

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

purely childish magazine, but have not yet attained to that of the public school one. It is for these that *The Prize* (1s. 6d.) has been prepared, and not for the boys only, but also for the girls. *The Prize* for 1908 is as good as ever. It contains a large number of stories, both continued and short ones, poetry, coloured pictures, new games, puzzles, and many other things.

NELSON.

A really gorgeous edition of *Alice in Wonderland* (6s. net) has just been published by Messrs. Nelson. It is large 8vo size, and broader than the ordinary large 8vo. Its boards are a soft cream, with gold lettering, and the picture is in shades of yellow and lavender. The book contains

ninety-two very clever coloured illustrations by Harry Rountree.

*Happy Sunday Hours* (5s. net) provides a story and a picture for every Sunday in the year. Many of these pictures are copies of famous paintings. In some, we think, the details might have been more correct. In the foreground of the 'Nativity,' for example, there is a lamp which bears not the slightest resemblance to the lamps used in Palestine in Christ's time, but reminds one of a remarkably up-to-date lantern.

*Queensland Cousins*, by E. L. Haverfield, is the story of the adventures of four children in that far-off colony, and of how they went to England to school. It is capitably written, and is excellent value, both in size and in quality, for its price (1s. 6d.).

## Some Problems of Herod's Temple.

BY THE REV. A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN THE  
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

VI.

### The Position of the Temple Courts.

ALTHOUGH Josephus speaks of the great court as 'the outer sanctuary,' to Jewish ideas the sanctuary proper was his 'inner sanctuary,' or the enclosure occupied by the temple with its outer court, or 'court of the women,' and its inner court, 'the court' *par excellence* of the Mishna. In accordance with the traditional ideas of temple architecture, a heritage from Babylonia, the sacred enclosure was raised above the level of the great court by means of a platform partly artificial, partly composed of the native rock. This platform was surrounded on all sides by a massive wall 40 cubits in height, according to Josephus. But inasmuch as the Roman soldiers on sentry-go on the roof of the western portico could see over it into the court (*J.A.* xx. viii. 11), we may, as is so often advisable with Josephus' measurements, read *feet* for cubits! Outside the wall, except on the west (for this exception see below), the platform was continued for a distance of 10 cubits, forming a terrace, the *khel* of *M.M.*, on the south, east, and north (plan X Y Z), to which several sets of 12 (*J.W.* says 14) steps gave access from the Court of the Gentiles.

The first problem that meets us here is the relation of Herod's platform, and consequently

the position of the temple courts, relatively to the present inner platform of the Haram. The latter, indicated on the plan by the double broken lines, has four unequal sides, its average length from north to south being about 540 feet, while its width varies from 419 feet (south) to 516 feet along the north side. Its surface, according to Sir C. Wilson, is from 15 to 19 feet above the general level of the Haram. Is it possible to determine with some approach to accuracy what portion of this now extended area of  $5\frac{3}{4}$  acres was occupied by the third temple and its courts?

If one could accept without further question, as so many previous writers have done, the measurements of the Mishna, the question would be easily answered. According to *M.M.* ii. 5, 6, the two courts formed a rectangle measuring 322 cubits from west to east, by 135 cubits from north to south. The latter measurement, however, takes no account of the gatehouses, priests' chambers, and other buildings between the courts and the containing wall. Still 322 cubits (472 feet) are so near the average width of the platform, *circa* 470 feet, and the distance of the altar from the eastern gate, as detailed in *M.M.* v. 1, viz. 157 cubits, is so near the distance of the rock from

the eastern edge of the platform, that one must recognize a generally accurate tradition, while reserving the right to examine the details more critically. Provisionally, therefore, we may regard the two platforms as substantially identical in width. As to length it is quite different, since the present platform extends almost to the northern limit of Herod's great court. The following considerations, however, have led the writer to more definite conclusions:—

(1) It has been shown above that the principal entrance to the temple was by a bridge at Wilson's Arch, probably through propylæa in the western cloister, such as other Syrian temples of the Roman age exhibit. Now it is in the highest degree improbable that Herod's architects would have so arranged the temple enclosure that nothing would have met the royal, or any other, eye along the line of this approach but a blank wall *cir.* 40 feet high. This would certainly have been the case had the temple enclosure extended as far south as does the present platform. I believe, then, that a line drawn across the Haram from the north end of the bridge must mark the furthest limit of Herod's platform towards the south.

(2) If the distance of this line from the centre of the rock is measured on the Survey map, it will be found to be 183–184 feet, or exactly 125 cubits. The principle of symmetry requires us to place the northern limit at the same distance. Now, mark the—to the writer at least—surprising result. Twice 125 cubits is the distance from the rock to the scarp which we saw reason to believe marked the northern wall of Herod's court, while the western wall is equidistant. These cannot be the result of an accident. In other words, we have discovered that the area of the great court of the second temple, before it was enlarged by Herod on the south and east, followed that of Ezekiel's outer court, that is, *it measured 500 cubits each way with the sacred rock precisely in the centre.*

But to return to Herod's courts.<sup>1</sup> The latter, it now seems fairly certain, corresponded in length to the width of the platform across the rock—more

precisely, let me say by anticipation,  $315^2$  cubits or 462 feet, including the walls and the *khel*—while the width from north to south, all included, was  $250^2$  cubits or 367 feet, measured north and south from the centre of the rock. An interesting test of the latter set of figures is supplied by the underground passage which the English surveyors discovered running under the platform for 130 feet towards the north end of the old Haram, and which they very reasonably identify with the passage to the gate Tadi mentioned in Middoth (*Recovery*, etc., 206). If the position of the courts above suggested is accepted, the passage will open into one of the temple buildings, marked L on plan.

It is very doubtful if the sanctuary formed an exact rectangle, 315 cubits by 250. The obtuse angle at the south-east corner of the present platform, with the consequent diverging line of the eastern boundary, in all probability goes back to Herod's day; the reason is found in the necessity for following the line of rock, as the foundation for the very heavy wall which formed the *enceinte* of the sanctuary.

Within the wall the sanctuary was divided into two unequal courts at different levels by a transverse wall from north to south. The actual rock levels of the present day are a safer guide to the relative levels of the different parts of the sanctuary than the data of the Mishna. The average level of the Haram is 2419 feet above the Mediterranean; that of the platform is 2435 feet, while the summit of the rock is 2440 feet. These figures cannot be reconciled with those of the Mishna, which represents the *khel*, and the Court of the Women which was on a level with it, as 6 cubits, the Court of Israel as  $13\frac{1}{2}$  cubits,—approached by 15 semi-circular steps, each  $\frac{1}{2}$  cubit in height (see plan H 10),—and the Court of the Priests as 16 cubits (=  $23\frac{1}{2}$  feet) above the level of the Court of the Gentiles. Assuming that the present artificially cut western base of the rock represents the position of the base of the altar of burnt-offering, the Court of the Priests will have been on approximately the same level as the whole of the present platform, viz. 2435 feet. The Court of the Women will have lain some 10 feet lower, which leaves 6 feet for the average height of the terrace or *khel* above the floor of the Haram. These results may most easily

<sup>1</sup> It is hoped that the ground-plan of the temple and courts in their relation to the inner platform of the Haram, which was given in the October number, will make the following condensed paragraphs sufficiently clear to any one who has studied the details as given, for example, in Witton Davies' article 'Temple,' in Hastings' *D.B.* iv.

<sup>2</sup> For the separate items making up these totals of 315 and 250 cubits, see the tabular statement at the end of these articles.

be reconciled with the data of the Mishna, by the supposition that the steps leading from one level to another had a rise, not of a half (*M.M.* ii. 3), but of a third of a cubit (6 inches).

From what has now been said as to the practical identity of Herod's platform and courts with the southern portion of the present platform, it is evident that I cannot follow two of the most recent reconstructions of the temple, the authors of which would place the Court of the Women to the east of the modern platform (Watson in *P.E.F.St.* 1896, 47-60, and Waterhouse in Sanday's *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 106-117, both with admirable plans, etc.). These reconstructions, in most respects the best that have yet been produced, are open to certain fatal objections. In the first place, Colonel Watson still maintains the now obsolete position that the sacred rock marks the site of the holy of holies, as does Colonel Conder. In the next place, Mr. Waterhouse, against the evidence of the Mishna, occupies the eastern part of the present platform with a large space entitled 'Court of Men of Israel.'<sup>1</sup> In this connexion it

<sup>1</sup> See now G. A. Smith's criticism (*Jerusalem*, ii. 508f.).

cannot be too strongly emphasized that the outer of the two courts—that named the 'Court of the Women,' because women were admitted on sufferance to the surrounding gallery—was the proper place of worship for the laity. The admission of the latter to the inner court was a restricted privilege (see below). Finally, to place the Court of the Women between the platform and the eastern portico, known as Solomon's Porch, occupies almost all the free space available on this side. But if there is one statement of the Mishna that seems more worthy of credit than another it is that of *M.M.* ii. 1, to the effect that the largest free space was on the south, and the next largest on the east. The same objection applies to Büchler's impossible theory that the Women's Court was a later addition to Herod's sanctuary, *circa* 44 A.D. (*Jewish Quart. Rev.* x. 678 ff., xi. 46 ff., where also the traditional Jewish identification of the gate of Nicanor is maintained, see below). No space is left by the writers named for the popular assembly which was convened by the Jewish leaders at the outbreak of the war, in front of the eastern gate (*J.W.* ii. xvii. 3, § 411).

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Hour of the Crucifixion.

It must surely puzzle many an expositor of God's Oracles to find it stated in Mk 15<sup>25</sup> that it was the third hour when our Lord was crucified, and when the soldiers cast lots upon His garments; whereas in Jn 19<sup>14</sup> the sixth hour is stated as the time when Pilate said, 'Behold your King!' and the people shouted, 'Crucify Him!' How are we to reconcile such a discrepancy? The third hour, counting from sunrise, is supposed to be, roughly speaking, about 9 a.m.; and the sixth hour we may consider as noon.

My attention has been drawn to this subject by a remarkable statement of a Syriac author whose Commentary on the Gospels I am now editing, viz. Isho'dad, Bishop of Merv, who lived in the middle of the ninth century. After quoting various opinions on the matter, he gives his own that Mark is correct, and that 'the sixth hour' of John is due to the error of a scribe. He says that

Eusebius testifies to this in his letter to Marinus, saying that the Greek sign for *third* is the letter *gamma* ( $\Gamma$ ), and the sign for *sixth* is the letter *stigma* ( $\varsigma$ ); and the scribe, who did not give heed in his heart when he was writing the Gospel, curved the perpendicular stroke of the *gamma* ( $\Gamma$ ) a little, so that it became  $\varsigma$  and was read as 'sixth.' Now Eusebius takes us back to the middle of the third century, so that the difficulty must have been felt at that time.

The Epistle to Marinus is not included in any modern edition of Eusebius; but Dr. Nestle of Maulbronn has kindly given me references to two works of Cardinal Mai, *Scriptorum Veterum, Nova Collectio*, vol. i. p. 91 (1825) and *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, vol. iv. p. 268, both of which contain the letter to Marinus, from a *Catena* published by Corderius in the seventeenth century.

I can see, I think, how Cardinal Mai's publication of this solution of the enigma has not met with the recognition it deserves. In 1825 Biblical Criticism