The Archaeological Journal.

SEPTEMBER, 1864.

REMARKS ON THE PAINTED GLASS AT LICHFIELD CATHEDRAL.[1]

By the late Mr. CHARLES WINSTON.

THE beautiful glass paintings which occupy (amongst others) the seven eastern windows of the choir of Lichfield Cathedral, belonged originally to the Abbey of Herckenrode, in the old episcopal principality of Liége. They are of the Italian-Flemish school, and appear from dates upon them to have been executed between 1532 and 1539. After the destruction of the abbey, the glass passed into the possession of Sir Brooke Boothby, Bart., who transferred it to the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield, by whom it was placed where it now is, in or about the year 1803 (A).

At the present time, when the very refuse of the continent is sought for, and even forgeries of ancient painted glass occasionally command high prices, such an acquisition would have produced no slight sensation, and a knowledge of the surpassing merit of these windows would have been generally diffused by means of the press. As it is, there is perhaps no work of equal importance in this country so little known or appreciated.

To the antiquary this glass may appear less interesting than that in the Beauchamp Chapel at Warwick, to which so many historical and local associations attach; but it must always be an object of the deepest interest to the student

[1] Read on the occasion of the visit of the Archæological Institute to Lichfield, July 29, during the Annual Meeting held at Warwick, 1864.

of glass-painting, anxious to trace the progress of the art, and to ascertain the method by which such striking and beautiful pictorial effects have been produced.

To those who have recently examined the painted glass in the Beauchamp Chapel,[2] it may seem somewhat surprising that both examples should have been produced by precisely the same technical process (B); and that the difference in effect between them, which we cannot fail to observe, should be entirely due to the greater skill of the artists who executed the works now under consideration.

We are familiar with the expression "the new method," by which Vasari and other writers on art designated the practice of the great painters of the Renaissance. The influence of this practice is shown as clearly in the Lichfield windows, as is that of the hard, dry, flat style of the pictorial art of their day in the windows of the Beauchamp Chapel. And surely if the "new method" of the Renaissance (the invention be it remembered of the greatest artistic geniuses whose works have come down to us) is admirable, and is admired in all other kinds of painting, we may well ask why should its adoption in glass-painting alone be deemed wrong? In what does the impropriety consist? Is any essential or fundamental rule of glass-painting thereby violated? I feel that a glance at the windows at Lichfield ought to set these questions at rest. But, as the works of the Renaissance in painted glass have been of late years systematically decried by a certain class of writers, not merely on account of their style, as being in the Italian and not the Gothic manner (a question with which we need not concern ourselves), but upon the broader ground that their design and mode of execution (matters perfectly distinct from style) are essentially erroneous, I trust that I shall not be deemed tedious if I endeavour briefly to show, that in works like those at Lichfield there really is no violation of the conditions imposed by the nature of glass, considered as a material affording a means of art. I am not aware, indeed, of the existence of any conditions that can be supposed to prohibit an artist

[2] The painted glass in the Beauchamp Chapel was a special subject of interest at the Meeting of the Institute at Warwick; a Discourse on its peculiar features and history was communicated on the occasion by the author of this Memoir. We hope to be enabled to publish hereafter his valuable dissertation on the subject.

from producing as perfect a pictorial effect in a glass-painting as he is able, provided he does not unnecessarily or excessively reduce the transparency and brilliancy of the glass.

The principal objections urged are, I believe, that the artists of the Renaissance ought not to have attempted pictures in painted glass, or anything higher than mere colored mosaics, because the nature of glass is such that more complete and perfect pictures can be produced by other methods of painting ; that their works are overshaded, and therefore unsuited to the nature of a translucent material ; and that the attempt to form a picture in glass is always accompanied by a diminution, in a certain degree, of the depth of coloring.

The first objection can easily be disposed of, upon the ground that it tends unnecessarily to limit the resources of art. Experience shows that we take delight in various methods of representation, some of which are certainly not less imperfect than glass-painting ; and that an artist's power in meeting and overcoming technical difficulties always forms a large ingredient in our estimate of his abilities.

To the second it may be answered, that, though it is true that translucency is the essential characteristic of a painting upon glass, and that any practice tending unnecessarily to reduce it must be vicious, yet, as it is impossible to give force and expression to a glass painting without some diminution of its transparency, the extent to which obscuration may properly be carried becomes a question of degree. Thus we rightly condemn the use of enamel coloring, that is to say, the method of coloring glass with enamels, instead of (as in the windows at Lichfield) using for the colored parts of the picture glass colored in its manufacture, and not afterwards, and which is as transparent as white glass itself. For though more varied and even truer effects of color are obtainable by means of enamels, such gain is disproportioned to the loss of effect through the dulness and want of brilliancy occasioned by the use of enamel coloring. But the employment of an opaque enamel color for the purpose of producing the chiaroscuro of a picture in glass is legitimate, if confined within reasonable limits.

The third objection must necessarily fall to the ground upon its appearing that pictorial compositions of a higher nature than mere mosaics are allowable in painted glass, as

being unopposed to any rule of glass-painting ; for, without using colors varying in degrees of depth, it would be impossible to impart requisite distinctness and relief.

In determining the various questions involved, we naturally turn to ancient examples as affording the best means of comparison and selection. But, before submitting ourselves to the teaching of antiquity, we should do well to bear in mind that mediæval architecture and mediæval painted glass stand upon a very different footing. The one had reached a point high enough to place it in the first rank of the architectural styles of the world, at a time when the art of representation on a plane surface (including glass-painting) was comparatively in its infancy. The latter, as is well known, did not attain perfection in the north of Europe until the period to which these very glass-paintings belong, and not until after the decline of Gothic architecture. The accidental association therefore of the earlier styles of glass-painting with Gothic buildings is far from proving, that any necessary or scientific connection exists between the best Gothic architecture and the state of the art of representation as then practised in glass-painting. Nor ought we to be deterred by any such association from condemning, along with their bad drawing, the confusion and want of relief which in a greater or less degree characterise all the painted windows executed previously to the second quarter of the sixteenth century. It is observable, however, that the most keen opponents of cinque cento art justify, on the score of taste, their preference of what may be familiarly designated the "ironed-out-flat-style" in painted glass, namely complicated compositions intended to represent objects occupying various distances from the eye, but which are so inartificially drawn, shaded, and colored, as to look as if they had all been compressed flat into one plane, as is exemplified in old windows (C).

It may be admitted that a composition of a flatter nature than is absolutely demanded by the conditions of glass-painting, might occasionally be employed with advantage, if it was treated artistically, and did not exhibit (like the ironed-out-flat-style) the flatness which results merely from feebleness and imperfect knowledge. And such a glass painting, in proportion to its simplicity and approach to a mere mosaic, might display a more uniform degree of bril-

liancy and a more uniform expanse of the deepest coloring, than would be possible in one of a more complex and pictorial character. But it would be found very difficult to design such a composition upon a very large scale; nor would its style be suitable for general adoption, since it would necessarily confine the subjects of glass-painting to a very few, and those of the simplest nature. Practically, therefore, our choice would be in favor of glass paintings more nearly approaching the character of pictures (of which class those at Lichfield and other contemporary works might be considered to be the type) on its appearing that they exhibited the highest pictorial effect of which glass-painting can be rendered capable, without violating that condition of the art which forbids undue obscuration of the material. That they do not infringe this rule is actually proved by those most opposed to the style in question, who occasionally place in invidious comparison with "the overloaded (with enamel), and overshaded cinque cento," mediæval works in which shadow not unfrequently occurs equal in quantity, and even more opaque than what was used in the cinque cento style. It is a fact that the fourteenth century figures and canopies in the east window of Gloucester Cathedral are more profusely and densely shaded than the pictures at Lichfield, and other examples might be adduced. Doubtless the effect of relief thus produced in these early works is very inferior to that in the Lichfield glass-paintings; but this, after all proper allowance has been made for the difference of material, is found to be due only to the greater skill and knowledge with which the shading in the later works is executed: the aggregate amount of obscuration is about the same in both instances. Nor, indeed, do the Renaissance glass paintings of this particular period, although so pictorial, and exhibiting such masses of shadow, at all suffer by comparison with the most brilliant mediæval examples. On the other hand, the comparative dulness of glass paintings of a later date, though scarcely attended by any corresponding advantage, proves that the obscuration of the material had reached its proper limit in such works as those now under consideration. That these glass-paintings also exhibit the greatest pictorial effect of which glass is legitimately susceptible, is manifest on comparing them both with earlier and later examples.

The radical error of the earlier works of the Renaissance is the complicated nature of their composition; that of the later is the complicated nature of their chiaroscuro; for to deal with either composition or chiaroscuro successfully would require resources not possessed by the glass-painter. His difficulties spring from the fewness of the glass colors, their uniform brightness, the impossibility of providing hues and tones to modify or unite them, and the imperfect means of imitating light and shade.

The evil attending the use of compositions too complicated is shown in the windows of King's College Chapel, Cambridge, and the east window of St. Margaret's Church, Westminster (D). These are mostly overcrowded with groups of figures extending backwards into the extreme distance, which is elevated to an absurd height in order to display them. The background occupies too large a proportion of the picture to admit of its being executed in the few retiring tints which glass supplies, without injury to the general coloring; other colors are therefore necessarily introduced, which come as forward as those in the foreground (E). The effect is flat and confused, however skilfully the light and shade may be managed. To a certain extent the same fault is observable in such of the glass paintings at Lichfield as exhibit groups of figures in the distance, and especially where the colors used are primary, or strongly contrasted.

We become only the more sensible of the disagreeable effect occasioned by the attempt to produce complicated chiaroscuro in painted glass, when contemplating the very works in which the experiment has been carried out with the most success, viz., those large pictures on glass, common towards the close of the last and at the commencement of the present century, which were faithfully copied from oil paintings especially remarkable for the breadth and variety of their light and shade. The glass, like the canvas, is shaded all over gradually from a point of light; but it is immediately perceived that an extensive mass of shadow in glass fails as an imitation of shade. It looks flat, dry, and even flimsy, and suggests rather the idea of a dirty window that has been sprinkled with drops of rain, than of clear immaterial gloom, such as is so well expressed by the shadow in an oil painting (F). To the same cause, the attempting too much in the way of chiaroscuro, may be traced the

dulness of almost all the glass paintings that were executed after the middle of the sixteenth century.

Subject to these introductory observations, I would invite attention to the manner in which the difficulties of the art have been met or evaded, and its resources developed, in the glass at Lichfield. Whether it was dictated by a profound knowledge of the material, or by timidity, by the influence of traditional rules, or by some happy chance, we must admit that the end proposed was admirably adapted to the means.

The picture is extremely simple in its composition, consisting of a foreground group, a landscape background of a sketchy character, and a clear blue sky. As a rule, it is represented as if seen through an architectural framework or canopy, which is more or less connected with the group by means of piers or columns introduced in the background. The whole is harmoniously colored upon a principle of relief and general resemblance to nature. The more positive colors, and those possessing the greatest degrees of depth, are confined to the foreground, being used in the group and in the ornaments of the architectural framework. The more qualified—the lighter shades and retiring tints—are employed in the background and sky. The architectural framework or canopy is composed principally of white glass shaded with brown, and enriched with yellow stain. It is adorned with garlands and other ornaments in which, as being the objects nearest the eye, the colors are with propriety harmoniously contrasted. In the group harmonious gradations of color occur, though on account of the nature of the material the harmony of contrast prevails. Its coloring is moreover so arranged that the eye is insensibly led up to some striking point or spot, produced by the decided introduction of one of the primary colors, or by a strong contrast, which gives life and spirit to the composition. In the distance and sky the harmony is that of gradation or resemblance. In general the most successful pictures are those in which the landscapes are wholly formed of different tints of grey, modified with brown shading and the yellow stain; for in these windows the space occupied by the landscape and sky is intentionally so confined by the architectural framework, or by some other means, as to prevent its color presenting too extensive a mass. The horizon is sometimes lighter, sometimes darker, but always

more solid in appearance than the sky, which is left clear and transparent, whilst the brilliancy of the landscape is necessarily more or less subdued by the enamel brown used in the drawing and shading. The architectural distances are generally rendered with much fidelity and consistency. They are worked out chiefly on white glass with drawing and shading, and the occasional addition of the yellow stain. To a certain extent the colors are united and brought together by the enamel brown with which the chiaroscuro of the picture is represented, but the harmony of the coloring depends principally on the skill shown in arranging the pieces of colored glass. It is true that all the colors used are very modified in their tone, more so indeed than those of any other period, but this has only rendered their harmonious disposition so much the less difficult.

In the subject of Christ before Pilate the harmony of coloring is effected principally by contrast. In the picture above it, Christ bearing the Cross, it is produced chiefly by gradation or resemblance. In the subject of the Day of Pentecost a curious example is afforded of gradation of color worked out very completely. One of the most beautiful, as well as most picturesque, of the architectural backgrounds is that in the Lord's Supper, in the east window.

The force and expression of the picture are of course chiefly given by its chiaroscuro. And, bearing in mind what has been said of the ill effect of very extensive masses of shade in painted glass, it is remarkable that here, as in the works generally of this period, the shadows are always confined within comparatively narrow limits. The chiaroscuro, though very powerful, is extremely simple. The requisite relief is imparted by means rather of strong but harmonious contrasts, than by gradations of light and shade.

The subjects are treated as if they were seen in the open air, whatever their situation may be. A point of light is barely if at all distinguishable. It is seldom that a figure, even in the rear of a group, is entirely in shade. The light is usually made to fall on all the figures alike, and the dark or shaded side of one figure is contrasted and relieved against the light side of the next. For the more extensive shadows necessary to give breadth and relief to the composition, recourse is had to the soffits or roofs of the architectural

framework, under or behind which the group is placed, and which are deeply shaded. A pillar, or other architectural accessory, is not unfrequently represented in shadow behind the group. The shaded soffit is contrasted with the clear sky and with the full light on the front of the architectural framework or canopy ; the shaded pillar or other accessory is contrasted with the landscape background, which is represented in full light, or with the sky. Instances of these various modes of producing relief by means of shadows of limited extent may be met with in nearly all these glass-paintings. The artifice is most shown in the subject of the Annunciation on the north side of the choir ; the principal mass of shadow here is on the roof of the apartment within which the scene occurs, and it is remarkable how small is the extent of its deepest part : the effectiveness may be readily estimated by covering this portion of the picture with a book or the hand. It is most concealed in the subjects of Christ before Pilate, and the Incredulity of St. Thomas. In the former, which is the most effective of all the pictures, there is an unusually large quantity of shade in the sunken arched panel which surmounts the lintel of the opening through which the group is viewed ; but it is so artfully disguised by means of the full lights introduced on the arabesques spread over the panel, and by their golden color, as not to catch the eye. In the latter subject there is not only the dark pillar in the background, but an accidental shadow is cast upon the tribune behind the group, the scroll work on the top of which comes darkly across and gives value to the bright landscape in the distance.

The result of these various expedients and contrivances has been the production of a series of pictures in painted glass, harmonious in their coloring, simple and intelligible in their composition, distinct and powerful in effect, yet always brilliant and translucent. They also display a very advanced state of art in the grouping and figure drawing, and, as works intended to be seen from a moderate distance, they are of unsurpassed merit. It is probable that if the three apsidal windows had been painted for the situation they now occupy, and of which so distant a view is obtainable, they would have been designed in a simpler and severer manner, more approaching the style of those most powerful and striking of glass-paintings, the windows

in the chapel of the Miraculous Sacrament and in the transepts at Brussels Cathedral (G).

I am aware that in this necessarily brief and imperfect statement I may have failed to do justice to the subject. My object is to induce that actual study of these windows at Lichfield which will supply all my deficiencies. Whilst examining them we must constantly bear in mind that, although they have hitherto fortunately escaped "restoration," they have suffered materially from three centuries of exposure to the weather. The whole outer surface of the glass has become corroded, by which not merely the high lights, but the unpainted parts, have been toned down and subdued, and thereby not only a flatter appearance has been imparted to the windows than they must have possessed when recently executed, but even much of the effect intended by the contrast of the clear brilliancy of the sky with the comparative obscurity of the painted figures, architecture, and landscape, has been lost.

Great however as these works are, they are objects of study, not of servile imitation. If ever the time come when the practice of glass-painting shall be taken up in England at the point where the Renaissance left it, even the best existing glass paintings will be found susceptible of improvement. No advance has been made beyond such productions as the Lichfield windows, except in some recently executed by the modern Munich school. That school, after nearly half a century spent in the consistent treatment of glass-painting as a branch of fine art, has lately abandoned the vicious practice of coloring glass with enamels, for the purer, though infinitely more difficult, method of the Renaissance, at the instance of those true patrons of the art who conceived and have carried out the greatest modern work of its kind, the adornment of Glasgow Cathedral with painted glass. The chief improvement displayed at Glasgow is the employment of many new and additional tints of colored glass, which have enabled the artists more easily to blend them, and to avoid repeating in the backgrounds the colors used in the foregrounds. The evil of this is seen in the tendency of some of the white objects in the Lichfield foregrounds to unite with the architectural distances. The avoidance of distant groups and of any strong contrasts of color in the backgrounds is also an improvement; and so is the occasional

enlivening of the horizons by the introduction of rosy tints, kept in their place by means of a blue enamel legitimately applied in the same way as the ordinary shading. Some of the figures are indeed noble works of art, but art has always characterised the Munich school. In coloring and power the Glasgow windows are inferior to those at Lichfield. Their material, like all ordinary modern glass, is comparatively flimsy, and its colors are crude; the general treatment also is rather of the kind suitable to fresco, which requires light colors and light shadows for effect at a distance, than that proper to a glass-painting, which, being by nature translucent, demands deep shadows and much powerful coloring to prevent its appearing weak. We must expect, however, that the Munich artists will rival the old glass in both particulars long before our glass painters can approach it in either, unless we renounce our practice of encouraging the production of works that will bear no comparison with the high standard we usually propose to ourselves in secular art (H). Archæology is not art, nor will a great artist ever condescend to become an archæological pedant. If we could transfer him from the influence of the art of the modern world to the exclusive study of some phase of mediæval art, we should only cramp his energies, and at best create a learned mannerist resembling a professor of religious painting in Russia.

Supplementary Notes.

A.—The Abbey of Herckenrode (equivalent to Herckenrood) seems to have been situate near the village of Hercken, in the ancient county of Loos, which in the seventeenth century became annexed to Liége. See Chronologie Historique des Comtes de Loos; Art de Vérifier les Dates, tom. iv., 254. Liége was annexed to France by the treaty of Luneville in 1801, after which the Abbey was probably dissolved. At the general peace the district became part of the kingdom of the Netherlands; and since the revolution in 1830 it has formed part of Belgium.

The circumstances which made Lichfield Cathedral the depository of these fine glass paintings are recorded in the following inscription in the east window of the south aisle of the choir:—

"Quæ in apsida vicina insunt, septem fenestræ picturatæ, cœnobio canonicorum Herckenrodensi quod olim exornaverant fœdissimè direpto atque diruto, novam, et, deo volente, stabiliorem sedem hàc ecclesiâ nactæ sunt; ope et consilio viri in omni judicio elegantissimi, Dom. Brooke

Boothby, de Ashburn aulâ in comitatu Derb. Baronetti: anno sacro MDCCCIII."

The following principal subjects are represented :—

The Resurrection and, in the distance, Christ appearing to Peter (dated 1538); Christ before Pilate (dated 1539); The Descent from the Cross and, in the distance, the Three Marys anointing the body; Christ bearing the Cross; the Incredulity of St. Thomas; the Day of Pentecost (dated 1534); the Day of Judgment; the Betrayal; the Triumphal Entry (dated 1538); the Last Supper and, in the distance, Christ washing the disciples' feet; the Lord's Supper and, in the distance, three small figures (dated 1537); the Ascension; the Annunciation and, in the distance, the meeting of Mary and Elizabeth (dated 1539); Christ crowned with Thorns and, in the distance, Christ buffeted by the soldiers; and the Flagellation.

The first four are in a window on the south side of the choir; the three following are in the next window; the next three in the southern apsidal window; the next two in the east window; and the next three in the northern apsidal window.

There are, besides, in the next window to the last, six smaller subjects representing benefactors to the Abbey (parts of larger subjects); and in the next are four other subjects similar to the last, but of larger size. The portrait in this window of the Cardinal de la Marck, Prince Bishop of Liege 1505—1538, much as it has suffered from time, shows to what extent direct imitation may be carried in glass-painting. The tracery lights of all these windows are filled with fragments of painted glass of the same period as the subjects, disposed in a kind of mosaic pattern. Much ingenuity has been exerted in fitting the glass-paintings to the widths of the present windows, and the mullions to the divisions of the glass. Each composition was originally designed to fill a space divided as now, by mullions, into three parts, for the areas occupied by the stone work are excluded from the designs, over which the mullions seem to pass, in the same manner as the horizontal saddle-bars. It may shock a modern architectural purist to find the mullions treated, according to their primary use, as mere uprights to support horizontal iron bars; but as they interfere with the glass composition scarcely more than upright iron bars would, the practice (which by the way dates from very early times) may be justified as a means of combining grandeur and breadth of effect in the glass painting with the construction of a Gothic building.

B.—This process is technically called the "mosaic method," in order to distinguish it from two other methods of painting glass, the "enamel," and "the mosaic enamel." A full description of each is given in "An Inquiry into the Difference of Style observable in Ancient Glass Paintings, especially in England; with Hints on Glass-Painting; by an Amateur. Parker, 1848."

The following account of the process may, however, not be unacceptable.

The foundation of a glass painting, executed according to the mosaic method, is a mosaic formed of pieces of white and colored glass nicely fitted together, by which the coloring of the intended picture is represented. If such a work were leaded together and put up in a window, without being touched with paint, it would then constitute a mere piece of colored glazing, and its harmony would depend on the good

quality of the colors used and the skilfulness of their arrangement. Such an appearance would of course be presented by any one of the Lichfield glass paintings, if all the chiaroscuro were cleaned off it. Whenever the limits of the pieces of glass happened to coincide with the outlines of the composition, some features of design would appear ; but, in general, little else would be recognised than unmeaning patches of color. Some of the draperies might be indicated, but many essential parts, such as heads, hands, feet, &c., might be altogether undefined. It is upon such a basis as this that the glass-painter works. He paints the chiaroscuro on the glass with an enamel color, usually called from its hue, "enamel brown," which is fixed to the glass by burning the latter in a kiln. The high lights are formed by leaving those parts of the glass where they occur free from enamel. The depth of the shadow depends on the density of the coat of enamel color which represents the shadow. There are two principal modes of applying the shading ; one, by simply smearing the enamel on the glass ; the other by stippling the coat whilst moist with a brush. The latter process (generally adopted in the Lichfield windows) was the later and improved invention ; by its means transparency is preserved even in the deepest shadows. The color of the shading, a rich cool brown, is always affected by the color of the particular piece of glass on which it is placed, which shows itself through the shadow, so powerfully as to make it appear as if the shadow was produced by deepening the local color. In the Lichfield windows, where only enamel brown is used for shading, no attempt is made to impart to reflected lights the color of the body causing the reflection. Nor would it be possible to modify the colors of the reflected lights by using other enamels than brown for shading, except where some particular local colors might happen to form the basis of the painting. The whole coloring of a glass-painting is so imperfect and conventional, that so minute a defect as this is overlooked. It should, however, be remembered that the very want of the power of closely imitating the hues of nature renders the creations of the glass-painter the more like works of monumental art, and requires appropriate treatment on his part to enable them to sustain that character. If we mention the "yellow stain," the means of removing the colored surface of "coated glass" so as to expose the substratum of white, and of obtaining a certain variety in the shade of color by choosing a piece of glass irregularly colored in its manufacture, we may be said to have recounted all the resources which the mosaic method places at the glass-painter's command : what may be achieved by such means in skilful hands is sufficiently shown by the specimens under consideration. There are satisfactory reasons for considering the mosaic method to be the true method of glass-painting ; and I am not aware of any modern improvement upon it except the occasional use, by the Munich glass-painters, of an enamel of a different color from brown for shading purposes.

The "enamel method" is the system most opposed to the "mosaic" in principle. In it the picture is painted upon white glass, as upon canvas, and entirely colored by means of enamel colors. Many more varieties and gradations of colors and tones can thus be produced than would be possible by the "mosaic method." But as, owing to technical difficulties which have hitherto proved insurmountable, glass colored with an enamel color is less transparent than glass colored in its manufacture, the use of the "enamel method" has been attended with so

great a diminution of the transparency and consequent vividness of the picture, as to expose its best specimens to an unfavorable comparison with even the inferior specimens of the "mosaic method."

For the same reason, the productions of the intermediate system, the "mosaic enamel," are inferior to those of the "mosaic." Although glass colored in its manufacture is used for some of the colors of the picture, it is found necessary to dull these parts down with enamel, in order to reduce their brilliancy to a level with that of the other parts of the work which are colored only with enamel colors.

C.—No one holds the earlier glass in greater respect than myself; without it we should not have had the cinque cento, which is the development of the older experience. But nothing can be less scientific or more ridiculous than the indiscriminate reproduction in modern works of the imperfections of the old.

D.—The contracts for the King's College Chapel windows, published in Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting, are dated 1526. It is my belief that the date of the window at St. Margaret's, Westminster, is about 1526. Mr. Scharf, in his excellent notes on the windows of King's College Chapel (see this Journal, vol. xii., p. 356, also vol. xiii., p. 45), which abound in valuable notices of Flemish glass-painters, attributes the Lichfield windows, on the authority of Mrs. Jameson, to Lambert Lombard of Liége, the master of Franz Floris commonly called the Flemish Raphael.

E.—An instance of this, which occurs in the east window of King's College Chapel, is thus noticed by Mr. Scharf, in this Journal, vol. xiii., p. 55. "One singular expedient (of preserving the balance of color) is worth mentioning. In the lower right-hand subject a mass of red was required against the extensive blue and green of the landscape. To afford this, a large patch of the landscape itself was colored bright red. At a distance it looks like a banner floating, but on closer inspection rocks and grass on it are distinctly visible."

F.—This results from the very nature of a transparent picture. The shadow painted upon glass is only a partial stopping out of the light, the rays of which are equally bright, however much diminished they may be in size by the smallness of the interstices in the coat of enamel through which they find their way. A similar appearance may be noticed in line engravings, though not so easily, partly owing to their small size as compared with a glass-painting, but principally because the rays of light are there modified by being reflected from an opaque surface, instead of coming directly to the eye from the source of light, as in a glass-painting. In an oil-painting the rays, besides being reflected, usually pass through some medium which is not perfectly transparent.

G.—The dates of these windows, as appearing on the glass, and as given by Lévy (Histoire de la Peinture sur Verre, Bruxelles, 1860), vary from 1537 to 1547. The second window from the east, in the chapel, is proved by this author to have been designed (and he adds, executed) by Bernard van Orley, whom he conjectures, and with reason, to have designed the two transept windows. The fourth window from the east, in the chapel, appears, from the same authority, to have been designed by Michael van Coxie, and executed by Jean Haecht of Antwerp. Van Coxie is also stated to have designed another, and Haecht (or, as it is sometimes spelt, Ack) to have executed two other of the chapel windows.

These works are remarkable for a simplicity of design, with a vigor and

breadth of treatment worthy of authors who were disciples of Raphael. Intended for distant effect, they are, perhaps, less delicate and refined than the Lichfield windows, though entirely free from any imputation of coarseness. The groups are less crowded, and the figures, instead of being much under life-size, exceed it by several inches. The pictures resemble those at Lichfield in the use made of architectural accessories as an additional means of simple but powerful effects of light and shade, and also in the principle of their coloring, which is in entire harmony with the chiaroscuro of the composition, instead of being uncomformable with, or even opposed to it, as in earlier examples. The architectural frame which supports the groups and regulates the extent of the background is simple and grand in design. In the transept windows it is in the form of a pavilion, having an arched roof on piers, within which is the group consisting of the kneeling figures of the donors supported by their patron saints. In the chapel windows similar pavilions are used alternately with loggias, or double colonnades. All these are of two stories; the upper is occupied with the figures representing an incident of the legend, the lower with the effigies of the donors and their patron saints. The perspective is modified so as to avoid the occurrence of unpleasing angles in the upper parts of the composition; and for the sake of picturesqueness the chief point of sight is a little removed from the middle to the side of the window. The figures are in strong but simple light and shade; the soffits of the arches and roofs, and the further row of piers and columns, are in deep shade. A landscape is properly dispensed with, since its appearance would be inconsistent with such an elevated position above the eye as is by the perspective shown to be occupied by the group, and the architecture and figures are represented as if they were seen in relief against a clear blue sky. The extensive mass of white which the architecture presents (tinted, however, with the shading and drawing upon it and enriched with the yellow stain) imparts, as at Lichfield, great value to the other colors. Garlands and other ornaments are used, the colors of which, when occurring in large quantities, are qualified and harmoniously graduated; positive colors and strong contrasts being usually confined to the smaller accessories. The group is colored generally on the same principle which prevails at Lichfield; the more powerful and positive tints predominate, and are arranged so as to lead up to some striking point or spot of color. In one of the windows, the first from the east in the chapel, the subordinate figures are rendered less conspicuous by the introduction of much white in the draperies. The sky was originally many degrees paler and less positive than the blue used in other parts of the picture, being rather warm grey than blue. That it was intended, as at Lichfield, to relieve the more positively and deeply colored, and comparatively more solid, figures and architecture, is shown by the placing of blue draperies immediately against it. In consequence, however, of a most unfortunate and injurious "restoration" which within the last fourteen years has befallen these windows (in course of which a large proportion of the original glazing has either been altogether removed, on the pretext of being disfigured with cracks, and supplied by modern glass, or toned down with an enamel color) the skies, for the most part, have been obscured, their color also deepened and rendered more positive, to the manifest deterioration of the relief of the pictures. The upper subject, indeed, of one of the chapel windows appears almost as if it had been painted on a blue ground. Ignorance of the

extent of the restoration has probably betrayed some writers into the assertion that these windows are in character flat, like the mediæval. Before their restoration they were no flatter than those at Lichfield, and it is a proof of the intrinsic excellence of their design that, notwithstanding the injury they have sustained, they still occupy the first rank amongst glass paintings of the more powerful and effective class. The most striking is, perhaps, the second of the chapel windows from the east, the design of Bernard van Orley, principally on account of the varied and vigorous action of the groups. At a distance, however, it is less broad in effect than the fourth window from the east.

H.—We hope that the projected annual exhibitions of "stained glass" at South Kensington may in course of time exercise a beneficial influence on the practice of glass-painting in this country. The present exhibition shows the deficiencies of our native artists, and how much they have to learn before they can compete successfully with foreign schools. Whether a demand for painted windows of a high class will ever be created sufficient to induce our best artists to direct their attention to the subject, may be doubted. The praiseworthy efforts made at Glasgow and at St. Paul's Cathedral are, it is to be feared, efforts, which for the present must necessarily be responded to by foreign artists who have devoted their attention to the finest examples of glass-painting. It cannot be supposed that a committee of management appointed by any body of subscribers will ever entertain the notion of educating a school of glass-painters. Their duty is simply to seek out and employ those whose works offer the best guarantee of ability to execute fresh commissions. Nor are they likely, if they have the interests of their constituents at heart, to submit to the guidance of any artist, however distinguished, who is wholly inexperienced in respect of glass-painting. The most important recent work, designed by a late eminent Royal Academician, demonstrates that glass-painting has conditions affecting the very nature of the composition, which must be thoroughly comprehended before a satisfactory result can be attained.

Whilst the foregoing pages were in the press and after they had received the author's revision, the painful intelligence of his sudden decease reached us. This sad event, full of anguish to those who best knew the excellent and amiable qualities of our lamented friend, claims our most hearty condolence. All who enjoyed his kindly intercourse, who were familiar with his generous disposition, his accomplished taste and attainments in a department of art which none had so successfully pursued as himself, will deeply deplore the loss of such a genial spirit. We must cherish the memory of the friend taken from us in the fresh energy of life, and of his wonted interest in our common pursuits—of one who was ever foremost in bygone years to impart the knowledge which he acquired, or to contribute to our gratification.