

tality, both its faults and beauties in the Constable's Chapel and the tombs at Miraflores. "The date of each may be put down at circa A.D. 1485," says the author. "The sculptor of the tombs was Gil de Borgoa, father of the celebrated sculptor, Gil de Silos. The name of the architect who designed the chapel I could not discover with certainty. The monuments of Miraflores are to the memory of Juan II. and his wife, and to his son the Infante Alonso. Little relating to these personages, beyond armorial bearings, is to be found on their elaborate sculptures, so rich and fanciful as to be rather fitted as shrines for some Shakespeare or Cervantes than for the glorification of those whose only claim on art was the accident of birth."

The Constable's Chapel is as large as some churches, and is very rich in florid sculpture, ironwork, and paintings. It was founded by Pedro Hernandez de Velasco, constable of Castille, and one of its noblest families: it was finished at the close of the fifteenth century; and there is every appearance that the sculptor of the tombs of Miraflores, if not its builder, was at least much occupied in its abundant sculpture. The wretched Churrigueraesque altar-piece is but one instance of the bad taste which has destroyed, in Spain, the old and valuable, to make room for the new and worthless. Mr. Waring gives several views and portions of it. Some of the drawings are rather coarsely executed, but all are very effective.

These subjects have never been illustrated, our author thinks, with the exception of some few in VillaAMIL's large work on Spain, and of these he says,—"That anything more false and unworthy of a great work, such as his purports to be, cannot be imagined, putting aside the entire incorrectness of the representation through an overloading of work, existing only through the lithographer's crayon: there is a general system of imaginary make-up about them, which becomes comprehensible when we find that the artist, in order to excite admiration, has joined the large and small Cloisters of the Huelegas into one view, with the salient points of each, thinking himself in this case probably secure, from the fact, that only by a royal order, of the utmost difficulty to be obtained, can the public enter there."

A great similarity runs throughout all the buildings in the north of Spain belonging to the last half of the fifteenth century, which leads to the belief that they are works emanating from the teachings of one master-mind; and this is more probable when we find such a very German character about them, and know that John of Cologne settled here about A.D. 1440. To him Mr. Waring thinks most likely is due the honour of being the great teacher during the period named.

The last view in the series represents the Constable's House, and La Trinidad, the first a curious specimen of the old Gothic palace, and made striking by great monsters, and coats of arms, and perforated balconies. It is now used as a barrack, or rather for military bureaux, in this garrison town. To such base purposes has it come at last, and the very name of Velasco strikes daily on the ear, whilst that of Velasquez brings to mind a nobility and distinction which neither costly palaces nor mausoleums can raise. The ruined Chapel of La Trinidad, says Mr. Waring, may well close this series of drawings, for it is emblematic of the land itself, ruined and neglected: "its past glory is gone; and where Calderon and Cervantes, Velasquez and Murillo, once wrote and painted, only so much lumber fills up the place in this dust-covered and forgotten chapel." For the enterprise which stimulated the work, and the ability with which it is carried out, Mr. Waring richly deserves support.

IRISH STONE.—A vessel just arrived from Galway has brought an entire cargo of marble, amounting to 160 tons weight, the produce of that part of the sister island; and another vessel arrived in the river on the same day from Arklow, and brought 100 tons weight of pyrites, the produce of that district of Ireland.

ON THE EVIDENCES OF SAXON ARCHITECTURE IN THE COUNTY OF DURHAM.

The following is part of a paper read by Mr. W. Hylton Longstaffe at the late meeting of the Archaeological Institute:—

You will nearly all, I suppose, be familiar with the great questions which have so long occupied the antiquarian circle respecting the nature and existence of Saxon architecture; and as the stream of history which will be pursued in this paper affects churches with some of the characteristics of presumed Saxon work only, it is unnecessary to go into the generalities of the subject with any minuteness. You are aware that the technicology of the old writers, who made the Saxon style include all our Norman buildings, and thus tacitly assumed the architectural character of the structures before and after the Conquest to be of a similar design, was swept away by Rickman. And then it was conceived that we had no ante-Conquest churches, and the Norman style was dubbed the first. It was, however, soon found that churches existed which were totally distinct from that style; and as we had others whose ascertained date came within a very narrow space of time from the Conquest—in Durham Cathedral, for instance, which was built about thirty years afterwards (1093)—and these examples were in a fully developed though plain Norman fashion, these anomalous examples were necessarily thrown back into the Saxon period. That long period of course includes sub-styles. Many of the buildings included in it have an arrangement sinking into Norman and forming the transition to it. And yet we find persons going back to the unlikely theory that we have no Saxon buildings, and stating that stone was only occasionally used by the Saxons, and that their buildings were very inferior in size to those erected by the Normans. Now we shall see that these latter statements clash with the Saxon records; and Mr. Wright has properly observed, that when William of Malmesbury, a late authority at the best, speaks of the Saxons wasting their substance in small and abject houses, unlike the Normans, who lived moderately in ample and superb edifices, he indefinitely states a well-known fact. The Saxons had not vast feudal castles. He also states another incontrovertible fact, that the Norman churches were raised *saxa edificandi genere*. But it is not shown that this change of style was consequent upon the Conquest, nor why the new style might not rise out of the preceding one, like all its successors, in the manner of the corresponding, but rather earlier change on the Continent. Isolated resemblances to the Saxon edifices would occur long after their style was obsolete. We saw a triangular arch over a Norman door at Warkworth Church; but such instances as little prove for or against the Saxon date of churches, where each peculiarity is in harmony with the rest, as the herring-bone masonry in a Roman station proves that such station is of Norman date.

The history of the Anglo-Saxon buildings, and probably the style of the buildings themselves, falls into three divisions.

The First or Anglo-Saxon Period is the period (about 670) before Wilfrid brought the foreign mode of building from the Continent, of stone, *more Romanorum*, which forms the second period. Now, in this early period we might expect a number of wooden churches, yet the contrary seems to be the fact; and little more appears to gratify such an expectation than that temporary wooden oratories were raised. Such a cell at Tyne-mouth, erected between 617 and 633, speedily gave way, before 642, to a small monastery of stone. (Mook of St. Albans, xii. cent. Lel. Coll. iv. iii. 42.)

The first bishops of Lindisfarne were Scotchmen. At their departure in 664, on account of the disputes about Easter with the Romish Church, they left behind them houses of the smallest size, save the church. It was not, says the chronicler, necessary to provide houses to receive the powers that were, or money.

* The paper at greater length will be found in the *Gateshead Observer*.

The former never came to the church save to pray and hear the Word, and the King, with his five or six servants, departed as soon as service was over. (Simoon.) The cathedral had been built in 661, St. says Bede, for an episcopal seat; yet *more Scotorum*, not of stone, but of split oak only, and thatched with reed.

That this architecture, *more Scotorum*, was not usual in England at the period, is evident from Bede's own words, even if we had not evidence of the existence of stone churches. Had it prevailed in England, we should have had *more indigorum* or *more Anglorum*, or some such expressions, in opposition to *more Romanorum*. And against any objection that the English style had become confined to Scotland in Bede's time, and that Bede's expression was not prospective, but alluded to his own period, we have his declaration that, in 710, Malise, King of the Scots, had sent to Ceolfrid, one of the introducers of the second Saxon style, begging him to despatch architects who might make a stone church after the manner of the Romans in that nation also; and despatched they were.

As the walls of the building of this first period were strong enough to stand after the very cause of the loss of their roof was forgotten, I see no improbability in the supposition that some of them may be built in with later masonry, although I cannot point out an example in this district. They were, doubtless, very rude in the manner of joining the stones, and very inferior to the structures of the next sub-style. Some have supposed that the strips on the walls of such towers as Earl's Barton were in imitation of an earlier timber style, and that the verb "to timber" alludes to the circumstances. But occurring as strips do in what appear to be buildings in a transition to Norman, such as Stanton Lacy, and being wanting in what appear to be the earlier examples, I am disposed to consider them as rather late in the period, when greater ornament was wanted on the walls, and as leading to the fir buttresses and other rough decorations of Norman date.

The Second or Romano-Saxon Period extends from the introduction of an improved and Continental masonry to the destruction of monasteries by the Danes, say to about 950. A practice now prevailed of English ecclesiastics visiting Rome. In 654, two individuals were at Rome, and they were destined to effectuate a revolution in the architecture of their native country. One was the turbulent Wilfrid; the other, Biscop, of noble blood—he who afterwards received the phenomenon of Benedict. Wilfrid was first in architectural order. On his being made Archbishop of Northumberland, in 669, he found the early stone cathedral so demolished by Penda, the pagan King of Mercia, that it was only fit for birds to build their nests in. He repaired the walls, roofed them with lead, and glazed the windows. Between 670 and 678 he erected the monasteries of Hexham and Ripon.

In 673, Benedict Biscop founded a monastery at Wearmouth, upon or close to a Roman site. Its material is unknown, but scarce had twelve months elapsed from its foundation when Biscop again crossed the ocean, for masons who might make a stone church after the manner of the Romans—a style he always loved—(*cementarios qui lapideam sibi ecclesiam juxta Romanorum, quem semper amabat, morem facerent*). They prosecuted the work with such diligence, that, within a year after the foundation had been laid, the spacious edifice was roofed and mass celebrated. When it was nearly finished, he obtained glassmakers from France, who glazed the windows of the church, the porches, and the refectories, and taught the mystery of their trade to the natives, who at that time were ignorant of it. Wilfrid had previously used glass, but it had been imported.

Jarrow was founded in 682, on a further donation by King Egfrid of a strong peninsula overlooking marsh and stream and Egfrid's port. Ceolfrid was despatched to the new possession, on which a suitable convent had been raised for his reception, under the patronage of St. Paul. The establishments of Wearmouth and Jarrow were properly one mo-