

## II.

MR. SCHICK'S paper completes his description of the very interesting discoveries made in the Russian property to the east of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It is greatly to be regretted that such a favourable opportunity for thoroughly examining and clearing this most important locality should have been lost. The questions which Mr. Schick raises with regard to the existence of a rock-hewn ditch, the course of the second wall, and the exact position of Constantine's Basilica, are of the greatest interest to every student of Jerusalem topography; and it is to be hoped that the Russian Palestine Society may be induced to resume the abandoned excavations and clear the entire area. It is only by taking advantage of opportunities of this nature that we can ever hope to re-construct ancient Jerusalem.

Though the discoveries that have been made are of high interest, I am not able to agree with the deductions that Mr. Schick has drawn from them, and it may be as well to state some of the objections that occur to me. (1) Mr. Schick believes that the granite columns in the street *Khan ez-Zeit* formed part of the Propylæum of Constantine's Basilica. In 1865 ("Notes to the O.S. of Jerusalem," 53, 54) I drew attention to the fact that "these remains, some of similar character in the ground formerly belonging to the Knights of St. John, and the so-called 'Gate of Gennath,' are nearly in the same straight line." A glance at the plan of Jerusalem will show that from the Damascus Gate a street runs southward to a point in the city wall where the Sion Gate stood before the walls were rebuilt in the sixteenth century. This street, I believe, follows the line of the main street of *Ælia*, which, in all probability, was adorned with columns as in the similar cases of Samaria, Scythopolis, Damascus, Gadara, Gerasa, &c. If this supposition be correct, the columns belong to the street; and the "Greek Arch" and "Gate of Gennath" are the remains of ornamental portals leading to side streets. The columns are certainly not such as we should expect in the Propylæum. Whether the Damascus Gate received its name of *Báb el-Amúd* from these columns or from the great column which, when the Moslems first took the city, marked the centre of the world, is uncertain.

(2) That the ancient masonry uncovered is Jewish. In 1865 I made some tentative excavations, and came to the conclusion that, though old material had been freely used, none of the existing remains bore the character of mural masonry. The remains seemed to me to belong to an old church, and this view was partially confirmed by the discovery of a very fine font or basin of white marble. ("O.S. Notes," 53, 74.) The character of the masonry, however, led me to believe that the church was a re-construction after Constantine's churches had been destroyed, and that it might even be as late as the period of the Crusades. The position is not that in which we should expect to find Constantine's Basilica.

(3) That the "threshold" is Jewish. Without personal examination

I should be sorry to pass a decided opinion; but this stone appears to me to be an old lintel used during a period of re-construction, and not to be *in situ*, as Mr. Schick supposes. There seems no valid reason for believing it to be Jewish.

(4) That the new cistern made by the Russians is in the ditch of the second wall. The truth of this speculation can only be proved by excavation; it is not impossible, but the space cleared is so small that it is rash to base any theory upon it, and there may have been an old cistern on the spot. Mr. Schick's view of the further course of the ditch is open to greater objection. He places the chapel and cistern of Helena in the excavation. It is true that no rock can be seen in the chapel, on account of the plaster, but what we know of the lie of the rock near it would lead us to believe that a portion of the walls are of rock. As regards the cistern, I find in the "O.S. Notes" (p. 54), that is described as being "of irregular shape, hewn out of the *Malaki* bed, with the overlying bed of *Missae* left as a roof, one of the most ancient types of cisterns, and similar to those in front of the *Masjed al-Aksa*." If this description be correct, and I have no reason at present to doubt it, the ditch could not have run in that direction. There are other objections to Mr. Schick's theory, the discussion of which would occupy too much space.

(5) The pavements are not the least interesting of the discoveries. The lower pavement is on the same level as the floor of the Rotunda in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre; the upper one at a slightly lower level than the floor of the Chapel of the Exaltation of the Cross, which is almost due west of it. How far either or both are the work of Constantine is a question; the lower one may in part be the street pavement of the city of *Ælia*; the upper possibly connected with the platform of the Temple that preceded the Church of Constantine.

It is so important that researches should be carried on at this spot, that the Committee have taken steps which they hope will be successful to work in co-operation with the Russian Society.

C. W. W.

## LINE OF SECOND WALL.

*Jerusalem, February 14th, 1888.*

### I.

IN the *Quarterly Statement*, 1888, page 16, Dr. Merrill pointed out that my Statements and Plan in *Quarterly Statement*, 1887, page 217, were wrong in two important points.

First, that the ancient remains of the so-called "second wall" are not in its right position and direction; and secondly, that I have not given it in full length!

To this I have only to say:—It is not my custom to go into any controversy at length, but only stating facts for my defence. In respect of