

He further called attention to the beautiful details about the building; remarking that even if it were used as a school-room they would be preserved, and there was a good deal worth preserving.

### THE JEWRY WALL.

Upon viewing the Jewry Wall, Leicester, MR. JAMES THOMPSON was called for, who said there were one or two theories put forward with respect to the origin of these remains. The rude fragment before them had always been known as the Jewry Wall from this circumstance—it had always been considered that in Leicester and other ancient towns in the country, there was one part of the town to which the Jews were compelled by their Christian neighbours to resort and there confine themselves. In mediæval times so strong was the antipathy of Christians towards the Jews that they compelled all the Jews to seek some part of the town in which to dwell—the least eligible place was considered good enough for the Jews. He believed that site took its name from that circumstance. In the paper he should read that evening he should show that it was at least 600 years ago since the place ceased to be the resort of the Jews; because 600 years ago a charter was granted by Simon de Montfort that no Jew or Jews should thereafter to the end of time inhabit or remain in the town of Leicester. There could be no question that the walls were of Roman origin, for similar walls were found throughout the country—at Silchester and at Wroxeter; at the latter place excavations had revealed important information concerning the outlines of the ancient Roman city. But there were architectural paradoxes about the Jewry Wall which those who had devoted considerable attention to the subject were still unable to solve. There were on that side the remains of four arches of different widths and height; but if they could have seen the other sides, before the adjoining factory was built, they would have seen two arches only, the arches they then saw not being all carried through. It had been found on examination that the piers of the arches did not extend in the direction of the adjoining church, and consequently that fabric had never extended towards the church. At the lower part of the foundation there were what appeared to be the remains of the original wall of the fabric. As to the purpose of the building, his own conclusion—from an examination of the building and from arguments which had suggested themselves to him,—was that in the early period of the existence of that building it was the western gateway to the ancient Roman town of Leicester. Subsequently, in all probability when the place became enlarged, the wall on the western side of the town was taken down, and the intervening space between the wall and the river was built over and occupied, the river—which was wider then than now—forming the defence on that side. But that structure

was made of such obstinate materials that it was not easy to pull it down, and possibly no immediate purpose would have been answered in its removal; so it was left and might very possibly have formed a portion of another building at a later period of the Roman occupation of the town. He thought there was evidence that the wall at different times had served different purposes. In confirmation of the theory that it formed originally the western gateway, Mr. Thompson pointed out on a map of Leicester the positions and defences of the town, showing the north, south, and east entrances, and that the "Jewry Wall" was the only possible place where the town could be entered on the western side.

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON TROLLOPE pointed out, with a view to the better understanding of the building, that the rough masonry now presented to the eye was not the original face of the building, which projected at least  $2\frac{1}{2}$  or 3 feet beyond the present face. They would see from the excavations just made that what he said was true. What the character of the original facing was he could not say. It was quite possible it consisted of very large stones. He might mention in connection with that a discovery made at Lincoln. In the course of some excavations they came across the remains of a Roman arch which had been long destroyed, and some of the stones revealed the fact that they had been fixed together with clamps, no mortar or cement having been used. They were pierced at each end, and pieces of iron were then put in and the hole filled up with lead.

REV. J. G. JOYCE said he had no doubt at all that the wall was originally the western gate of the city. It appeared to him to be the remains of a gateway which had been altered or rebuilt. At the lower end of it they would see the place where the first gateway was made, perfectly defined. The previous day they had pierced down to a depth of 15 feet, and without getting to the bottom of the ancient wall; but from that depth of 15 feet were to their astonishment thrown up pieces of modern brick, so that the ground must have been previously opened to ascertain the depth of the wall. (Several gentlemen remarked that was the case.) It seemed to him that the first gateway had been much lower. He could not, however, suppose that the Roman street was fourteen feet below the present level; as, if it were, the niches in the wall, which were probably intended for the reception of the figures of deities would have been entirely out of reach. He considered that had been a gateway, because a road coming from the Fosse-road into the town would go straight through one of those openings; and because a line drawn as far as they could ascertain from the angle on the north to the angle on the south would pass through the axis of that wall. Therefore, taking the two facts together, there could hardly be a doubt that that would be the proper site for the gate, and indeed that that was the gate.