KING'S COLLEGE CHAPEL WINDOWS, CAMBRIDGE.

"Lucem tuam da nobis, o Deus."

Motto of the Company of Glaziers and Painters on Glass, Incorporated 1637.[1]

In hot climates the window proper—that is, the window for admitting light—is, and ever was, a mere germ.

So manifestly is this the case, that it has led some of our writers to reflect too hastily upon the ancients. Thus, Mr. Hope blames them for "not admitting the light;" and Hallam wonders that "with all their wisdom they overlooked the window."

But the truth is, the inhabitants of those countries where architecture was born, did not want windows in the sunny climate of the south, and therefore instinctively kept them small and subordinate. The window was never a feature of ancient architecture: Vitruvius does not name it, though he describes both the door and the ventilator.[2] Much the same may be said of the countries in question at this day; their window, if enlarged at all, is enlarged for the purpose of admitting air rather than light, heavily trelissed, and seldom occupied by glass.

Here, on the other hand, owing to the necessities of a northern latitude, the window is at once large, serial, and ornamental; perhaps the most striking feature of our architecture.

It would be an instructive study to trace the history of the window step by step, from the classical through the Byzantine, to the Gothic styles, observing how it has continually increased in size and importance as a medium of light, according to the isothermal line, or in other words, according to the necessities of climate; but our present business lies rather with another element entering into the

[1] Maitland's London. Fol. p. 1246.

[2] "Lumen hypætri" which Wilkins renders, "the space intended to be left open to the air;" and explains in a note as "that part of the door which was hypæthral, or exposed to the air." Vitruv. Wilkins, p. 81.

calculation here. Our Gothic windows would never have grown to such dimensions but for the discovery, or at least the increased use of *glass*.

While a northern latitude demanded light, it demanded also a protection from the storm.

Our ancestors, therefore, so long as glass was unattainable, very wisely contented themselves with lofty and widely splayed, but narrow windows.

It was only with the freer use of glass, first as a protection, and then as an ornament—a surface for the display of taste—that the window expanded, embracing mullion after mullion, until, at length, in the Perpendicular period, we have almost a wall of glass, as in the noble specimen under consideration.[3]

But, besides this general ground of interest, as a piece of fenestral work, the windows of King's have some intrinsic and *peculiar* claims to attention.

The pictures they contain are the original glazing of the chapel; they are well preserved and intelligible; they are extensive, varied, and complete, a thing very rare in this or any other land. They belong to the last style of glass; and since all the preceding styles were executed upon the same essential principles, these windows serve as a specimen of all.

They were painted at a period when the "Ars Vitraria" had attained its perfection, that is to say, when it exhibited grand and instructive designs without tampering with the nature of any of its materials.

And lastly, as this is the latest example of a style of glass, ere the degeneracy or rather eclipse commenced, we may take it to be the best in the eyes of the latest professed masters, who, in forming it, deliberately laid aside the older and more conventional styles, for this free and pictorial one. Such are some of the interesting points of the windows before us.

Let us enter a little more into detail on a few of them.

With regard to the *history* of these windows, we possess

[3] This law of progress is still in force. A slight aberration was caused by the window-tax; but this was only temporary. All the later developments of architecture, especially of civil and domestic architecture, show more strongly than ever the tendency to an increase of window-light. Whenever an old casement in our streets is altered, it is only to be enlarged, and to exchange its dull glass and leads and saddle-bars, for the largest and clearest sheet possible.

some valuable documentary evidence, and something more may be added from inspection.

HISTORY FROM DOCUMENTS.

Their immediate prototypes were the windows of Henry VII.'s chapel, at the east end of Westminster Abbey. We gather this from a contract, dated 1526, for completing the general work of King's College Chapel, which, among other things, provides that "the windows are to be set up with good, clean, sure and perfect glass, and orient colours, and imagery of the story of the old and new law, after the form, manner, curiosity, and cleanness in every point of the King's new chapel in Westminster." Here is doubtless a reference to the then existing windows of Henry VII.'s chapel, Westminster Abbey.

These have long since perished, but there are sufficient traces left to show that the clerestory lights (the lower windows being too irregular in plane to admit of pictorial glass) were once filled as here intimated. I allude, of course, to the remains in the tracery; but more particularly to a figure still to be seen in the east window of Henry VII.'s chapel, vulgarly called Henry himself; but which, by the aid of a glass, resolves itself into the prophet Jeremiah, under a canopy, holding a scroll, and altogether a match for the "Messengers" in the chapel at Cambridge.

I mention this, not only because it is in direct genealogical connection with our subject, but because it is a curious instance of reflex light being thrown upon a collection of glass, once important as a standard in the kingdom, but now so far lost, that its very existence might otherwise be questioned.

But, to proceed: the foundation stone of this chapel was laid under the Clare Hall tower, on St. James's day, 1446; but owing to the wars of the roses and other interruptions, the shell was not completed until the 29th of July, 1515, or the seventh year of Henry VIII.

The following year witnessed the commencement of the glass.

This is noted in an indenture dated Feb. 15, 1516, made between the executors of Henry VII. and the provost of the college:—

The order is simply "to glaze all the windows of the said chapel, with such images, stories, arms, badges, and other devices, as it shall be devised by the said executors."

These words are sufficiently identical with those of the will of Henry VII. relating to his chapel at Westminster;[4] and since only seven or eight years had elapsed, and the executors were nearly the same, it is probable that they hastened to employ the same hands on the glass of the building just committed to their charge.

This matter might be cleared up had we the first contract for the college chapel glass, but this has unfortunately been lost.

From the second contract, however, already named, (dating April 1526,) we learn that Barnard Flower was the original contractor for the Cambridge windows; and since he alone is at first employed on so large an undertaking, it seems altogether likely that he was the popular man of his day, and possibly had been the painter of the Westminster windows.

But be that as it may, we know that he was selected and engaged to do sundry work here, in terms carefully recounted in the second contract; that he had been for several years at this work; and had just died, leaving a certain amount of glass finished and ready to be put up. We shall presently consider what this legacy was.

The next contractors were Galyon Hone, Richard Bounde, Thomas Reve, and James Nicholson.

These men bind themselves to three things: first, to put up what Barnard Flower, "lately deceased," had left ready to be put up; secondly, to execute eighteen windows more themselves, including the east and west windows; and thirdly, to furnish cartoons or vidimuses, as they were called, for the four remaining windows of the chapel.

With the exception of the west window, never executed,[5] and therefore reducing the number to seventeen, we may

[4] "And the windows of our said chapel, to be glazed with stories, images, arms, badges, and cognisants as is by us already devised, and in picture (pattern) delivered to the Prior of St. Bartholomew's, beside Smithfield, master of the works of our said chapel." This will is dated Richmond, March 31, 1509. Henry VII. died on the 21st of the next month.

[5] There is nothing to lead us to suppose that this window has ever been filled with stained glass. The tracery of a destroyed window generally retains some patches of colour, but there is not a particle to be observed here. Moreover, the College records, I understand, while noting the injury done to the *side* windows, make no mention of the west window at all.

suppose this engagement to have been faithfully carried out.

The last contracting parties were Fraunces Williamson and Symond Symonds, who in the succeeding month of the same year, covenant to execute the four remaining windows just named, according to the patterns supplied to them by the superior artists.

The proper sequence of these latter contracts should be observed; for Walpole, by placing the last first, has fallen into the mistake of giving a share of the credit of *designing*, to those who manifestly were not to be entrusted with that important branch of the business.

The honour of designing these windows undoubtedly belongs in the first place to Barnard Flower, and in the second place to Hone, Bounde, Reve and Nicholson. And here we observe as an interesting fact, that all those names are English;[6] and further, that these establishments —there are six distinct establishments—are all specified as being in London.

We may, therefore, I think, fairly claim these windows, both in respect of design and workmanship, as genuine productions of British art.

This is a valuable addition to similar testimony, gleaned from the accounts of St. Stephen's chapel,[7] in the reign of Edward III.; and of the York and Warwick windows; to name no more, altogether dissipating the common doubt as to whether painted glass was ever a regular manufacture of this country.

Other important particulars to be gathered from these contracts are:—first, that the glass must date from 1516 to 1530-2; omitting, of course, the relics in the north chapelries, which cannot be less than half-a-century older; but of which no account is preserved.

Again, we find that we are indebted to Henry VII. and his executors, and not to Henry VI., as Dyer states, nor yet to Henry VIII., as is more commonly supposed, for the gift and completion of these magnificent windows.

[6] Hone's name, it has been objected, should stand "Hoon" which is Dutch. This is true as far as the body of the contract goes, but the man always signs himself "Hone." I observed also, when kindly permitted to inspect the original documents, a short time since, that the first intention was to have had good "Normandy" glass; but that in every instance the word Normandy has been erased. We may infer from this, that not only the men, but their materials, were British.

[7] Smith's Antiquities of Westminster.

Henry VIII. supplied the rood-screen and interior fittings of the chapel, but his wealthy and superstitious father had already provided for the glass.

This circumstance, by the way, accounts for the profusion of memorials relating to Henry VII. which these windows contain, though executed, as we see, some time after that prince's death.

We further learn that the royal executors left the devising and ordering of the glass, that is, I suppose, the choice of subjects and the supervision of the vidimuses, to a select committee, consisting of the Provost Hacomblen assisted by William Holgylle, clerk and master of the Savoy, London, and Thomas Larke, Archdeacon of Norwich. Of these three, since to the last two was referred the judgment of compensation in cases requiring a knowledge of art, of whom Larke was the general superintendent of the building in Cambridge; it remains that Holgylle, residing in London, where all the glass-work was executed, was the special manager of this department.

Finally, as to the distribution of the work; it is plain, that as there are twenty-five painted windows in the chapel, twenty-one of which may be sufficiently accounted for, it would appear that Barnard Flower had completed four windows ere he died, together (probably) with the glass in the heads or tracery of all the windows: but of this more hereafter.

Before dismissing the documentary part of our subject, it may be well to state, that these windows were condemned by the Long Parliament.

There is an entry of the commissioners in the Journals of the House to this effect:—"Dec. 26th, 1643; steps (altar-steps?) to be taken down; and a 1,000 superstitious pictures, the ladder of Christ, and thieves &c."

This was during the Provostship of Dr. Collins, ejected 1645. How it happened that our windows escaped during the intervening year, 44, we are not informed.

Possibly they were taken down, (it is certain they have all been down and releaded at some time or other;) but it is more likely that they remained in their places at the period we speak of, and that the superstitious pictures at the west end then sustained the serious damage they exhibit to this day, while the general scriptural character of the

rest,[8] together with the opportune election of Dr. Whichcote (a moderate man), preserved them to us much as they are at present.

THEIR HISTORY FROM INSPECTION.

And now for a word or two as to what further historical information may be obtained from inspection. Omitting—as I said before—the glass in the north-east chapelries, and confining ourselves to the chapel itself, the oldest glass appears to be that over the north-west door. This window is unique as to age and style, partaking more of the Perpendicular aspect than anything in the chapel. If, therefore, it is one of Flower's four, he afterwards altered his style. Is it not more probable, that it was a purchase or present to the chapel, and executed by other hands?[9] Next, we may safely conclude, that Flower fitted all the tracery lights of the windows; for first, it is highly probable that they would be inserted ere the scaffolding of the roof was removed. Again, they all appear to be the work of one hand, strongly contrasting, in this respect, with the variety of manipulation in the pictures below; and once more, among all the cognisances and initials with which they are crowded, there is no reference to Anne Boleyn, but only to Henry VII., and Elizabeth of York, or to Henry VIII. and Catherine. This, I imagine, would not have been the case had they been executed after 1526 (the date of the second contract) when the subject of the divorce was pending.

It is more difficult to decide upon the other contributions of Barnard Flower. But not to trouble ourselves with speculations, I will merely mention a key which I think can be used here with advantage; it is the east window. This window, we know, is *not* Flower's work, because it is specially contracted for after his death by Hone and his partners. Now in this window, the figures are on a large scale, and executed with much freedom and vigour.

Taking this, therefore, as a guide, we ought to be able to detect, not only its sixteen companions, but also the last four for which designs were furnished by one and the same party.

[8] I have met with many cases of this kind of discrimination.

[9] We find instances of the purchase of ready-made windows in the reign of Edward III.; and this looks rather like an adapted window.

With regard to these last-named four, it is also worthy of notice, that they were to be placed "two on oon side, and two on the other side of the chapel." If this means vis-à-vis, here is a further key.

In this way, Flower's work might possibly be eliminated; when it would, I conceive, be found to lie among the north-eastern windows, where the figures are on a smaller scale, and also in a somewhat earlier manner.

GENERAL ARRANGEMENT.

Having finished the history, we now pass on to consider the general arrangement of these windows. This is very simple when the clue is once perceived.

Generally speaking, each window contains four pictures, two above and two below the transom.

The lower tier is the one *in series*, being a regular chain of Gospel history, passing all round the chapel. It commences at the north-west corner, with the birth of the Virgin Mary, continues eastward through the various scenes of our Lord's active life, then takes up the Acts of the Apostles and concludes with the legends of St. Mary's death in the south-west corner. It has often occurred to me, whether these cycles (for they occur elsewhere) might not be in illustration of the ecclesiastical year, according to some "use" of the time; but I could never identify them.

The upper tier consists of stories also, but not in any chronological order, being chosen out of the Old Testament, or the Apocrypha, simply on account of their correspondence respectively with those beneath, on the well-known principle of type and antitype.

There are a few exceptions to this arrangement, as in the first, or north-westernmost window, in the east window, and in those illustrating the Acts; but the rule is as above-stated.

There seems nothing wrong in this plan of parallelism, except where it is superstitiously applied; but, at any rate, it was a very favourite scheme of the mediæval artists: we meet with it in the catacombs of Rome; in the Biblia Pauperum; and there are few remains of *glass* without some traces of it.

It may be recognised in Canterbury, in Bourges, in the

accounts of St. Stephen's chapel, and of Horschau monastery; at Fairford, at Liege, at Gouda. Moreover, in this way are to be explained such references to lost collections, as the following: "the windows contained the whole story, from the Creation to the Judgment."[9] For it so happens that the Temptation of Eve, easily mistaken for the Creation (especially if, as in King's Chapel, the animals are scrambling out of the ground at the feet of our first mother) was the received type or correspondence of the Annunciation, one of the *first* subjects in the Gospel history.

But to return to our subject:—Care was always taken in this arrangement that the Crucifixion should fall into place at the east end of the church, and the Last Judgment at the west.

This was clearly the idea here, and had the west window been painted, it would probably have presented us with some such a combination of gorgeous colouring and gross superstitions as may be seen at Fairford to this day.

Perhaps it will be well to give a complete list of the subjects as they stand in the chapel.

Commencing then at the north-west corner and counting eastward, we have—

No. I.

Joachim's Offering refused by the High-priest.
Text.—"Angelus in . . . ."
(See Spurious Gospel of St. Matthew, or Birth of Mary, c. i.)

Joachim with the Shepherds.
Text.—". . . . peperit Anna . . . ."
(Spurious Gospel, c. ii.)

Joachim and Anna at the Golden Gate.
Text.—"Angelus in . . . . ens de . . . ut . . . . decem."
(Spurious Gospel, c. iii.)

Birth of the Virgin Mary.
Text.—". . . . peperit Anna Mariam benedictam."
(Spurious Gospel, c. iv.)

No. II.

TYPE.
Tobit's Offering to the Temple.[1]
Text.—"Mensa aurea oblata est in templo."
(No reference.)

TYPE.
Tobias' Marriage.
Text.—"Hic Sara desponsat Tobie."
(No reference.)

ANTITYPE.
Mary presented at the Temple.
Text.—"Maria Domino oblata est in templo."
(See Spurious Gospel.)

ANTITYPE.
Marriage of Joseph and Mary.
Text.—"Hic virgo Maria desponsat Josep."
(Spurious Gospel: Joseph holds the Budding Rod.)

[9] So the windows of Lambeth chapel, in Laud's time are described, and a window of twenty-one lights, at Hengrave, Suffolk.

[1] Besides Tobit's dog, the young man has a fishing-net on his shoulder. This identifies the subject, but the connection between the golden table and the Virgin Mary is beyond my comprehension.

No. III.

TYPE.

Temptation of Eve.

Text.—"præcepit nobis Deus ne commederemus et ne tangeremus illud ne forte moriamur."—Gen. iii. (3).

ANTITYPE.

The Annunciation.

Text.—"En! Bethleem, terra Juda, non eris minima in(ter) princip(es) . . ."

(Reference gone; probably to Matt. ii. 6.)

TYPE.

The Burning Bush.

Text.—"Apparuitque ei Dominus in flamma ignis de medio rubi: et videbat qd. rubus arderet et non combureretur." Ex. iii. (2).

ANTITYPE.

Birth of Jesus Christ.

Text.—"Cum autem natus esset Jesus in Bethleem civitate Judeæ."—Matt. ii. (1).

No. IV.

TYPE.

Institution of Circumcision.

Text.—"Vocavitque Abraham nomen filii sui quem genuit ei Sara, Isaac, et circumcidet eum octavo die."—Gen. xxi. (3, 4).

ANTITYPE.

Circumcision of Jesus.

Text.—"Et postquam consummati sunt dies octo, ut circumcideretur puer, vocatum est nomen ejus Jesus."—Luke ii. (21).

TYPE.

Queen of Sheba.

Text.—"Dedit ergo regi centum viginta talenta auri, et aromata multa nimis, et gemmas pretiosas."—(2 Chron. ix. 9.)

ANTITYPE.

The Wise Men's Offerings.

Text.—"Apertis thesauris suis obtulerunt illi munera aurum, thus, et myrrham."—Matt. ii. (11).

No. V.

TYPE.

Purification of Women under the Law.

Text.—"Sanctifica mihi omne progenitum quod aperit vulvam in filiis Israel."—Ex. xiii. (2).

ANTITYPE.

Purification of the Virgin Mary.

Text.—"Adduxerunt illum Hierosolyma ut sisterent eum domino: sicut scriptum est in lege Domini."—Luke ii. (22, 23).

TYPE.

Jacob flying from Esau.

Text.—"Ecce Esau frater tuus minatur ut occidat te."—Gen. xxvii. (42).

ANTITYPE.

Flight into Egypt.

Text.—"Surge, et accipite puerum et matrem illius, et fuge in Ægyptum, et esto illic donec dixero tibi."—Matt. ii. (13).

No. VI.

TYPE.

Moses Destroying the Tables of the Law.

Text.—"Iratusque valde projecit de manu tabulas et confregit eos." — Ex. xxxii. (19).

ANTITYPE.

The Images of Egypt falling down before the infant Jesus.

Text.—"(Onus Ægypti ecce Dominus ascendit) super (nubem) levem et ingredietur (Ægyptum et commovebuntur simulacra Ægypti a facie ejus)."—Is. xix. (1).

TYPE.

Joash saved from Athaliah.

Text illegible. (This correspondence occurs in the Biblia Pauperum.)

ANTITYPE.

Herod's Massacre of the Innocents.

Text.—"Et missis satellitibus interfecit omnes pueros qui erant in Bethleem."—Matt. ii. (16).

No. VII.

TYPE.

Naaman Washing in Jordan.

Text.—"Naaman leprosus septies lavit in Jordane . . . . . et mundatus est."—4 Kings v. (14).

TYPE.

Esau tempted to sell his Birthright.

Text.—"Ait Jacob, Jura ergo mihi. Juravit ei Esau, et vendidit primogenita." Gen. xxv. (33).

ANTITYPE.

The Baptism of Christ.

Text.—"Baptizatus autem Jesus, confestim ascendit de aqua, et ecce aperti sunt ei cœli, et vidit spiritum Dei."—Matt. iii. (16).

ANTITYPE.

The Temptation of Christ.

Text.—"Et accedens tentator dixit ei, Si filius Dei es dic ut lapides isti panes fiant."—Matt. iv. (13).

No. VIII.

TYPE.

The Triumph of David.

Text.—"(Assumens autem) David caput Philistinum attulit illud in Jerusalem."—1 Sam. xvii. (54).

ANTITYPE.

Christ's Entry into Jerusalem.

Text.—"Ecce Rex tuus venit sedens super pullum asinæ."—John xii. (15).

TYPE.

Elisha Raising the Shunamite's Son.

Text.—"Tolle filium tuum. Venit illa et corruit ad pedes, et adoravit super terram."—4 Kings iv. (36).

ANTITYPE.

Lazarus Raised from the Dead.

Text.—"Lazare, veni foras! Et prodidit qui fuerat mortuus."—John xi. (43).

No. IX.

TYPE.

The Manna.

Text.—"Panem de cœlo præstitis eis." Wisdom xvi. (20).

ANTITYPE.

The Last Supper.

Text.—"Desiderio desideravi hoc pascha comedere vobiscum antequam patiar."—Luke xxii. (15).

TYPE.

The Fall of the Rebel Angels.

Text.—"Si ceciderint in terram a semitipsis non consurgent."—Baruch vi. (26).

ANTITYPE.

The Garden of Gethsemane and the Ministering Angel.

Text.—"Pater, si vis transfer poculum hoc a me."—Luke xxii. (42).

No. X.

TYPE.

Cain killing Abel.

Text.—"Consurrexit Cain adversus fratrem suum Abel."—Gen. iv. (8).

ANTITYPE.

Judas Betraying Christ.

Text.—"Dixit ave Rabbi, et osculatus est eum."—Matt. xxvi. (49).

TYPE.

Shimei Cursing David.

Text.—"Egredere, egredere, vir sanguinum, et vir Belial."—2 Sam. xvi. (7).

ANTITYPE.

Christ Mocked by the Soldiers.

Text.—"Velaverunt eum et percutiebant faciam ejus."—Luke xxii. (64).

No. XI.

TYPE.

Jeremiah Imprisoned.

Text.—"Irati principes contra Jeremiam (cæsum) eum miserunt in carcerem."—Jerem. xxxvii. (15).

ANTITYPE.

Christ before Caiaphas.

Text.—"Si malo locutus sum (testimonium) perhibe de malo."—John xviii. (23).

TYPE.

Noah Drunken and Naked.

Text.—"Bibensque vinum inebriatus est et nudatus (in tabernaculo suo)."—Gen. ix. (21).

ANTITYPE.

Christ Stripped before Herod.

Text.—"Væ qui dicitis malum bonum, et bonum malum."—Is. v. (20).

No. XII.

TYPE.

Job Vexed by Satan.

Text.—"Dominus dedit, Dominus abstulit; sit nomen Domini benedictum."—Job i. (21).

ANTITYPE.

Christ Scourged,

Text.—"Tunc ergo reprehendit Pilatus Jesum et flagellavit."—John xix. (1).

TYPE.

Solomon Crowned.

Text.—"Egredimini et videte, filiæ Zion regem Salomonem."—Cant. iii. (11).

ANTITYPE.

Christ Crowned with Thorns.

Text.—"Et milites plectentes coronam de spinis imposuerunt capiti ejus."—John xix. (2).

No. XIII.

The Great East Window contains six pictures relating to the Crucifixion, without correspondences. Recommencing at the south-east corner and counting westward, we have :—

No. XIV.

(Some modern glass.)

TYPE.

Naomi and her Daughters.

Text.—"Ne vocetis me Naomi."

ANTITYPE.

Christ Bewailed.

Text.—"Quin et tuum ipsius animam penetrabit gladius."—Luke ii. (35).

No. XV.

TYPE.

Joseph in the Pit.

Text.—"Et mittamus eum in cisternam veterem quæ est in solitudine."—Gen. xxxvii. (22).

ANTITYPE.

Christ laid in the Tomb.

Text.—"Posuit illud in monumento suo novo."—Matt. xxvii. (60).

TYPE.

The Exodus.

Text. — "Eduxit Israel per turmas suas."—Ex. xii. (51).

ANTITYPE.

The Harrowing of Hell.

Text.—"Advenit te liberare Salvator mund(i) august . . . ."

(See Spurious Gospel of Nicodemus.)

No. XVI.

TYPE.

Jonah and the Whale.

Text.—"Evomuit Jonam in aridam."—Jon. ii. (11).

ANTITYPE.

The Resurrection of Christ.

Text.—"Revolvit lapidem et sedebat super eum."—Matt. xxviii. (2).

TYPE.

Tobias returning to his Mother.

Text.—"Et illico agnovit venientem filium suum."—Tobit xi. (6).

ANTITYPE.

Christ appearing to his Mother.

Text.—"Salve, parens, enixa es puerpera regem qui cœlum terramque regit."

(No reference : see Golden Legend.)

No. XVII.

TYPE.

Reuben seeks Joseph in the Pit.

Text.—"Reversusque Reuben ad cisternam non invenit puerum."—Gen. xxxvii. (29).

ANTITYPE.

The Women at the Sepulchre.

Text.—"Et valde mane a primo die (Sabbatorum) veniunt ad monumentum, orto sole."—Mark xvi. (2).

TYPE.

Daniel in the Lions' Den addressed by Darius.

Text.—"Venit autem rex. . . . . Daniele, Daniele!"—Dan. vi. (30).

ANTITYPE.

Christ appearing to Mary Magdalene.

Text.—"Hæc cum dixisset, conversa est retrorsum et vidit Jesum stantem."—John xx. (14).

No. XVIII.

TYPE.

The Angel appears to Habbacuc.

Text.—"Argentum et aurum non est mihi, qd. autem habeo hoc tibi do."—Acts iii. (6).

(This text is a repetition of No. xxi.)

ANTITYPE.

Christ appearing to the two Disciples going to Emmaus.

Text.—"Viri Judei et qui habitatis Hierosolymis universi, hoc vobis notum sit."—Acts ii. (14).

(This text is a repetition of No. xxi.)

TYPE.

Habbacuc feeds Daniel.

Text.—"Et illi quidam ibant gaudentes a conspectu consilii."—Acts v. (41).

(This text is a repetition of No. xxi.)

ANTITYPE.

Christ breaking bread at Emmaus.

Text.—"Quid utique convenit vobis tentare spiritum Domini."—Acts v. (9).

(Text belongs to No. xxi.)

No. XIX.

TYPE.

Joseph meeting Jacob.

Text.—"Dixit Jacob ad Joseph: jam lætus moriar quia vidi faciem tuam."—Gen. xlvi. (30).

ANTITYPE.

Christ appearing to the Desciples.

Text.—"Pax vobis, et cum hæc dixisset, ostendit eis manus et latus."—John xx. (29).

TYPE.

The Prodigal Son.

Text.—"Pater, peccavi in cœlum et coram te."—Luke xv. (21.)

ANTITYPE.

The Unbelieving Thomas.

Text.—"Pax vobis; deinde dixit Thomæ, infer digitum tuum huc et vide manus meas."—John xx. (27).

No. XX.

TYPE.

Elijah's Ascent to Heaven.

Text.—"Cumque transissent, Helias dixit ad Eliseum."—4 Kings ii. (9).

ANTITYPE.

Christ's Ascension.

Text.—"Qui est iste qui venit de Edom tinctis vestibus."—Is. lxiii. (1).

TYPE.

The Law given to Moses.

Text.—"Videns autem populus quod moram faceret descendi de monte Moses."—Ex. xxxii. (1).

ANTITYPE.

The Holy Spirit given to the Apostles.

Text.—"Spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum."—Wisdom i. (7).

No. XXI.

Peter and John heal the Lame Man.

Text.—"Advenientes autem principes sacerdotum et omnes qui cum eo erant convocaverunt consilium."—Acts v. (21).

(This text is misplaced.)

The Crowd following Peter into the Temple.

Text.—"Viri Judei et qui habitatis Hierosalymis universi hoc vobis notum sit."—Acts ii. (14).

Imprisonment and Scourging of Peter and John.

Text.—"Et dimiserunt eos, et illi quidem ibant gaudentes a conspectu consilii."—Acts v. (41).

Death of Ananias.

Text.—"Petrus autem dixit, argentum et aurum non est mihi, quod autem habeo, tibi do."—Acts iii. (6).

(This text misplaced).

No. XXII.

Conversion of St. Paul.

Text.—"Et subito circumfulsit eum lux de cœlo et cadens in terram."—Acts ix. (3, 4).

St. Paul and Barnabas at Lystra.

Text.—"(Sacerdos quoque Jovis qui erat ante civitatem) illorum tauros et coronas ad vestibula afferens cum turbis volebat (sacrificare)."—Acts xiv. (12).

St. Paul disputing with the Jews at Damascus.

Text.—"(Fuit autem) Saulus cum discipulis qui erant Damasci per dies aliquot."—Acts ix. (19).

The Apostles assaulted at Iconium.

Text.—"Supervenerunt autem quidam ab Antiochia et Iconio Judei . . . . ."—Acts xiv. (19).

No. XXIII.

St. Paul casting out the Spirit of Divination.

Text.—"Præcipio tibi in nomen Jesu Christi exire (ab) ea."—Acts xvi. (18).

St. Paul parting from his Friends.

Text.—"Cum soluissimus igitur a Troade recto cursu venimus Samothracen."—Acts. xvi. (11).

(This is obviously a mistake for Acts xxi. 1).

St. Paul arraigned.

Text.—"Et apprehendentes Paulum trahebant eum extra templum."—Acts xxi. (30).

St. Paul before Felix or Nero.

Text.—"Permissum est Paulo manere sibimet cum custodiente se milite."—Acts xxviii. (16).

I have now only to mention the arrangement of the last two windows, that is, the westernmost on the south side. These,

containing the conclusion of the Virgin Mary's history, have sustained irreparable injury, and are only intelligible after much patient study. They represent "the death of Mary," typified above by "the death of Tobit." The correspondence lies in this: that when Tobit and Mary were dying each of them sent for their sons. Hence both legends begin with words taken from the last chapter of the book of Tobit: "In hora mortis vocavit filium suum." In the upper picture is seen the young Tobias with the Angel by his side; and in the lower, our Lord (with the labarum, or resurrection-standard in his hand) at the foot of his mother's bed.

Then follows in order, Mary's burial; this is typified above by "the burial of Jacob," with the legend: "Josep tribus sepeliunt Jacob." The point of correspondence here must be, that (according to the spurious gospel) Mary, like Jacob, gave commandment concerning her burial. On this occasion a disturbance with the Pagan soldiery is said to have taken place, all of which is faithfully depicted on the glass.

The last window contains, on the left hand, "the Assumption of the Virgin," typified by "the apotheosis of an unknown saint" with a conspicuous pouch by his side.[2] On the right is "the Coronation of Mary," typified by the subject of Solomon placing Bathsheba on a throne at his side." The proximity of the small stone image of the Virgin in the rose to this window will now be understood.

I have dwelt a little upon these two windows, because the guide-book does not name them; indeed I believe this is the first time that either they or the first window, or any of the texts given above, have been described.

THE MESSENGERS.

Another part of the general arrangement worthy of note is the system of "messengers"—as they are called—in the central lights of all the side windows, ranged one over the other. Of these there are four to each window (ninety-four altogether in the chapel) holding scrolls with the texts of scripture to explain the subject of the pictures.

A similar arrangement occurs in the block books and

[2] This symbol might lead us to conjecture that it is Saint Nicholas, to whom the chapel was dedicated in conjunction with Saint Mary. If an Old Testament subject, might it not be the Translation of Enoch?

illuminations of the period, and in many collections of glass.

We have already seen that this was the case with the windows of Henry VII.'s chapel, Westminster. In Fairford church the prophets face the apostles, and whilst the latter recite the Apostles' Creed amongst them, the former exhibit prophecies relating to the last judgment. Even Norman and Early English glass have traces of this explanatory method.

The messengers of King's consist of *two* classes, the one venerable figures like prophets, the other angels, with or without the nimbus.

This distinction I imagine was only made for the sake of variety; for they follow no order, but illustrate indiscriminately an Old or New Testament subject, always observing, however, that two of each sort are attached to a window. To this seeming disorder there is but one exception, viz., in the windows illustrating the Acts of the Apostles, where six figures of St. Luke (with the bull at his feet) carry his own texts; but even they share this honour with as many angels.

The demi-figures with wings are usually called St. Michael; and the prophet Ezekiel may perhaps be distinguished by his dress. But it is plain that all symbolism, whether of colour or form, was by this time held with a very loose hand.

THE TEXTS.

The texts or legends are written in large Gothic characters, with the usual abbreviations, and sometimes having Lombardic capitals. The book and chapter are invariably marked according to the custom of the day.

The Old Testament quotations generally agree with the Vulgate, or with some of the scarcely dissimilar varieties of Jerome. But not so the quotations from the New Testament, which vary very much from any version (I have compared seven or eight) except that of Erasmus, especially his second edition, 1519. This coincidence taken in connection with the fact that Erasmus had not left Cambridge when our windows were begun, would favour the idea that the great reviver of learning as well as of morals has had a hand in these inscriptions. Such a thing would not be beneath him, professor though he was; for we find him in the year 1515 receiving twenty shillings for drawing up an

epitaph for Margaret of Richmond's tomb in Westminster Abbey.

THEIR VALUE AS WORKS OF ART.

But, besides being curiously and historically interesting, these windows are truly invaluable as works of art. They offer altogether the best and almost only examples of an English historical school of painting. As marble was the material of Greece, and fresco of Italy, so glass is certainly the material and surface upon which our native genius has expended itself. Define a school of high art as you may, what is there in this kingdom, we ask, in point of scale, of quantity, or of merit (and that under considerable disadvantages), to compare with the collections of glass in our cathedrals and churches, to say nothing of scattered remnants and of demolished glass. Surely nothing formerly done in the way of illuminations or woodcuts, or latterly in the way of oils, can claim such a title? But here (to confine ourselves to this single specimen) are at least one hundred gigantic pictures, retaining much of their original vigour, and executed at the revival of art in Europe, and in rivalry of the great Italian school itself.

That I am not speaking without warrant, hear Vandyke's opinion of the Fairford glass, far inferior to this in respect of historic merit: "He often affirmed to the king (Charles I.) that many of the figures in the Fairford windows were so exquisitely done that they could be exceeded by no pencil."[3]

Walpole also remarks of these very windows of King's chapel, that "the artists who executed them would figure as considerable painters in any reign," adding, in true antiquarian spirit, "and what a rarity, in a collection of drawings, would be one of their vidimuses!"

But an example is worth a thousand recommendations. For this purpose I would beg to point out the two figures on horseback, one in profile, the other a three-quarter face, conversing together in the lower right-hand subject of the great east window. Nothing can be more full of expression and individual character than the countenances, or more easy than the composition of these figures. And here let me explain one of the difficulties which our glass painters had to contend with in making their designs. Each bay or light is divided both

[3] Cooke's Topography of Gloucestershire.

vertically and horizontally by iron bars; that is to say, the cartoon, ere the design was commenced, had to be marked off like a gridiron; and then every head and hand was brought into one or other of the divisions! Sometimes, in older glass, this may be mentioned as an apology for stiff necks and other contortions; but here it is only another matter of astonishment and praise, when we find how well the difficulty has been overcome. And does not this peculiarity of conformation (together with the necessarily high pitch of the horizon line in all old glass designs) prove their *originality*,—another point of merit in any work of art?[4] "The Christ" likewise, "bearing his cross," in this window, has a fine face, quite of the Spanish school.

Another example of the historic merit of King's chapel windows is the well-known figure of Ananias, in the window on the south side of the chapel nearest the organ-loft. The ghastliness of the face is exceedingly well done, and will repay an examination through a glass.

Lastly, as a piece of difficult, but most graceful design, observe the apotheosis of the unknown saint in the last window in the south-west corner in the upper left-hand compartment.

Upon the whole, though there are doubtless many inferior parts and a considerable amount of mutilation and displacement, and some still later damage, yet these windows must ever be acknowledged to offer a truly wonderful collection of designs and details, worthy of a high place (yea, I submit, in the absence of anything more worthy, of the highest place) in our kingdom of historical art.

The men who painted them were not mere vitrifiers or glaziers, but artists in a high sense of the term.

Refreshed from the fountains which Michael Angelo and Raffaelle had just opened to the world, they approached their material with no mean ideas or trembling hands; their arms seem to have forgotten the trammels of lead and of arming, and to have swept over the glass with grand and flowing lines, that can scarcely be outdone, and every bold contrast of colour and composition. To brilliant lights and colours, such as no other kind of painting can approach to, they have added a manly vigour of conception that never seems to flag.

[4] I should add here, that this "a priori" supposition is fully sustained by an examination of the windows before us. No plagiarism but that of subject and conventional treatment can be brought against them.

Observe, too, how well they tell a story! In choosing a subject, instead of invading the province of poetry or of the histrionic art (the vice of modern painters) they seize upon some stirring incident, like that of the Hampton Court cartoons; and then narrate it to the eye both simply and earnestly, and (conventionalisms apart) with astonishing truth to nature. This shows power of mind as well as of hand.

But I hasten to offer a few remarks upon the manufacture of these windows.

The ironwork—or arming—is very heavy, a "defence," as the contracts need scarcely tell us, "against great winds and outrageous weatherings." Besides the vertical bars on the outside, there are saddle-bars within, seven inches apart, one being missed or bent occasionally, to avoid cutting a face or any material part of a figure. It is a question, whether we attend enough to the arming of our windows now-a-days. Time only can prove; but certain it is, that this cobweb of iron bars—some of them an inch square—have only just sufficed to preserve their charge for three centuries.[5]

The glass itself is all perfectly transparent, except where it is shaded, and even the shadows are stipple-shaded, that is, made as diaphanous as possible. In this respect the windows under review agree with all old glass. It remained for later times to think of obscuring glass with enamels or dirt. Our modern obscurists would do well, I think, to bear in mind that the contractors for these windows were especially bound to supply "clean" glass.

The specific tint is slightly warm or golden, being indeed only the white glass of the day, as may still be seen in old cottages. But it is observable that this tint or basis underlies and affects all the colours, as well as the white glass, subduing the blue, for instance, and enriching the ruby. Here is an important hint, I imagine, on the general harmony of any window which may hope to vie with old glass. The cathedral tint—as the manufacturers term it—ought to pervade *all* the colours.

Some very successful attempts have been made lately to prepare raw glass in this way. But for myself (if I may be allowed to offer an opinion) I believe we shall eventually come to the glass of commerce—the glass of the day. We ought,

[5] Professor Willis has recommended an extra sheet of plate glass on the outside, in lieu of "arming." This may answer very well on a small scale, but could hardly be applied to such a building as that before us.

indeed, only to be too thankful that it is so pure and good as it is; and I feel persuaded that we shall be doing better by giving attention to the essential principles of the art, than to the recovery of this or that tint, which our ancestors were constantly changing, and always—it appears to me—with the hope and determination of getting rid of it altogether.

The flesh in King's chapel windows is stained with iron,[6] which allows of its being transparent also, another point not to be overlooked in pictorial glass-work; for it is plain that the flesh, constituting, as it does, the prominent parts of the picture, is a sort of key-note to the whole: if this is dulled with enamels of any kind, the entire window has to be dulled too. Thus the glass is shorn of its glory, its brightness, its first essential property, without which it is turned into a mere transparency or blind, quite out of place in a window made on purpose for the admission of *light*.

The colours used in this chapel are very varied; several shades, particularly of purple and green, producing delightful associations with the more positive colours.

The colour, moreover, varies in depth on the same piece of glass. Many effects of sky, foliage, and drapery, are thus skilfully imitated. This difference of shade, in the present instance, depends, I observe, upon the thickness of the glass. But I believe the great charm of these windows lies in their restricted and careful use of colour; quite three-fourths, in some cases seven-eighths of the whole surface, being white glass, or white glass shaded. This reservation gives intense value, by contrast, to the colours employed, greatly reducing their gaudiness, and enhancing their depth.

And then the colour that *is* used is collected into nose-gays, as it were, and not spotted or diluted by being spread over the picture. This is bold treatment, no doubt, but it is very successful here, particularly in the three windows on the north side of the chapel, illustrating the Acts of the Apostles; and, I doubt not, would be with us also, if we could induce our artists, or rather their patrons, once to reflect that there may be too much of a good thing.

[6] I was fortunate enough, three or four years ago, after a number of experiments, to succeed in recovering the cinque-cento flesh stain. Its value lies in dispensing with a flux of any sort. I may, perhaps, be allowed to say, that Mr. Winston fully approves of it.

It is a curious fact, in the history of painted glass in this country, that, from first to last, there has been a growing tendency to reduce the quantity of colour. It may, perhaps, be explained thus :—the art was imported (say during the sixth or seventh centuries) from southern countries, whence it came glowing with colour suited to the richness of those skies, and necessary to obscure some of their light.

But this exuberance was soon found inappropriate and inconvenient here ; hence arose, in the first place, the white pattern windows of our various styles, and then the gradual but general preponderance of white glass over colour, which we speak of.

I had some more remarks to make on the manipulation of these windows ; but, as they are purely technical, they may be spared in a paper of this sort.

Such are a few of the ideas naturally suggested to the student of King's chapel windows ; and nothing shows, I think, more clearly the intimate and interesting connection there is between archaeological reviews and our future progress in art.

Here is an art, the art of glass painting, which must, in the nature of things, ever be popular in this country. It is, in fact, just the ornamented state of a material, the use of which is increasing every day among us.

How necessary, then, that it should be securely grounded and rightly directed! And what so useful for this purpose as the experience of the past ; those first principles obtained from a survey of long periods together, and the comparison of various styles ?

At the same time, we see the folly of going back to ancient times, when circumstances were so different, and taking thence, in too slavish a manner, our model, either of architecture, or of any of its parts.

Eternal principles of taste of course there are, and principles based upon climate, materials, and habits, equally binding ; but their application should ever be left to the independent impulses of genius, under the direction of present exigences, and of the ever-shifting, but, no doubt, necessary and happy effects of time and providence. For light of this kind, and on an art so easily abused, it seems to me we cannot be too thankful.

W. J. BOLTON.