according to Josephus’s account of the whole circumference of the temple with Antonia, the latter extended a stadium north of the north-west angle of the temple portico, *i.e.,* 600 feet north of Wilson’s arch ; and, if we measure off this distance on a plan of the rock contours and then draw a line at right angles to represent the north face of the Antonia, we find that this line runs across the narrowest part of the saddle from which the temple hill is assailable. The breadth of the Antonia from east to west cannot have been more than about 300 feet if, as is to be presumed, the gate Tadi was opposite the twin gates of Huldah ; but with this breadth it would entirely cover the dangerous saddle.

Every attempt to reconstruct the area and situation of the temple as it was before Herod must be more or less conjectural, and an analysis of the possibilities would take up so much space that it seems better simply to offer a plan which appears to satisfy the main conditions of the problem.

According to this plan the area of the temple enclosure was doubled by Herod, his additions being in the parts where the work of levelling up was heaviest, and where neither the convenience of worshippers nor reasons of defence called on earlier builders to extend the plateau. It is certain that the substructures of the south-west angle, raised to a dizzy height above the Tyropœon, are Herod’s (*Ant., XV.* 11, § 5), and Josephus also speaks of an extension to the north (*B.J.,* v. 5, § 1). But, on the other hand, the Baris already adjoined the temple, a condition which is satisfied by giving the older north court K (correspond­ing to the new court of Chronicles, and perhaps also to the upper court of the first temple) a length from east to west of 300 feet and a breadth from north to south of 150. The old east face of the plateau is, as Josephus says, 600 feet long, but this length was gained after the time of Nehemiah by taking in the site of the armoury or house of the forest of Lebanon (H) and the street in front of the water gate (J). For the proof that the water gate stood at a re-entrant angle between the retaining walls of the armoury and the palace and faced east as shown in the plan reference must be made to an article in the *Journal of Philology* (vol. xvi.). The rocky boss between these two walls was in Nehemiah’s time surrounded by an out­work, which to the north joined the wall of Ophel,—that is, of the swelling mass of hill which lies out to the north­east of the palace. From the lower city (south of the Haram area) a stair near the wall led up to the plateau H (Neh. iii. 19; xii. 37). The armoury was 150 feet long and 75 broad; the plan allows the same dimensions for the open space within the water gate. The great court C, C, C is arranged in accordance with 1 Kings vii. 12, in such a way that it is at once the court of the palace and that of the temple, enclosing the inner court B. The dimensions of the inner court are not given in 1 Kings, but as the temple was twice the size of the tabernacle the court was probably also double the court of the tabernacle. This gives a length of 300 feet and a breadth of 150, as in the plan. The part of the court in front of the temple is 150 feet square, which agrees with the dimensions given in Ezek. xl. 23, 27. The great court is a square of 300 feet. This gives room on the east face for two porches D and E leading to the palace and each 75 feet long. Both porches are described in 1 Kings vii. 6, 8, and the dimensions of one are given. It is also expressly stated that the porch was before (*i.e.,* on the east side of) the pillars that deco­rated its front, and that it led into the inner court of the palace, so that the arrangement in the plan is fully justified. In the time of Jeremiah (xxxviii. 14) there were three entries from the palace to the temple ; the third was prob­ably into the north court, the palace having been extended northwards. It is evident that before the time of Herod the palace had disappeared. It was on a lower level than the temple, and when it was cleared away the great sub­structures on the line PE stood out as the boundary of Solomon’s building. North of E the substructures were less considerable, the rock at the north end of this porch being but 20 feet under the present level of the plateau. In Herod’s time, as can be seen at Robinson’s arch, the level of the plateau was the same as at present (2420 feet), but in older times there was a fall between the upper and lower court, and K was probably 10 feet above C, C, C. In that case D was on the natural level of the ground, while (unless the great court was on two levels) E stood on a retaining wall 10 feet high at the north end of the porch and nearly twice as lofty at the south end. The plan shows the temple thrown out on very lofty substruc­tures, so as to be practically inaccessible on all sides and overhang the Tyropœon in the most striking way.@@1 The whole group of buildings formed a complete defence to the city of David on its northern or vulnerable side. It will be observed that in Herod’s temple the Huldah gates at R led directly to the altar, the position of which seems never to have been changed, and also that the plan explains the statement of Hecatæus that the temple was 150 feet broad. His length of 500 feet from east to west is 50 feet too much unless he includes some remains of the old palace. The Baris is shown as standing on the soutli-west corner of the existing platform of the Dome of the Rock.

A word may be said in conclusion on the ancient line of wall to the west of the temple, which, as has been shown from Neh. iii. in the article Jerusalem, ran along the eastern side of the Tyropœon. A bridge connected the temple with the upper city in the time of the later Has- moneans, and, as the palace (on the site of Herod’s palace)

@@@1 It ought, however, to be observed that the contour lines in and near B, B, B are almost purely conjectural.