(H10) a flight of fifteen semicircular steps led up from the court of the women.

On a level with the entrance and running round three sides of the inner court (so Josephus) was a narrow strip (B), about 18 ft. broad, called the “ court of the men of Israel.” The rest of the oblong area, however, was reserved for the priests and such of the laity as might require admission for the offering of their sacrifices. As in the lower court, the spaces between the gates were occupied by chambers, as to the purpose of which details are given in the Mishnah.

With regard to the more precise location of these temple courts, the present writer in the series of essays above referred to (see esp. *Exp. Times,* xx. 181 ff.),@@1 has endeavoured to prove that the *whole fortress-sanctuary within the great walls stood on what is now the inner platform of the Haram,* the present extended area of which is indicated by the double dotted line on the plan.

According to the Mishnah *(Middoth,* ii. 5, 6) the upper and lower courts together formed a rectangle measuring 322 cubits from west to east by 135 cubits from north to south, the upper court 187 by 135, the lower 135 by 135. But, on the one hand, no account is taken of the gate-towers and priests’ chambers which lined the courts, and on the other, the frequent recurrence of the number 11 and its multiples in the details which make up the above totals awakens suspicion as to their accuracy. The measurements of the accompanying plan are based ,on a critical comparison of the data of the Mishnah and those of Josephus with the relation of the whole to the altar on the *sakhra* (see next section). The total area covered by the sanctuary, including the terrace or *khēl,* is entered as 315 cubits (462 ft.) across the rock from west to east, and 250 cubits (367 ft.) from north to south (for the detailed measurements see *Exp. Times, xx.* 181 ff., 271 ff.). The upper court shows an area of 170 cubits by 160, the lower court has a free space between the colonnades of 135 cubits (the Mishnah figure) by an average width of no cubits.

(c) *The Altar of Burnt-offering.—*Herod’s great altar (D on the plan) was formed of unhewn stones, like that which preceded it. Its size, however, was increased till it formed a square, each side of which measured 32 cubits or 47 ft. at the base, thus occupying almost the whole of the exposed surface of the *sakhra.* The sides of the square decreased upwards by three stages until the altar-hearth was only 24 cubits square. The priests went up by an inclined approach on the south side (cf. Exod. xx. 26). To the north was the place where the sacrificial victims were slaughtered and prepared for the altar (cf. Levit. i. it). It was provided with rings, pillars, hooks and tables. A laver (O on the plan) for the priests’ ablutions stood on the west of the altar ramp.

(d) *The Temple Building.—*A few yards to the west of the altar rose the temple itself, a glittering mass of white marble

and gold. Twelve steps, corresponding to the height (12 half­cubits) of the platform, led up to the entrance to the porch. In the disposition of its parts Herod’s temple was in all essential

respects a replica of its two predecessors. But there were differences in details. Thus the porch was increased in width and height until its front elevation measured, according to our authorities, Josephus and the Mishnah, 100 cubits by 100. This, however, probably includes the platform, as the principles of proportion in relation to the other dimensions suggest 96 cubits by 96 (over 140 ft.) as the actual measurements. In shape the porch may be supposed to have retained its original likeness to an Egyptian pylon, as suggested in the accompanying diagram (fig. 4).

The holy place (F). retained its former area (40×20 cubits), but was raised in height to 40 cubits. A magnificent double curtain, embroidered in colours, screened off the most holy place, which remained a perfect cube of 20 cubits each way. By intro­ducing a passage-way giving access to the side-chambers and requiring an extra outer wall, Herod increased the width of the temple building to at least 60 cubits (70 according to the Mishnah).

The problem of the height of the naos remains almost as per­plexing as before. Josephus, it is true, agrees with the Mishnah *(Middoth,* iv. 6) in giving it a height of too cubits. It may be that Herod, “ if he was forbidden to extend the House, would at least make it soarl” (G. A. Smith). But the details given by the Jewish doctors do not inspire confidence, for, as Fergusson long ago perceived, “ one storey is merely an ill-understood duplication of the other." A more modest height of 60 cubits (88 ft.), equal to the extreme width, gives at least an element of proportion to the edifice which is altogether wanting in the traditional figures (compare the accompanying cross section, fig. 4).

The open entrance to the porch now measured 40 cubits by 20, equal to the section of the holy place. The “ great door of the house,” 20 cubits high and 10 wide, was covered with gold; in front was suspended a richly embroidered Babylonian veil, while above the lintel was fixed a huge golden vine.

(e) *The Temple Furniture.—*This remained as before. In the. holy place in front of the holy of holies, still a dark and empty shrine, stood the altar of incense, against the south wall the seven-branched golden lampstand,. and opposite to it the table of shewbread. The two latter, as every one knows, were carried to Rome by Titus, and representations of them may still be seen among the sculptures adorning the arch which bears his name.

When one considers the extraordinary height and strength of the outer walls of the temple area, parts of which excite the wonder of every visitor to the holy city, the wealth of art lavished upon the wide-extended cloisters, the imposing character of the temple façade, and the impression produced by the marble-paved terraces and courts rising in succession, each above and within the other, one is not surprised that the temple of Herod was reckoned among the architectural wonders of the ancient world. There is for once no exaggeration in the words of Josephus when he records that from a distance the whole resembled a snow-covered mountain, and that the light reflected from the gilded porch dazzled the spectator like “ the sun’s own rays ” *(Bell. Jud.* V. v. 6).

Literature.—In addition to the primary sources, the Bible, Josephus, and the Mishnah treatise *Middoth* (ed. Surenhusius with commentaries), the commentaries and notes on Kings by Benzinger, Kittel, Stade, Burney and Skinner, the articles on the temples in the recent Bible Dictionaries and the “ Archaeologies ” of Benzinger and Nowack, the following should be consulted: De Vogüé, *Le Temple de Jerusalem* (1864); Jas. Fergusson, *The Temples of the Jews* (1878); Perrot et Chipiez, *Le Temple de Jerusalem* (1889); C. Schick, *Die Stiflshütte, der Tempel,* &c. (1806); W. Shaw Calde­cott, *Solomon's Temple* (1906), and *The Second Temple,* &c. (1908); R. Kittel, "*Tempel ”* and *“ Tempelgeräte ”* in Herzog-Hauck, *Reatencyklopädie,* 3rd ed. (1907), vol. xix. ; G. A. Smith, *Jeru­salem,* 2 vols. (1908, see index to each vol.); also W. R. Smith’s art. “ Temple ” in *Ency. Brit.,* 9th ed. For Herod’s temple more especially see Maimonides’ treatise *Beth Ha-bekhtra* (the chosen house), trans. in *Quart. Statement* of Pal. Explor. Fund (1885); and the recent studies by Watson, *ibid.* (1896 and 1910); Water­house in Sanday’s *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (1903); A. R. S. Kennedy, “ Some Problems of Herod’s Temple,” *Expository Times,* vol. xx. (1908-1909); G. Dalman, “ Der zweite Tempel zu Jerusalem,” in the *Palästinajahrbuch* (1909); P. Berto, “Le Temple de Jéru­salem,” *Rev. des études juives,* lix.-lx. (Jan.-July 1010), and the articles in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia.* For the study of the site the works of the English surveyors (see Jerusalem), including Sir C. Wilson’s large-scale map of the Haram, are indispensable.

(A. R. S. K.)

@@@1 A summary of the results is given in the article “ Temple ” in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible* (1909).