aspect and effect, and fix in my mind the proportions and true contour of the building. And the conclusion forced upon me was just that at which, times without number, I had invariably arrived before. The Gothic architecture, with all its solemn grandeur and beauty, is a greatly lower and less exquisite production of the human intellect than the architecture of Greece. The saintly legends of the middle ages are scarce less decidedly inferior to those fictions of the classic mythology which the greater Greek and Roman writers have sublimed into poetry. I have often felt that the prevailing bias in favor of everything mediæval, so characteristic of the present time, from the theology and legislation of the middle ages, to their, style of staining glass and illuminating manuscripts, cannot be other than a temporary eccentricity, - a mere cross freshet, chance-raised by some meteoric accident, - not one of the great permanent ocean-currents of tendency; but never did the conviction press upon me more strongly than when enabled on this occasion to contrast the new architecture of St. Paul's with the old architecture of Westminster. New! Old! Modern! Ancient ! The merits of the controversy lie summed up in these words. The new architecture is the truly ancient architecture, while the old is comparatively modern: but the immortals are always young; whereas the mortals, though their term of life may be as extended as that of Methuselah, grow old apace. The Grecian architecture will be always the new architecture; and, let fashion play whatever vagaries it pleases, the Gothic will be always old. There is a wonderful amount of genius exhibited in the contour and filling up of St. Paul's. In passing up and down the river, which I did frequently during my short stay in London, my eye never wearied of resting on it: like all great works that have had the beautiful inwrought into their essence by the persevering touches of a