it may reasonably be inferred, was the height of the porch in the first temple, from which, in that case, the figure was derived. The probable outside measurements for the porch are thus 32 cubits for the breadth across “the house," 15 for the depth including the front wall, and 60 cubits or 88 ft. for the height.

Still following the Egyptian model, the hêkãl will have had its separate roof of massive cedar beams, covered probably by heavy limestone slabs, for which l½-2 cubits may be allowed, giving a total of *32* cubits (47 ft.), equal to the outside width of this part of the temple. In the same way the roof of the dëbîr will have been 10 cubits lower, or *circa 32* ft. in all, that of the lateral building about 4 cubits lower still, say 26 ft. (cf. the section through the temple from W. to E. in fig. 2). While the measurements above given are, as they must necessarily be, in part conjectural, it is claimed for them that they introduce the element of proportion between the parts to an extent not attempted hitherto.

(c) *The Interior of the Temple and its Furniture.—*The entrance to the temple was through a wide and lofty opening in the front wall of the porch. Crossing the vestibule one entered the hêkāl by a large folding-door of cypress wood (vi. 34)—probably 10 cubits wide as in Ezekiel’s temple—each of its four leaves ornamented with carved figures of cherubim, palms and flowers, all overlaid with gold. The inner walls of the hêkãl and the dëbîr were lined with boards of cedar from floor to ceiling, while the floor was covered with planks of cypress wood.@@1 From the hêkãl a door in the partition wall gave entrance to the dëbîr. The doorway was not rectangular but apparently pentagonal in form (see the commentaries on vi. 31), the lintel consisting of two blocks of stone meeting at an angle, a feature “ intro­duced to distribute the pressure of the superincumbent wall ” (W. R. Smith).@@2 The walls of the dëbîr were overlaid with “ pure gold ” according to our present text (vi. 20) ; this enhancement of the dignity of the adytum as the earthly dwelling-place of the heavenly King is not so incredible as the profuse application of gold decoration to other and inferior parts of the house, even, as we have seen, to its floor (on this question see the critical works cited above).

As regards the furniture of the house, it is probable that the original text of 1 Kings introduced only the altar of cedar now found in the corrupt text of vi. 20, and to be identified with the table of shewbread, as the sole furniture of the holy place. The ten golden candlesticks, properly lampstands, of vii. 49 are generally believed to have been introduced at a later date (cf. Jer. lii. 18 f.). In the most holy place stood the palladium of Israel’s religion, the sacred ark of Yahweh. On either side of this venerable relic of the past were two cherubim, sculptured from olive wood and overlaid with gold, each 10 cubits high, their outstretched wings reaching right across the dëbîr, and forming a haldachin over the ark (vi. 23-28).

Although forming no part of the interior furniture of the temple, the remarkable twin pillars which stood on either side of the entrance to the porch may he mentioned here, since they belonged rather to the temple than to its court. These pillars, which in the received text bear the enigmatical names of “Jachin and Boaz,”@@3 were hollow columns—the bronze metal being about 3 in. in thickness—over 26 ft. in height and 6 ft. in diameter, surmounted by elaborate capitals about 7½ ft. high. The latter were globular in form, ornamented by a specially cast network of bronze, over which were hung festoon­wise two wreaths of bronze pomegranates, each row containing a hundred pomegranates. As the pillars doubtless stood on plinths, the total height of each will have been at least 35 ft. Such free-standing pillars were a feature of temple architecture in Phoenicia and elsewhere in western Asia, as later reproduc­tions on local coins attest, and would appear to Solomon’s

Phoenician architects as a natural adjunct of his temple. Jachin and Boaz, therefore, may be regarded as conventional symbols of the Deity for whose worship the temple was de­signed.@@4

*(d) The Temple Court, Altar and other Apparatus of the Cult.—* The temple stood within the western half of “ the court of the house of the Lord,” also known as “ the inner court ” to dis­tinguish it from “ the other court ” round the adjoining palace and from “ the great court ” which surrounded the whole com­plex of Solomon’s buildings. All three had walls in which three courses of hewn stone alternated with a course of cedar beams (see next section). To the “ court of the house ” laymen as well as priests had access (Jer. xxxv. 1 fl., xxxvi. 10). Several gates gave entrance to it, but their precise position is uncertain. The principal entrance from “ the great court ” was doubtless in the east wall. Another was in the south wall and communi­cated with “ the other court ” and the royal palace. There were also one or more gates on the north side of the court.

In our present text of 1 Kings vi.-vii., there is no mention of so indispensable a part of the apparatus of the cult as the altar of burnt-offering. This silence has been explained in two ways. The majority of critics believe that the original account did contain a reference to the making of a bronze altar (cf. 2 Chron. iv. 1), but that it was excised by a later editor, who assumed that the bronze altar of the tabernacle accompanied the ark to the new sanctuary. Others, with greater probability, maintain that the silence of our oldest source is due to the fact that Solomon followed the primitive Semitic custom and used the bare *sakhra* rock as his great altar. In this case the altar, which was removed by order of Ahaz to make way for his new altar after a Damascus model (2 Kings xvi. 10-16), must have been introduced by one of Solomon’s successors.@@5

In the court, to the south of the line between the altar and the temple, stood one of the most striking of the creations of Solomon’s Phoenician artist, Huram-abi of Tyre. This was the “brazen sea,” a large circular tank of bronze with the enormous capacity of over 16,000 gallons (1 Kings vii. 23-26), resting on the backs of twelve bronze bulls, which, in groups of three, faced the four cardinal points.

It is doubtful if this strange “ sea ” served any practical purpose (see 2 Chron. iv. 6). Most recent writers agree in assigning to it a purely symbolical significance, like the twin pillars above described. Babylonian temples are now known to have had a similar apparatus, termed *apsu,* which symbolized either the primeval abyss, personi­fied as the monster Tiamat subdued by Marduk, whose symbol was the bull, or, according to a later theory, the upper or heavenly sea, bounded by the Zodiac with its twelve signs.

Associated with the “ brazen sea ” were ten lavers of bronze, also the work of Huram-abi (vii. 27-39). Each laver consisted of a circular basin holding over 300 gallons, and borne upon a wheeled carrier or "base.”@@6 The sides of the carriers were open frames composed of uprights of bronze joined together by transverse bars or rails of the same material, the whole richly ornamented with palm trees, lions, oxen and cherubim in relief. Underneath each stand were four wheels of bronze, while on the top was fitted a ring or cylinder on which the basin rested. According to Kittel, “ it is highly improbable that these lavers served any practical purpose. They were rather like the great ‘sea,’ the embodiment of a religious idea; they were symbols of the rain-giving Deity ” *(op. cit..* p. 242).

*The Relation of the Temple to Contemporary Art.—*Of the many problems raised by the description of the temple in 1 Kings none is of greater interest than the question of its relation to

@@@l The overlaying of the floor with gold (1 Kings vi. 30) is a later interpolation; the same is probably true of the gilding of the sculptures on the walls, which may have been added at a later date (cf. Ezek. xli. 18).

@@@2 This partition wall, it will be remembered, had to support the back wall of the hêkãl according to the view of the temple archi­tecture advocated above.

@@@3 The various forms which the latter name assumes, in the Greek text, suggest that Boaz is an intentional disguise of an original Baal, applied of course to Yahweh (Barnes, *Jour. of Theot. Studies,* v. 447 ff.).

@@@4 Robertson Smith’s theory that they were huge cressets in which “ the suet of the sacrifices ” was burned *(Rel. Sem.,* 2nd ed., 488) has found no support. For recent attempts to explain the symbolism of the pillars in terms of the “ early oriental *Weltan­schauung,”* see A. Jeremias, *Das atte Test.,* &c., 2nd ed., 494; Benzinger, *Heb. Archäol.,* 2nd ed., 323, 331.

@@@5 For a detailed study of the successive altars that stood upon the *sakhra* and their relation thereto, see Kittel, *Studien zur hebr. Archäologie,* ρρ. 1-85, with illustrations and diagrams.

@@@6 This section of Kings is peculiarly difficult, and has been made the subject of a special study by Stade in his *Zeitschrift* (1901), 145 ff. (cf. "Kings ” in Haupt's critical edition), and more recently by Kittel, *op. cit.,* pp. 189-242, with illustrations of similar appa­ratus found in Cyprus and Crete.