilized due to lack of assemblies to make laws, and no sense of community beyond the family.⁸

It is these ancient origins and literary sources that nurtured both Greek and Hebrew approach to open urban space. In classical Greece new urban centres usually adopted the blueprint of the *agora* rectangle, a public square in the *center* of town, with adjacent orthogonal layout. Such was the deliberate design scheme at Akragas and Megara Hyblaea in Sicily, Croton in southern Italy, or in the Ionian colonies on the Black Sea coast.⁹ In the historically parallel Israelite civilization, on the other hand, there is almost no evidence of adherence to *geometric* groundplans in cities.¹⁰ But similar to the Greek city, open public spaces in Israelite cities too were accorded significance. In variation from the Greek *agora*, however, the open space, intended for assemblies and gatherings, within the Israelite city appears near gates and walls, as if to connect with the surrounding agricultural land.

The myths of the Garden and the Citadel

In all major Near-Eastern mythologies cities are created by gods, and in classical Greece they are dedicated to gods.¹¹ In the Bible cities are man-made.¹² Primal sacredness in the Bible is conferred upon the Garden. The Garden in *Genesis* epitomizes innocence, a primordial interaction with the environment, and guileless human relations. First and foremost among these is sharing in the environment as the only mode of human existence. And yet, the dread of human existence emerges

precisely as an outcome of selflessness. For the outcome of the Garden's innocent altruism is the sharing in the Garden's Forbidden Fruit. The need for shelter in the Bible arises only following the expulsion from the Garden, and it emerges at once with the discovery of reason as well as alienation.

Extending Vico's interpretation of the ancient sources, and Jung's archetypal theory of the collective unconscious, the primordial emergence of two myths, both stemming from the Earthmother archetype, can be conjectured. Both myths inform the urban cultures of classical Greece and ancient Israel. The feminine archetype of the Earthmother culminates in the ultimate myth of the Garden, possibly at the turn of the late Stone Age, c. 50,000 BCE. Symbolizing human fertility, the female gatherers of fruits and vegetables thus become the Garden's emissaries. The emergence of the other myth occurs more recently, evolving from the Earthmother and becoming a primal, masculine, paradigm on its own: It is the paradigm of the Citadel. Hunters, fathers of families, forming pacts to face off external attack as well as to suppress internal mutiny, become the first overlords, the builders of citadels and forts. The masculine paradigm of the Citadel unfolds in early civilization into the myth of the City. Following the first prehistoric settlements, sometime after 20,000 BCE, the Ideal City becomes thus the masculine consort of the seraphic Garden. The myth of the Garden is primeval while that of the Ideal City is at the founding of early civilization. Both myths continue to define our culture, both entailing a collective unconscious as an outgrowth of the Earthmother archetype. Figuratively, the Citadel represents solitude, exclusion, solidity and power, whereas the Garden represents multitude, compassion, fluidity and cultivation.¹³

The myth of the Citadel emerges along with the invention of counting, separation and individuation. Measurement and allocation of space date back at least as far as ancient Egypt. And since time immemorial a measurement has also implied or confirmed hierarchy: First a hierarchy of objects, later hierarchy of individual persons or deities. But through measurement of their relative wealth humans, too, become objects in the eyes of one another. Egoism, as a tenet of human relations, emerges as an attendant attribute of the ability to separate and count. The citadel of antiquity and the Middle Ages rises as a the means to protect power and wealth.

Imprint of the two paradigms, so fathomed, is implicit in early Greek thought. In Pre-Socratic philosophy the Paradigm of the Citadel can be seen as represented by

Parmenides of Elea (6th century BCE), while that of the Garden is represented by Heraclitus of Ephesus (5th century BCE). The fundamental statements of the two philosophers show this ostensibly: Whereas Parmenides' pronouncement is that *that which is, is One*, an unchanging singularity, Heraclitus' most famous assertion is: "You cannot step into the same river twice, for other and yet other waters are ever flowing on."¹⁴ Later, the myth of the Citadel can be detected in Plato's austere notion of the Ideal City-State, and in Stoic philosophy, in the notion of Cosmopolis by Dio Chrysostom.¹⁵ The paradigm of the Garden, on the other hand, is represented by Aristotle and Epicurus both avid admirers and observers of nature and wilderness.¹⁶

The open space of Israelite settlements

Yet if open urban space can be seen as a mutation of the Garden, then Plato too admits the Garden into the Citadel. In his *Laws* Plato advises that temples should be located around the *agora* to act as a protective ring, and further on he urges against city walls.¹⁷ Instead of walls he proposes *dwelling*s to be lined in a casemate pattern, *as a wall*.¹⁸ This Platonic defense pattern, adhering to open space or inadvertently creating it, appears to have been a common practice, at least six centuries before Plato, among the Israelite tribes settling in Canaan.

The conquest by Israelite tribes of the Land of Canaan, later the Land of Israel and the Holy Land, occurred in the Late Bronze Age, around the 13th-12th centuries BCE. Over a period that covers much of the Iron Age, c. 1200-586 BCE, the tribes gradually unified under different monarchies. The transition of the tribes into a monarchy occurred first under King Saul close to 1000 BCE. With David's conquest of Jerusalem, at the time a Jebusite enclave within the territory of the Hebrew tribes, a united monarchy of Israel was established under David (ruled c. 1000-960 BCE). It was during the reign of his son, King Solomon (r. 960-925 BCE), that Jerusalem and ancient Israel reached the pinnacle of their glory. With the death of Solomon, however, the united monarchy split into the Kingdom of Israel in the northern part of the Holy Land, with Samaria its capital, and the Kingdom of Judea, with Jerusalem its capital.

With the gradual emergence of walled Israelite cities under Saul (r. 1025-1010 BCE) open spaces appear to have been often deliberately designed in the vicinity of gates or towers, near city walls. The building, reinforcement and maintenance of walls in Jerusalem by David was at the later period reflective of the urbanization within the united Israelite monarchy. Under Saul, and particularly during later Solomon's reign, many

Israelite cities built walls, in response to threats from the Sea People on the Mediterranean coast in the west, and from Assyria and Babylon in the east. And yet, in spite of such intense construction activity, open spaces within as well as outside of the Israelite city remained a significant consideration. As if the paradigm of the Garden had overcome that of the Citadel, the predilection with open space in ancient Israel could be seen as an aspect of the prevalent rejection of the monumental built form.

Sedentarization of the Israelite tribes was not a uniform process, and it did not yield uniform architectural styles in settlement.¹⁹ Nevertheless, this process brought with it gradually an enclosed open space as a unique style of defendable settlement. A common design element in all early Israelite habitation is a continuous elliptical perimeter of rooms or dwellings, and the open space within this elliptical band. A defense pattern along these outlines has been uncovered in settlements dating back to the 12th century BCE, such as in Ebenezer, the place where Israelites encamped before their battle with the Philistines in the year 1050 BCE.²⁰ Other early Israelite settlements from the 11th century BCE, such as Tel Esdar and Tel Masos in southern Israel, also show defenses without walls.²¹ The basic idea underlying the settlement layout there appears to have been the same as the one suggested by Plato centuries later: the enclosure of a central open space by means of a belt of houses along the outer edge of the site. Houses were close to one another for protection, although at these two sites there is no evidence that they formed a continuous line of defense on the outer side. The long sides of the houses were on the perimeter line and the entrances faced the courtyard.²² The pattern of casemate walls, in fact, seems to have been preserved for several centuries. According to the archaeologist Kathleen Kenyon, excavations at Samaria from the time of King Ahab (ruled 875-854 BCE) indicate that a casemate wall was actually rebuilt in the royal quarter of the city.²³ This supports the notion that provision for open space in Israelite cities, had gone beyond economic need.

Perhaps the best illustration of this proposition is in one special case: fortifications uncovered at Shiloh. As a religious center and the seat of leadership of the Israelite tribes during the first half of the 11th century BCE, Shiloh was the site where supplicants came bringing offerings, and where during annual religious festivities, young girls danced in its vineyards.²⁴ The Shiloh fortification walls, found to be from Middle Bronze Age, were at a height estimated at 2.5 meters above floor level. The religious dominance of the

site and, at the same time, the fact that much of it was a protected open space, seem to show that the significance attached to open space by the Israelite tribes had, in fact, a *ritual* meaning.

Such attitude appears to have been preserved over at least a millenium. In the fifth century BCE Ezra the Scribe, a major political and religious figure who led in 458 BCE a group of Israelite exiles from Persia back to the Holy Land, used to read from the Scripture in an open space near Jerusalem's Water Gate.²⁵

Open space as urban feature of ancient Israel

The physical configuration with buildings, has always been an important facet of open urban space. The relatively high population density upon a very small urban area would seem to have called for a rational spatial organization of functional physical components that would limit extensive use of open space, particularly in walled cities such as biblical Jerusalem. But, as if to stress the overriding significance of open space, perhaps the best illustration to the contrary is the site of Solomon's Temple. According to the Scripture, the Temple was at the site of a threshing floor on the northern outskirts of Davidic Jerusalem, at which a pestilence threatening the city was halted.²⁶ A major component within Solomon's Temple complex was the Great Courtyard somewhere near the main structure, the royal palace and the palace of his Egyptian wife.²⁷ In Kenyon's calculation the Temple was situated at least 232 meters north of the southern part of a colossal, artificial platform. Considering the distances within David's Jerusalem only several decades earlier, these were very significant dimensions. This and the placement near the city's walls (outside the perimeter of the City of David) mark a distinction in the urban configuration of the Temple, quite contrary to most other major sanctuaries of the Near East.

Most Near Eastern civilizations emphasize spatial hierarchy reflected in their built structures, culminating in religious monuments and temples. The design aspect relating to walls and towers in Israelite cities undoubtedly shows the influence of the surrounding monumental cultures, whereby a city was the walled, often the most densely inhabited portion of an urban settlement. But in contrast, the urban design of Israelite cities attached also a significant value to open space. Instead of a spatial hierarchy of structures the agricultural civilization of Israel had developed a temporal hierarchy, reflected in the sanctification of days within the week, the month and the year. The Hebrew rituals relating to the Sabbath, New Moon, and no less than three different notions of a year's beginning, illustrate this. Open space, rather than a

three-dimensional, solid structure, was the urban design link with this temporal-agricultural tradition. Consistent with the evolution of its religious tradition, open urban space appears to have received a significantly more respectful consideration within ancient Israel and its nascent civic culture, than within the surrounding civilizations.

Although urban use of open space during the Iron Age might not have been unique to Israelite cities, the emphasis on the built-form in other Near Eastern civilizations had come on the account of lack of recognition for open space. Even in early Greek cities where Cretan colonial settlement was evident, no clearly defined public squares existed. The Greek *agora*, that had developed some two hundred years later, did not stem originally from aesthetic attitudes to design, but from political and commercial needs.²⁸ There is no indication that builders of early cities throughout the Near East took a more sublime attitude to open urban spaces.

In Aristotle's classificatory observation of the arts, in fact, neither architecture nor landscape design, are accounted for. It is noteworthy, however, that in his *Poetics* (Chapter 4) Aristotle divides the imitative arts into those emulating visual appearances by means of colour or drawing, and those encompassing poetry and imitation of human action through verse, song and dance, and drama. Considering Aristotle's elaborate discussion of urban planning in his *Politics* Aristotle possibly regards architecture, and even more so urban design, as primarily civic, rather than artistic, facilities. Deliberately designed open urban space, then, is conceived through its civic function, as a shared place of the public.

If so, the dance at Shilo should be seen as an early synthesis of art, dance in this particular instance, and shared space. The fact that this event was of a ritual, *i.e.* sacred, nature allows one to think that the notion of public in-gathering such as that at Shilo, expressed by the open space and by the dance, had been granted a significant, perhaps divine, stature. Within the Jewish tradition such attitude is by no means exceptional. A ceremony, called the Blessing of the New Moon, developed by the *Tannaim*, the Hebrew sages who compiled the Mishnah in the 2nd century C.E., is set to be held in a quorum of ten men. Recited at night under an open sky, the Blessing, too, makes an explicit reference to a *dance*: In ancient times the public announcement of the appearance of the new moon was accompanied by a dance in an open space.²⁹

The Garden and the Citadel in the design history of the West

The Garden, transformed within the confines of the small Israelite city into an open, public place, signifies a particular aspect of the archetypal supposition reflected in the urban form of Western civilization. Jung's notion of archetypes, the Earthmother in particular, is useful here, in that it does not impose a formalized framework of mutually exclusive paradigms.³⁰ Rather, the archetypes are interwoven within each other, without any particular logical structure.

The two myths permeate not only the thought of the Occident but also its architecture throughout history. The two myths become a significant consideration in Roman theater, where the Ideal City is represented by the tragic scene while the Garden is embodied by the satyric (or pastoral) scene.³¹ Over a thousand years later these theatrical settings become the inspirational leitmotif of the architectural streetscapes of Sebastiano Serlio.³² Up until the Renaissance both Western art as well as Western scholarship had sporadically related to open space as a human or public domain of aesthetic value. Yet in Aristotelian philosophy place is considered and analyzed mostly in terms of physical properties. But Aristotle too dedicates considerable portions of his *Politics* to the design of the *agora* as well as other open spaces within an explicit concern for the public good.³³ It might not be a far fetched attempt, therefore, to follow Aristotle's classification of imitative arts in his *Poetics* in suggesting that the Garden appears to be represented by arts emphasizing temporal flows – music, dance, poetry – whereas the fine arts emulate the Citadel, highlighting visual image – architecture, sculpture, painting.

How well does the notion of designed, open urban space fit within these two paradigms? A generation after Aristotle, about 311 BCE, the philosopher Epicurus (342-270 BCE) came to Mytilene, a place on the island of Lesbos where Aristotle during the period 345-342 BCE had conducted his life-sciences investigations. Emerging from Mytilene, Epicurus in his teachings contended that immediate experience is incontestable, since its source is sensation. Citing sensory experience as the ultimate evidence, the philosopher established c. 306 BCE at Athens an Epicurean community called the Garden.³⁴

With the decline of classical Greece and the emergence of the Roman Empire, the transmutation of the Garden into an open and publicly shared urban space continued in the *forum*, a municipal center of the Roman city, which served identical function as the Greek *agora*. Similar to the *agora*, the *forum* too was generally of rectangular

shape but its delineation was much more methodical, lined by *stoa*e and other civic edifices as well as temples. The Roman architect and engineer Vitruvius refers to the *forum* as an item of both public benefit and communal convenience, as well as beauty.³⁵ To Vitruvius, beauty is largely circumscribed by symmetry and proportion.³⁶ In this regard Roman aesthetics reflects primarily on the perfection of the human body as contemplated by Marcus Tullius Cicero.³⁷ According to Cicero, beauty depends, in his own phrase, on the configuration and congruence of parts, *Convenientia partium*.³⁸ Furthermore, Cicero held that the universe, the human body and the graceful building are all unified in a principle leading to order and to beauty itself.³⁹

At the turn of the Middle Ages Aurelius Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo better known as St. Augustine (354 - 430), continued this line of thought by viewing the city as a part of cosmic order.⁴⁰ The aesthetic concern with proportions led St. Augustine, in *The City of God*, to revive formal Vitruvian ratios that mirror the dimensions of man's body,⁴¹ by evaluating Noah's ark as an architectonic object: "[...] therefore the ark was made 300 cubits in length, 50 in breadth, and 30 in height."⁴² And just like Noah's ark, the civic square too was amenable to proportions in three-dimensional configuration: "If it be oblong, let the length and breadth be added together and let half of the total amount be given to the height under the ceiling"⁴³

The Augustinian design notion in *The City of God* appears to imply the paradigm of the Citadel, as such dominating the civic culture of much of the Middle Ages. The architect and thinker Leone Battista Alberti, marking the onset of the Renaissance, revives the notion that comely proportions are divine, and ensue from the composition of man's body. In his *De re aedificatoria* (IV, 3) Alberti suggests specifically that Greek columns were made in the image of man's body, and as such, adorned, and should continue so, the arcades of the civic square.⁴⁴ In 1447 Alberti became the architectural advisor to pope Nicholas V who commissioned him to prepare a new plan for Rome. Work according to Alberti's plan commenced in the course of Nicholas' pontificate, 1447-1455, during which time also the first *piazza* was created, at the *Ponte Sant' Angelo*, and a large open space was carved at the foot of the Vatican Hill, intended as a terminal point of several avenues.⁴⁵

Through the notion of the perspective and the vanishing point, Alberti wielded influence on many of his contemporaries. Among the theoreticians, Antonio Averlino Filarete (c. 1400-1469) appears to have been the most significant of

Alberti's urbanist adherents. In his *Trattato d'architettura* the Citadel comes to be epitomized in an imagined townscape with a Tower of Wisdom and Vice placed at the center of the Ideal City's perimeter.⁴⁶ Continuing Alberti's planning work, the monumental re-design of Rome by pope Sixtus V (pontificate, 1585-90) and Domenico Fontana (1543-1607), saw the placement of mammoth obelisks at streets' nodes of the redesigned Rome.⁴⁷

From the aesthetics of the Garden to the ethics of altruism

Intertwined with the Citadel, gardens of early modernity had attained *measured*, geometrical landscape forms such as the Villa d'Este and Villa Giulia both near Rome.⁴⁸ Transplanted into the open space within the Renaissance city, the Garden had come to signify in Italy the geometric vastness and the newly rediscovered perspective, while in France it had been represented by the quiet court, the formal garden and the open public place.⁴⁹

Measurement becomes acute with multitude and scarcity of space in a crowded, walled city. But in a stark contrast to the hierarchical medieval townscape of the West-European Gothic, and the masculine urban design of the Italian Renaissance and early Baroque, the thought of St. Thomas More (1478-1535) synthesizes architectural images of the Garden with the ethos of equality and communality. In Book II of his *Utopia*, named after a fabled island by the same name, a bond with the Epicurean tradition of classical Greece emerges in the description of Amaurot, the capital city. The citizen's homes, all with gardens and vineyards in their rear, are periodically exchanged by lot amongst the inhabitants. There is, in fact, no private property and the homes and their gardens are continually open to all.⁵⁰

The urban space of the Renaissance *new towns* had become the utmost achievement of geometric measurement, as well as a noble reaction to the overcrowded and tortuous street network of the medieval city. It was within the geometrically paced urban milieu of the Renaissance that the science of mechanics had emerged along with early modern philosophical doctrines. The mythical pairing of the Garden and the Citadel unfolds, from Plato and Aristotle through Scholasticism of the Middle Ages and early modern philosophy, into the metaphysics of dualism between the spirit and the body. This cerebral process culminates in the thought of René Descartes, his separation between the mind and the body, and between certainty and doubt, becoming the hallmark of early modern philosophy.

The other manifestation of this outcome is the ethical and political philosophy of Thomas Hobbes (1588-1676). Where the aggregate desires and actions of separate and self-interested individuals identify a community, optimal utility of the communal benefit is determined by the sum-total of individual, sometimes opposing, desires. The methodical advantage of individual egoism is, according to Hobbes, in the ability to derive optimal choice of public welfare through measurement: "The skill of making and maintaining Commonwealths, consisteth in certain Rules, as doth Arithmetique and Geometry."⁵¹

It is on this background of Hobbes' individualism, and his reflection upon egoism, that Auguste Comte (1798-1857) introduced the notion of *altruism*. But the 19th century altruism of Comte is conceived also on the background of urban depravity – manifested by urban space of the industrial revolution. Within the domain of sentient social ethics that has evolved since early modernity, the two myths, that of the Garden and that of the Citadel, attain thus a representation in the tension between altruism and egoism. By Comte's time, open urban space, shared equally by all, emerges as the self-contradictory, noble idea of planned wilderness.

The backdrop to Comte's altruism could be seen, in fact, in the urban-design impact of the philosophical and literary work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in his plea for the natural man. This occurred first outside cities, notably in the open garden of Stourhead, England (1741-1781), designed by Sir Henry Hoare. Similarly, Rousseau's *Discourses* resulted in the landscaped wilderness of Ermonville (1754-1778), outside Paris.⁵²

Urban parks, as open and publicly shared grounds within cities, are introduced first in England by Joseph Paxton who, in designing Birkenhead Park (opened in 1844) introduced thus the world's first municipal park. North America followed in municipal park design led by Frederick Law Olmstead (1822-1903) and Calvert Vaux (1824-1895). In the late 19th century the Garden City concept of Ebenezer Howard (1850 - 1928) was not only a remarkably elaborate attempt to make clean air and green space available to the working class, but inadvertently it also marked the dawn of the garden suburb.

And yet, less than a hundred years later, the suburban front yard and the public park had become anything but a manifestation of the Garden. In the novel *Nausea* by the existential philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre, the municipal garden is but an epitome of measured, meachanistic urban culture: "[...] In a vacuum all

bodies fall at the same rate of speed, the public park is closed at 4 p.m. in winter, at 6 p.m. in summer, led melts at 335 degrees centigrade [...]" while the city's groomed green space is mockingly described as "[...] bastard trees held up with crutches."⁵³

Moments versus monuments: Open space or office space?

The twentieth century garden of the suburban front yard has distorted the myth of the Garden. From Ezra the Scribe to Epicurus, to St. Thomas More, to Ebenezer Howard, the Garden had been accorded mainly to the *public* domain: a shared space of the citizenry, the commons of a community. The twentieth century garden, however, is primarily a suburban expression of *private* prosperity. The city park and the public square of the contemporary city hardly fit within the archaic paragon of the Garden. For the most part they remain within the domain of mainstream community only during short breaks of daytime, before the middle-class flees, at the end of day's work, back to the suburbs.

Has the paradigm of the Citadel come to dominate our cities? Has it come to distort the very symbols of the Garden, too? Often adjacent to the downtown office towers, the city's open space is a shared place only for fleeting moments of the workweek. Complete with concrete slabs, it is a controlled space, not unlike the adjacent towers. The garden of the suburban front-yard only sharpens the remoteness of the open space downtown, reinforcing the alienation of the member of the public, the stranger. And, on the other hand, no urban square or a downtown park can hide, and much less revert, the flight of the middle-class away from the city's ostensibly open public spaces.

The advent of the elevator and the skyscraper in the late nineteenth century had facilitated a serialized production of the office tower. The projection of military and religious prowess by the medieval tower, was thus transformed into protuberance of corporate power delineating the skyline, as well as the property values, of the North-American downtown. Whereas a society championing its built structures only, might consider open space as tantamount to a little more than void between buildings, a time-bound, pastoral attitude might espouse a fundamentally different approach. Much as a time-interval between events that is filled with anticipation and a climax, so too open urban space - as well as its built-up environs - can be filled with expectation, surprise, and culmination.⁵⁴ Yet the scarcity of downtown real estate had, in fact, denigrated the public open space into a secondary consideration, while buttressing the archetypal myth of the Citadel.

And then came September 11. In ninety horrifying minutes the Citadel turned from the epitome of commanding dominance into an emblem of mortal liability. But, in fact, through mass transit, communications and urban sprawl, the twentieth century may well have signaled not only the rise but also the decline of the Citadel decades earlier. And not only vulnerability in the face of madmen, to paraphrase from John Forester's work,⁵⁵ but also obsolescence in the age of the Internet, have twirled the tower into a token.

The architectural challenge for the twenty-first century does not abide in reconstituting the Citadel but in reviving the Garden. The task is to re-create the city square, to bring it back as a genuine *open* space, an authentic *shared* place. The charge of architects and designers is to help bring the myth of the Garden *into* the corporeality of the Citadel. If we succeed in bringing back an authentically public, shared space within the city, we will have endowed the city with an old-new urban artifact, a bequest for generations to come.□

NOTES

- 1 Giambattista Vico, *Scienza Nuova*, II, 370. From Thomas G. Bergin and Max H. Fisch, *The New Science of Giambattista Vico*, revised translation of the third edition of *Scienza Nuova*, 1744 (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1968).
- 2 Genesis 5:2 and 47: 23; "Man" is referred to also as "Ben-Adam," i.e., the "Son of Adam" (e.g., Ezekiel 2:8).
- 3 Vico, *Scienza Nuova* IV, 982.
- 4 The *Iliad*, together with the *Odyssey*, both written probably in the eighth century BCE, are only ascribed to Homer, with no evidence of authentic authorship.
- 5 Will Durant, *The Life of Greece* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1966), 44-45.
- 6 Deuteronomy 3: 28; 3: 5-13.
- 7 Homer, *Iliad* 12: 346-395; 19: 81-317; Durant, 1966: 53.
- 8 Homer, *Odyssey* 9: 105-15.
- 9 G.P.R. Métraux, *Western Greek Land-Use and City Planning in the Archaic Period* (New York: Garland Press, 1978), 153-5.
- 10 With perhaps only two exceptions, Tel el-Far'ah and Timnah, no Israelite cities were set on an orthogonal plan. See Amihai Mazar, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 464.
- 11 See, e.g., the account in *Diodorus Siculus* IV, 12:10, relating to the founding of the Greek colonial city of Thurii. C.H. Oldfather, *Diodorus of Sicily* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1989).
- 12 P. Lampl, *Cities and Planning in the Ancient Near East* (New York: George Braziller, 1968), 7-12.
- 13 Abraham Akkerman, *Place and Thought: The Built Environment in early European Philosophy* (London: Woodridge, 1998), 6-12.
- 14 David Gallop, *Parmenides of Elea* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 7-28; Philip Wheelwright, *Heraclitus* [Fr. 21] (Princeton: Princeton University, 1959), 29.
- 15 Plato's *Laws* V, 746, written c. 360 BCE; Dio Chrisostom (rhetorician, lived during the years 40-115) in his 36th *logos*, paragraph 21, translated in Malcolm Schofield, *The Stoic Idea of the City* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 62.
- 16 E.g., Aristotle's *Biology* written c. 350 BCE; citing sensory experience as the ultimate evidence, Epicurus established his famous Garden in Athens c. 306 BCE, including among its attendants also women and slaves. George K. Strodach, *The Philosophy of Epicurus* (Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, 1963), 79.
- 17 Plato, *Laws* 778 a-d.
- 18 Plato, *Laws* 778 e – 779 b.
- 19 Israel Finkelstein, *The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1988), 238.
- 20 I Samuel 5: 1; 4: 1.
- 21 Tel Masos is possibly the biblical Horma referred to at *Joshua* 25: 30 and *Numbers* 14: 39-45; 21: 3.
- 22 Finkelstein (1988), 38.
- 23 Kathleen Kenyon, *Royal Cities of the Old Testament* (London: Barrie Jenkins, 1971), 124.
- 24 I Samuel 3: 24; *Judges* 21:19-21.
- 25 *Nehemiah* 8: 1-16.
- 26 II Samuel 24:16.
- 27 The Temple's dimensions are described in I Kings 7, 9: 12; on the architecture and archaeology of the site see W. Harold Mare, *The Archaeology of the Jerusalem Area* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1987), 73.
- 28 Paul Zucker, *Town and Square: From the Agora to the Village Green* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1966), 26.

- 29 According to the *Mishnah* (*Rosh Hashanah* 2: 5-7) judges in Jerusalem would consecrate the new month upon verified observation of a new moon by witnesses. The consecration was marked in a public courtyard by the blowing of ram's horn, and a dance. Later, a prayer, *Blessing of the New Moon*, of talmudic origin included a short address to the moon, recalling the dance: "Even as I dance before you and cannot touch you, so shall all my foes be unable to touch me for evil." See Abraham E. Milgram, *Jewish Worship* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1971), pp. 263-267.
- 30 Carl Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, translated from the German by R.F.O. Hull (New York: Pantheon, 1959), 3-53.
- 31 Vitruvius V, 6: 9. Frank Granger, *Vitruvius: On Architecture (De Architectura)*, edited from the Harleian manuscript 2767 and translated into English by Frank Granger in two volumes, (London, William Heinemann, and New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1931).
- 32 Serlio's *L'Architettura*, Book II, 68r-69v; 69v-70v. *The Five Books of Architecture: An Unabridged Reprint of the English Edition of 1611*, (New York: Dover Publications, 1982).
- 33 Carnes Lord, *Aristotle: The Politics* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1984), p. 267 (note 44).
- 34 Strodach, 1963: 79.
- 35 Vitruvius V, 1-2.
- 36 Vitruvius I, 2
- 37 Cicero, *De oratore* III, 45: 179. H. Rackham, *Cicero: Concerning the Orator* (London: Heinemann). A Stoic philosopher, Cicero (106-43 BCE) adopted the early idea of *Cosmopolis* introduced possibly for the very first time as early as 4th century BCE by the Cynic Diogenes of Sinope.
- 38 Cicero, *De Officiis* I, 14. M.T Griffin and E.M. Atkins (eds.), *On Duties* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- 39 Cicero, *De oratore* III, 45: 178-179.
- 40 Ernest Barker, "Introduction," in V.G. Tasker (ed.), *The City of God*, translation of Saint Augustine's *De civitate Dei* (London: J.M.Dent & Sons, 1962), p. xii.
- 41 Vitruvius I, 2.
- 42 *De civitate Dei* XV, 26.
- 43 Vitruvius V, 2.
- 44 Alberti, *De re aedificatoria* VIII, 6; IX, 7. Joseph Rykwert, Neil Leach and Robert Tavernor, *On the Art of Building in ten Books*, translation of Alberti's 1486 edition (Cambridge, Mass. and London, MIT Press, 1988).
- 45 Ludwig Pastor, *The History of the Popes*, Vol. II (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner & Co., 1899), pp. 171-176.
- 46 Filarete, *Trattato d'architettura* VI, 42v – 43v. John R. Spencer *Filarete's Treatise on Architecture*, Vol. I: *The Translation* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1965).
- 47 Charles Burroughs, "Streets in the Rome of Sixtus V," in: Celik Zeynep, Diane Favro and Richard Ingersoll (eds.), *Streets: Critical Perspectives on Public Space* (Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1994), 189-202.
- 48 Villa d'Este, 1565-1572, by Pirro Ligorio; Villa Giulia, 1551-1555, by Giorgio Vasari.
- 49 Perspective was used for the first time during the Renaissance by Giotto di Bondone, a Florentine painter, sculptor and architect, c. 1276-1337, in his painting *Entrance in Jerusalem*; on French urban design of courts and public places see Michael Dennis, *Court and Garden: From the French Hôtel to the City of Modern Architecture* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT Press, 1988), 29.
- 50 George M. Logan and Robert M. Adams, *Thomas More: Utopia* II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 43-47.
- 51 Hobbes, *Leviathan* II, 20. A.D. Lindsay, *Thomas Hobbes: Leviathan*, (London: Dent, 1914).
- 52 Leland M. Roth, *Understanding Architecture: Its Elements, History and Meaning* (London: Herbert Press, 1993), 410-412.
- 53 Jean-Paul Sartre, *Nausea*, translated from the French by Lloyd Alexander (New York: New Dimensions, 1964), 158.
- 54 Abraham Akkerman, "Harmonies of Urban Design and Discords of City-Form: Urban Aesthetics in the Rise of Western Civilization," *Journal of Urban Design* 5(3) (London: Carfax, 2000), 267-290.
- 55 John Forester, *Planning in the Face of Power* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

EGOISM AND ALTRUISM A. W. Price I : INTRODUCTORY The old problem of egoism versus altruism often arises in this form: "Of course I have reason to pursue my own interests" but why should I respect the interests of others?" We then seem to face a tension that everyone must wish everyone else to overlook. In discussions of egoism and altruism, a distinction is customarily made between (descriptive) psychological egoism and (normative) ethical egoism. The "egoism and altruism in The Oxford Companion to Philosophy (2 ed.) View overview page for this topic. Related Content. In this work. Blackburn, Simon (1944). Butler, Joseph (1692-1752). Duty. Ethical egoism is the normative ethical position that moral agents ought to act in their own self-interest. It differs from psychological egoism, which claims that people can only act in their self-interest. Ethical egoism also differs from rational egoism, which holds that it is rational to act in one's self-interest. Ethical egoism holds, therefore, that actions whose consequences will benefit the doer can be considered ethical in this sense.