and the Baris were the points which it was most important to connect, it no doubt corresponded to the northern bridge already spoken of, at Wilson’s arch Μ. But at that date it must have led, not directly to the temple, but to a lower point on the slope south of the Baris. In Nehemiah’s time there was no bridge, but the gate of Ephraim probably corresponded to the east end of the bridge near the south­west angle of the Baris. In that case the wall, as is natural, ran close under the western substructures of the temple and probably served as a buttress to them in the part of its course south of the gate of Ephraim, which in Neh. xii. 38 is called “the broad wall.” The throne of the Persian governor, beside the gate of Ephraim (see Jerusa- lem, vol. xiii. p. 640), stood so close to the Baris that we may conclude that there was already a castle on its site, held for the great king. The position assigned to the gate of Ephraim, which, according to 2 Kings xiv. 13, was 600 feet from the corner gate, where the north wall of the city joined the west Avail, suits the fact that a line drawn east and west 600 feet north of Wilson’s arch coincides with the line of scarped rock marked on the plan. Here, therefore, the old north wall ran, with the great. fosse filled up by Pompey. This wall figures also in Herod’s siege, but seems to have been destroyed by him.

*Literature.—*The literature of the subject is immense. The re­sults of modern surveys and diggings are given in the Palestine Exploration Fund volume on *Jerusalem* (London, 1884) and in the accompanying *Atlas.* Of other books it may suffice to name De Vogué, *Le Temple de Jérusalem* (fol., Paris, 1864) ; Fergusson, *Topography of Jerusalem* (*8vo,* London, 1847); Id., *The Temples of the Jews* (4to, London, 1878) ; Thrupp, *Antient Jerusalem* (8vo, Cambridge, 1855) ; Lewin, *The Siege of Jerusalem by Titus* (8vo, London, 1863) ; and Perrot and Chipiez, *Histoire de l'Art* (Paris, 1887). (W. R. S.)

TEMPLE, Sir William (1628-1699), English states­man, diplomatist, and author, was born in London in 1628. He came of an old English family, but of the younger branch of it, which had for some time been settled in Ireland. He was the eldest son of Sir John Temple, master of the rolls in that country. His mother was Mary Hammond, sister of a well-known Tory divine. Temple received a liberal education, calculated to produce that moderation of judgment for which he was afterwards re­markable. He was first a pupil of his uncle Dr Hammond, after which he went to the grammar-school at Bishop Stort- ford, and then to the Puritan college of Emmanuel at Cambridge, where he came under the influence of Cud­worth. At the commencement of the civil troubles his father embraced the popular cause and was deprived of his office. Coming to England, he sat in the Long Parlia­ment as member for Chichester, and was one of the recal­citrant members turned out by Colonel Pride. Before this event happened his son had left Cambridge, without taking a degree, and in 1647 started to travel abroad. In the Isle of Wight, while on his way to France, he fell in with Dorothy Osborne, and won her affections. Her father, Sir Peter Osborne, was governor of Guernsey and a Royalist. Her family were naturally opposed to the match, and threw difficulties in the way, which hindered its consummation for seven years. During this period Temple travelled in France, Spain, Holland, and other countries, gaining knowledge of the world and keeping up a constant correspondence with his betrothed. At length, apparently in 1654, the difficulties were surmounted and the marriage took place. In 1655 Temple and his wife went to Ireland. The next five years were spent in the house of Sir John Temple, who had made his peace with Cromwell, and had resumed his official position. His son took no part in politics, but lived the life of a student and a country gentleman.

The accession of Charles II. rescued Temple, like many others, from obscurity. In 1660 he sat in the convention parliament at Dublin as member for Carlow, and he repre­sented the same county along with his father in the regular parliament that followed. After a short visit to England in 1661, as commissioner from the Irish parlia­ment, he finally removed thither in 1663. There he attached himself to Arlington, secretary of state, and two years later received his first employment abroad. It was in March 1665 that the disastrous Avar with the United Netherlands began. Charles II. was anxious to obtain allies, especially as Louis XIV. was taking up a hostile attitude. At this juncture the bishop of Münster sent an envoy to England, offering to attack the Dutch if the English Government would supply the means. Temple was sent over to negotiate a treaty, and in this business gave evidence not only of the diplomatic skill but of the peculiar candour and frankness for which he was after­wards so distinguished. He was successful in making the treaty, but it was rendered ineffectual by the declaration of Avar by France, the threats of Louis, and the double­dealing of the prelate, who, after receiving a great part of the subsidy, made a separate peace with the Netherlands. As a reward for his services Temple was created a baronet, and in October 1665 became the English representative at the viceregal court at Brussels. While the war con­tinued, Temple’s duties consisted chiefly in cultivating good relations with Spain, which was a neutral in the quarrel between England and the Dutch, but was threat­ened by the claims of Louis XIV. on the Spanish Nether­lands. Louis’s designs became apparent in the spring of 1667, when he marched an army into Flanders. This event was one of those which led to the peace of Breda, and to the subsequent negotiations, which are Temple’s chief title to fame. The French conquests were made at the expense of Spain, but were almost equally dangerous to the United Netherlands, whose independence would have been forfeited had Louis succeeded in annexing Flanders. While the French were taking town after town, Temple made a journey into Holland and visited De Witt. The friendship established and the community of views dis­covered during this interview facilitated the subsequent negotiations. Temple had for some time pressed on his Government the necessity of stopping the French advance, and had pointed out the way to do so, but it was not till December 1667 that he received instructions to act as he had suggested. He at once set out for The Hague, and in January 1668 a treaty was made between England and the United Netherlands, which, being joined shortly afterwards by Sweden, became known as the Triple Alli­ance. It was a defensive treaty, made against the en­croachments of France. Whether we regard the skill and celerity with which the negotiations were conducted or the results of the treaty, the transaction reflects great credit on Temple. The French king was checked in mid­career, and, without a blow being struck, was obliged to surrender almost all his conquests. Pepys records public opinion on the treaty by saying that it was “ the only good public thing that hath been done since the king came into England.”

Unfortunately the policy thus indicated was but short­lived. In taking up a hostile attitude towards France Charles’s object had apparently been only to raise his price. Louis took the hint, increased his offers, and two years later the secret treaty of Dover reversed the policy of the Triple Alliance. Meanwhile Temple had developed the good understanding with the Dutch by contracting a com­mercial treaty with them (February 1668), and had acted as English plenipotentiary at Aix-la-Chapelle, where peace between France and Spain was made in May 1668. Shortly afterwards he was appointed ambassador at The Hague. Here he lived for two years on good terms both with De