

THE ANCIENT WINDOWS OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE CHAPEL, CAMBRIDGE

By BERNARD RACKHAM

Everyone knows that two Cambridge colleges, Christ's and St. John's, were founded by Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby, the widowed mother of Henry VII ; the older of the two colleges, Christ's, was chosen by Lady Margaret to be the residence in which she spent her last days and died in 1509. It may not be known to those not fully acquainted with Cambridge history that Christ's College is a re-foundation of a pre-existing college, Godshouse, which was first founded by William Bingham, Rector of St. John Zachary, London, in 1442, and re-founded in 1448 by Royal Charter of Henry VI. Bingham's college began its existence in houses already standing on a site now occupied by King's College ; this site is covered by the middle portion of King's Chapel and the adjacent part of the First Court. In 1443, a year after the foundation of Godshouse, the buildings were surrendered to the king to make room for his own new college, and a fresh site was acquired outside the Barnwell Gate, the site now occupied by the college to which, on its second re-foundation, Lady Margaret gave the name of Christ's ; this re-foundation dates from 1506, the year in which the college received its new statutes in pursuance of the Letters Patent of Henry VII granted in the previous year.

Ancient stained glass is now to be seen in four windows of the college chapel. It has been the subject of brief mention in several works and of a lengthy description in the *Christ's College Magazine*. It is my purpose to discuss these remnants of old glass and to examine what has been published as to the figures which are their most conspicuous features.

It is first necessary to consider the date of the chapel building itself. The late Dr. A. H. Lloyd, in his book *The Early History of Christ's College, Cambridge*, was the first to point out, and to point out convincingly, that the present chapel does not date from the re-foundation by Lady Margaret, but is essentially the chapel of Godshouse, erected after the transfer of the college from its first home on the site where King's College now stands. Dr. Lloyd argues for its erection when John Sycling was head of the college, with the title of Proctor (1490-1506), or possibly under the earlier proctorship of William Basset, who resigned his post in 1477. It seems certain that some at least of the surviving stained glass dates from the time when the building was the chapel of Godshouse, before the re-naming as Christ's College by Lady Margaret in 1506. The building has of course undergone great alterations in details of structure and internal fittings since it was erected ; the college building accounts give evidence of extensive works done in 1510, to say nothing of drastic changes at several later times. The stonework of the windows as we now see it appears to be modern ; the original mullions

were discarded when the chapel was remodelled—'rebeautified'—in 1702-3; some were discovered in 1899 to have been used, laid horizontally one above another, for blocking the window in the south wall of the chapel which ceased to have a purpose when the end wall of the Master's Lodge was built immediately next to it. The east window was reconstructed in 1847, when a glass-painting of the Crucifixion was inserted in memory of a Fellow of the college, Richard Burney, who died two years before. This window in turn, showing signs of decay, was removed in 1912; the tracery was reconstructed and the now existing stained glass was inserted in memory of the late Master, Dr. John Peile, from a design by the late Sir William Nicholson, one of the Beggarstaff Brothers (not to be confused with the glass-painter Archibald Nicholson).

The ancient glass is now gathered together in the four windows on the north side of the chapel. Each window is divided by mullions into three lights; a figure-panel has been placed in the middle light of each of the first three and in each light of the fourth window; in two of the windows royal badges and other decorations occupy the spaces above and below the figures. The figure-panels obviously belonged originally to two different series, one, which I believe to be the earlier in date, having figures on a larger scale than the other. The first two windows (approached from the west) have each one large figure, the third a small one, and the fourth two small figures and one large. The figure in the middle light of the second window is much mutilated and made up with fragments not originally belonging to it; the remaining five are each represented as being in a recess flanked by columns. The two un mutilated larger figures have behind them a brocaded curtain hung tautly from a decorated beam at the height of the shoulders, above which are seen two columns with three mullioned and quarry-paned windows in the intervals behind them.

In the case of the three smaller figures there is no continuous hanging, and the recess is depicted more clearly in perspective, as if it were an apsidal chapel of half-hexagonal plan, the middle bay of each being closed with a brocade curtain above which, in two cases, hangs a shallow domed canopy or baldacchino; the masonry in the form of tracery which takes the place of this canopy in the first of the small-scale panels is of contemporary work, but probably an insertion to make good a breakage. This first panel also is the only one which shows what was doubtless a feature of all three—a mullioned window seen at a raking angle on both sides (instead of the left side only, as in the two other remaining panels of this series). It will be noticed that the mullions are traversed by a transom, a feature of English Perpendicular which is, I believe, without parallel in contemporary windows on the Continent. I think there can be no doubt that the two series of panels are not contemporaneous, and that the small-scale series is slightly more recent than the large-scale. In this conclusion I find I have been anticipated by Dr. Lloyd; it is, I believe, borne out, as I shall explain, by the content of the designs.

Before dealing with the identity of the persons represented in the windows it will be well to recount what has been recorded as to the history of the windows. Standard books on stained glass have little or nothing to say about them; Westlake makes no mention of them whatever, and Dr. Philip Nelson, in his *Ancient Painted Glass in England*, merely records, in his alphabetical list arranged by counties, under the heading 'Cambridge, Christ's College'—'There is some interesting glass in the Chapel'. For the earliest reference to the windows known to me I am indebted to Mr. E. A. R. Rahbula; he kindly drew my attention to an account given by Francis Blomefield in *Collectanea Cantabrigiensi*, published in 1751. It reads as follows: 'In the North Vestry Windows, are the Effigies of Henry VII and his Mother, the Countess of Derby and Richmond, the Foundress of this and St. John's College, with Edmund de Hadham alias Teudor, Earl of Richmond, her first Husband, and Thomas Stanley Earl of Derby, her 2nd Husband, in Armour, with their Helmets by them; also John Beaufort Duke of Somerset, her Father, and Margaret Daughter of Thomas Holland Earl of Kent, her Mother; but they are now broken and misplaced, and the Inscriptions spoil'd. This may still be read,

'Komitissa Rychemondie et Derbei . . . tis pro quibus . . . suo verbo . . . tam Magni . . .'

The next reference is that of Lysons, published in 1810; he tells us briefly that 'In the east window of the chapel are portraits of King Henry VII and some others of the family of the foundress'.

In 1861 C. H. Cooper, in his *Memorials of Cambridge*, states that the east window of the chapel 'is filled with ancient glass representing the Crucifixion. This window was formerly occupied with the portraits in stained glass of the foundress, her father and mother, her son king Henry VII, and her husbands the earls of Richmond and Derby. These are still preserved, and it is intended to place them in the other windows of the chapel'. Willis and Clark, in Vol. 2 of their *Architectural History of the University of Cambridge*, published in 1886, give a citation from the college accounts, dated 4th May, 1703; the entry reads: 'Paid Phillip Prigg in full for Glazing the Inner and outward Chappel, [£] 51. 03. 00'. They also give information as to the Crucifixion window which, as we have seen, Cooper, writing in 1861, strangely spoke of as of ancient glass; they state: 'The glass in the east window was given in 1847 by Miss Caroline Burney in memory of her brother, Richard Burney, M.A., formerly Fellow Commoner. It was executed by Messrs. Clutterbuck of London, in imitation of old Flemish glass. Before this time the original four-centred window had been made to consist of a centre light with a semicircular head, with a lower square-headed light on each side, by filling in the arch with brickwork; and a semicircular pediment of wood . . . obscured the lower third of it'. A footnote to this passage records that 'a view of this state is given by Ackermann, ii, 50. The stained glass, representing the Foundress, her son Henry VII

and others of her family, had evidently been brought from elsewhere'.

Next in order we have the article I have already mentioned, in the *Christ's College Magazine*, Vol. I, no. 2, 1886, by Professor J. H. Middleton, entitled 'The old glass of the Chapel'; this is reprinted in *Christ's College of former days*, edited by my late brother, Harris Rackham, published in 1939. The article gives a detailed account of the windows as they now survive, of which all I need say is that I am unable to agree in certain particulars with the identification of the figures. Professor Middleton begins by referring to 'the newly rediscovered pieces of stained glass', a phrase which can be explained from another article, dated 1899, reprinted from the Magazine in the same book; this is on 'The Decoration of the Chapel' and is by the then Master, Dr. John Peile. Dr. Peile states that 'Some really fine old glass, coeval with the College, was taken out [in 1847] to make room for Miss Burney's window: it was put into a box and remained there till 1886, when it was placed in the north windows of the chapel, where it still remains: its earliest place is uncertain; I do not believe that it originally belonged to the east window: it was probably put there in 1702'. In his book entitled *Christ's College*, published in 1900, Dr. Peile briefly refers again to the windows; he speaks of certain 'payments for stained glass in the windows, of which some lights survive, few, but of excellent quality'. Again, he writes of alterations then recently made: 'The top of the 1702 reredos has been replaced: it had been removed in 1848 to exhibit better Miss Burney's painted glass, which (not quite unfortunately) is a gradually fading memorial'. Miss Burney's Crucifixion window is seen in Plate V of Dr. Peile's book, and I can testify from my own recollections to the shabby condition to which it had already been reduced a few years earlier.

Reverting to Professor Middleton's article we find he mentions the name of a glazier, Thomas Peghe, as receiving payments in 1510 for making consecration crosses at the hallowing of the chapel: this would be in connection with Lady Margaret's refoundation of the college. He implies, and reasonably, that it was this Thomas Peghe also who made the original windows. It is to be noted that Professor Middleton makes no reference at all to Blomefield or any other earlier accounts of the glass. As to its first location, he says it 'seems to have been made for the small windows in the two north transepts'. He continues: 'Judging from its style, it was probably made at the time of the consecration of the chapel in 1510. It appears to be all of one date, or nearly so, though it is the work of two, or perhaps three, different glass-painters'.

Lastly, in our survey of the literature of the subject, we come to Dr. Lloyd's book on the early history of the college. He has a brief mention of the glass in which he writes: 'Of the six panels of ancient glass now to be found in the north windows of the chapel, it would seem probable that while the three smaller figures in oratories are of the 1510 period, the three larger ones are part of the old glass inserted in the

Godshouse chapel and used again in 1510'. He is referring to an entry in the college accounts for 29 March, 1510, quoted by him on an earlier page. This entry reads: 'To Thomas Peghe glasier for $\frac{xx}{vii}$ xv fotes di' of glasse with Imagerie at xijd the fote viij li xv s vj d. Item to the same for settinge up all the old glasse in the chapell by hymselffe and his servant by viij dais at vjd the day viijs'.

I think this entry makes it quite clear that new panels with figures were provided in 1510 by Thomas Peghe, and that at the same time pre-existing glass made for the building as the chapel of Godshouse was used afresh in whatever reconstruction of the windows was then undertaken as part of the general rearrangement of the building. The still surviving panels give us undoubtedly samples of both classes of glass-painting. Their original location is uncertain, but it seems likely that some of them may have been in the windows of what was later used as the vestry, on the north side of the chapel where, according to Blomefield, old glass was to be seen in 1751. There are indications, as I shall presently suggest, that one of the figures had its original place in the east window of the chapel itself.

We may now pass to an examination of the six figures represented. Taking first the larger series, we find in the middle light of the second window a bearded figure vested in a blue cope or mantle over an alb, and a kind of mitre or domed crown encircled with oval ornaments (Pl. XI B). Like the two other large-scale figures, this one is truncated slightly above the knee level; it has been much damaged and repaired by the insertion of incongruous fragments, notably what seems to be a pastoral staff with foliated head and twisted stem with a vexillum or handkerchief attached; this staff at a rapid glance has the deceptive appearance of a sceptre held in the right hand of the figure, but nearer inspection shows that the right arm is bent inwards and the hand is raised in the gesture of benediction; the left hand, which may perhaps not have belonged originally to the figure, supports an open book. Above the figure are mutilated remains of an elaborate crocketed canopy. The leading shows quite clearly that the glass originally filled a pointed light enclosed upwards by tracery with strongly projecting cusps; this is a feature of which I shall have more to say. Everything beyond this cusped outline is a jumble of fragments from other places; they include, on the right, two crowns side by side and upside down, of the kind normally employed, in alternation with lengths of plain coloured glass, to fill the borders of lights about the middle of the 15th century and later. Below these, on the right again, are remnants of another canopy with large-scale foliated crockets and horizontal mouldings behind them. The finial and mouldings on the left seem to belong to the panel from which the figure came.

Professor Middleton strangely identified this figure as St. Gregory, although he makes no comment on the appropriateness of this saint to the chapel. He was misled by the head-dress which he describes as

' the papal tiara, treated in an early fashion, with only one crown '. He seems to have overlooked the fact that the halo behind the tiara is ornamented with a foliated cross and rays. Now this cruciform halo is, I believe, confined from the earliest times to figures of Christ or the other two persons of the Trinity. I think therefore it may be taken as almost certain that we have here a figure of the Almighty ; such a figure would be entirely appropriate in a chapel window of William Bingham's foundation of Godshouse.¹ The obvious place for this figure would have been in the middle of the east window, and the shape of the cusped head of the panel as it was originally seems to me to indicate that the window was quite different in form from that as now restored ; it had main lights shaped at the top like a spade in a pack of cards.

There is, however, a point which seems to call for explanation : the figure of God is inclined slightly to one side, not facing full front as might be expected. This circumstance caused me to consider whether we have here the Second Person of the Trinity from a window of three or five lights showing all three persons ; the large-scale canopy fragment with horizontal mouldings, now in the right-hand part of the panel, might in this case conceivably have belonged to the middle light, devoted to God the Father. The only example known to me in glass-painting in which the Trinity is depicted is at Holy Trinity, Goodramgate, York ; here, although all three Persons are in human form and similarly robed, in a mantle or cope and a crown with high point, Christ is shown with bare blood-stained body under His mantle and has a wreath of thorns woven round His crown. In a French representation of the Trinity, however, in a fifteenth-century MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, all three persons are exactly similar as regards their vesture ; all wear a white robe under a single mantle that enfolds the shoulders of all three together ; in this instance the Father looks straight forward and supports a large open book on His knees. The Son raises His right hand in benediction, as in the figure in the Christ's College window, whilst the third Person holds a royal orb ; the two outer figures are half turned towards the middle one. There is, however, one consideration against an identification of our figure with any but the First Person : the face is that of an aged man. The left hand, which seems almost certainly to " belong " to the right hand, holds a book opened as if for reading, instead of the orb which would rather have been expected, but this is to some extent paralleled by the large book displayed by the Father in the Paris miniature.

There is yet another point which calls for explanation—the sideways glance to the right of the figure ; this may perhaps be held to argue that the figure was originally accompanied, in the adjoining light of the

¹For comparison it is worth while to refer to contemporary or slightly earlier figures of St. Gregory at Canterbury (north-west transept) and Great Malvern ; also to that of the Almighty in the Death of the Virgin window, of the Cologne School, recently put up in the chapel of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

window to the right, by a person kneeling in adoration; this would almost certainly involve a companion figure in the opposite flanking light who might conceivably have been a patron saint. The question obviously arises whether these requirements are supplied by the two other large-scale figures which survive in the windows, but we are compelled to answer in the negative in view of the fact that both these figures are standing, not kneeling.

The large figure in the middle light of the fourth window (Pl. XII B) presents no difficulties of identification: it is obviously St. Edward the Confessor, as he is shown repeatedly in Westminster Abbey; he holds in his left hand a sceptre, and in his right the ring he gave to St. John in the guise of a pilgrim. The well-known legend is recounted in full by Professor Middleton in his article on the glass; he draws attention to the fact that King Edward is depicted as a handsome youth with flowing hair, not a bearded man as at Westminster, and, I may add, as in the Wilton Diptych. Professor Middleton explains the presence of this saint as being one of the avowries or patrons of Henry VII. If this explanation is accepted it would bring the date of this earlier series of panels within the reign of Henry VII, that is, after 1485, and on stylistic grounds this seems probable. This would rule out the possibility that these glass-paintings could date from the proctorship of William Bassett, who resigned in 1477—even if the chapel itself could have been erected so early, which Dr. Lloyd regarded as not out of the question.

The third large figure (Pl. XI A) is that of a king, youthful and beardless, in the middle light of the first window. He is crowned, and wears a red mantle and ermine tippet over a blue tunic; he holds the royal orb and sceptre. A comparison with the figure of the Confessor shows at once that both are based on a single cartoon, in accordance with an economical practice which was common in glass-painting at least as early as the thirteenth century; there can be no doubt also that both figures are painted by a single hand. Whether this is true of the figure of God the Father also is an open question, although the same cartoon seems to have done duty here also; it was doubtless the difference in style of rendering the features in this figure which prompted Professor Middleton, as we have seen, to surmise that the work of three different hands may perhaps be recognised in the surviving glass, in spite of the fact that he considered all six panels to be of the same date.

This figure is regarded by Professor Middleton as 'perhaps intended to represent Henry VI'; this identification is accepted by Dr. Lloyd in the title to the frontispiece of his book in which the panel is reproduced, and I think there can be no doubt that Dr. Lloyd is right. A portrait of Henry VI as second founder of Godshouse must surely have had a place in the windows. The presence of this portrait may also be held to bear on the date of the glass, for it may be questioned whether its introduction would have been considered politic in the reign of Edward IV,



A. KING HENRY VI



B. THE ALMIGHTY

ANCIENT WINDOWS OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE CHAPEL, CAMBRIDGE

(Photos : Royal Commission on Historical Monuments. Crown Copyright ; reproduced by permission of H.M. Stationery Office.)



A. HENRY VI



B. HENRY VII, ST. EDWARD THE CONFESSOR, AND ELIZABETH OF YORK
ANCIENT WINDOWS OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE CHAPEL, CAMBRIDGE

(Photos : Royal Commission on Historical Monuments. Crown Copyright ; reproduced by permission of H.M. Stationery Office.)

or until the Lancastrian cause had returned to favour by the accession to the throne of Henry VII.

We now pass to the three small-scale panels. That which is set in the middle light of the third window (Pl. XIII A) is a king kneeling in prayer, whose identity is left unstated by Professor Middleton; but I think he also may be accepted as Henry VI, both from the similarity of his features to those of the larger king in the first window, and because his figure would have been considered appropriate in any new series introduced in the time of Lady Margaret, or by her wish. There is abundant evidence of the veneration in which she held the memory of her uncle; in the licence granted to her by her son for the foundation of Christ's College mention is made of the sincere love which she bears to his great uncle Henry VI.

The figure in the left-hand light of the fourth window (Pl. XIII B) is undoubtedly Henry VII, as has been recognised by several of the writers who have mentioned the glass; his features are unmistakable. The companion figure of a lady, in the right-hand light, has hitherto been accepted without question as his mother, Lady Margaret. I am inclined to doubt this identification, and to suggest that she is his queen, Elizabeth of York. Anyone unacquainted with the checkered history of the windows, and supposing that the present disposition of the panels is original, might argue that no female figure other than that of a wife would normally occupy such a position in relation to a male figure; it is unnecessary to labour this point, but the argument is irrelevant in view of the facts. It has been claimed that the coronet instead of an arched royal crown is against identification as a queen, but just such a coronet is worn by Queen Elizabeth Woodville in the very slightly earlier Royal Window at Canterbury (Pl. XIII B).

My plea in favour of Elizabeth of York is based solely on likeness; I have compared this face with portraits of Elizabeth and of Lady Margaret, such as the paintings in the National Portrait Gallery and in the hall of Christ's College, as well as the bronze effigies on the tombs in Westminster Abbey; there is also the tapestry in St. Mary's Hall, Coventry, showing Henry VII and Elizabeth in the midst of a large assemblage of courtiers and others. In all these the queen is shown as a young middle-aged woman with somewhat full features like those in our glass-painting; in all the portraits of Lady Margaret she is shown as an elderly woman with long narrow nose and sunken cheeks—she was 44 when her son came to the throne and nearly 70 at the presumed date of this glass-painting. It is true that a close degree of likeness is not necessarily to be expected in stained glass, but the figures of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville at Canterbury show what could be achieved in this medium.

We must now consider again what the literature of the subject has to say. Blomefield in 1751 speaks of remnants of inscription with the name of Lady Margaret and her title as Countess of Richmond and

Derby ; but he speaks also of glass now no longer existing as being in evidence at that time—a second female figure (that of Lady Margaret's mother, Margaret Holland Duchess of Somerset), as well as no less than three male figures—two of Lady Margaret's husbands and her father, for it is, I am sure, impossible that Blomefield could have mistaken for these persons any of the four male figures besides Henry VII which are now in the windows. He mentions expressly that the husbands are shown with their helmets by them (just as Henry VII still has his helmet on a pedestal behind him) ; and this applies to none of the surviving figures except Henry VII ; the royal crown worn by the small-scale kneeling figure which I have identified as Henry VI makes it unlikely that this figure could have been mistaken by Blomefield for John Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, Lady Margaret's father. It is therefore clear that much of the glass Blomefield saw is no longer in the chapel, and that some of the panels now to be seen there were unknown to him, probably then stored in packing-cases. It seems highly probable that a figure of Elizabeth of York would have been included in the windows of the chapel at the time of its rearrangement as the chapel of the new foundation ; I feel it is not impossible that a figure of this queen may have been among those existing in 1751 unknown to Blomefield, and that the Lady Margaret mentioned by him (assuming him to have been right in his identifications) may have shared the fate of her mother and the male figures now lost. A parallel case of disappearance is recorded in the late Canon Hutchinson's book on the glass of All Souls College, Oxford, whence three archbishops were lost between 1786 and 1855.¹

Besides the six figure-panels a few other remnants of ancient glass have been inserted in two of the windows to fill spaces in the upper parts of the lights. Above the figure of the Confessor is a large quarry pane with the portcullis badge of the Tudors. In each of the lights with small-scale figures a panel has been placed with a rose under a crown, in a lobed white medallion with coloured border set against a ground-work of diaper under a flattened cusped arch supported on squat columns. In the light with the small figure of Henry VI it is the red rose of Lancaster ; the medallion has a green edging and the ground against which it is set is deep purple. In the lights with Henry VII and his companion it is in both cases a red-and-white Tudor rose ; the medallion in one case is edged with blue and the background is murrey, with a lozenge diaper, in the other the edging of the medallion is amber-coloured and the background pale green with a leafy brocade diaper. The flanking columns in one panel are twisted, in the other faceted, in accordance with the architectural fashions of the period, not peculiar to England.

¹ F. E. Hutchinson, *Medieval Glass at All Souls College*, London, 1949, p. 55.

It may be of interest finally to compare the Christ's College glass with other similar work of the period. The introduction into windows of portrait figures of donors and others was no novelty, but it is only about the middle of the fifteenth century that we find such figures represented not against a formal decorative background, but as if kneeling or standing in an actual building. With the advance of time this setting becomes steadily more realistic in treatment. The earliest surviving examples are perhaps in France, the figures of the dukes and duchesses of Anjou, in the north transept of Le Mans Cathedral, in front of curtains hanging from rings; they can be dated apparently some time between 1466 and 1488. In England we have the north-west transept window at Canterbury, with kneeling figures of Edward IV and his family; in their case the curtains behind them hang flat, from a crested beam, without any suggestion of folds. This Canterbury window is almost certainly a work of the King's Glazier in London, and can be dated almost beyond doubt 1482. Next we have the great window in St. Mary's Hall, Coventry, with seven figures of Kings of England, erected probably quite early in the reign of Henry VII; the kings are shown standing, with curtains behind them hanging from a beam as in the Canterbury window, but in this case with a slight suggestion of hanging loose from points of attachment, not stretched taut. The figures of Edward the Confessor and St. John in the apse clerestory windows of Westminster Abbey, which must date from about the same period, show a more realistic treatment; here there are curtains hanging loose in folds from rings attached to a rod. The Westminster figures are now defective, and those at Canterbury doubtless had originally some sort of canopy, now lost; but at Coventry we find a close parallel to the treatment of the smaller series of figures at Christ's: the figures stand each under a round fringed canopy suspended below vaults of masonry. Fringed canopies are also a feature of the east window of Little Malvern Priory Church, dedicated about 1481 by Bishop Alcock, with portraits of Edward IV and his family; at Great Malvern there is a similar setting again for the portraits of Arthur Prince of Wales and others, which Mr. Rushforth has shown to date from the end of 1501 or the beginning of the following year.

The question arises as to the authorship of the designs. We know that in 1505 Barnard Flower, a German, was appointed to be King's Glazier, and to him and his successor are due the windows of King's College Chapel; these exhibit already the introduction into England from abroad of new fashions in glass-painting, a thoroughgoing pictorial treatment and Renaissance fashions in accessories. The extent of the change of style can best be appreciated if the King's Chapel windows are compared with those at Great and Little Malvern; the Malvern glass is doubtless the product of a local workshop, and exhibits English traditions without any trace of foreign influence. The panels at Christ's are likely to be products of the Royal workshop, but even the later,

small-scale panels show no signs of Renaissance idioms such as would be expected after the appointment of Flower¹ ; as we have seen, it was in 1510, that is, five years after Flower's arrival, that the glazier Thomas Peghe was paid for re-glazing the chapel, partly with old glass and partly with newly designed figures. The explanation may be that, although the work on the windows was not completed till 1510, the commission for the new figures (the small-scale series) may have been given and the designs made in 1505, as soon as Lady Margaret obtained a licence from Henry VII for the refoundation of the College.

To sum up, it seems to me that the glass now remaining in the chapel belongs to two different periods : the earlier panels date from the early part of the reign of Henry VII and were made for the windows of Godshouse ; the later panels were executed some time between 1505 and 1510, when the chapel was rearranged and reconsecrated to serve the new foundation of Lady Margaret Beaufort. The present middle light of the second window, with the figure of the Almighty, provides evidence that the east window of the chapel was originally different in the form of its tracery from that now existing. Both the earlier and the later series of panels exhibit the style of the royal workshop in London carrying on the English tradition, as yet uninfluenced by the change of style when Barnard Flower was appointed to direct it. As regards the persons represented, apart from the figures of the Almighty and of the Confessor, we have portraits of Henry VI twice over, of Henry VII and of his Queen, Elizabeth of York. In spite of their fragmentary condition, the panels are noteworthy, both for the portraits contained and as examples of the latest Gothic glass-painting in England.

¹ There is, however, Renaissance ornament in a fragment inserted as a patch near the right lower corner of the panel with the figure of the Almighty.