

ON THE PAINTED GLASS IN FAIRFORD CHURCH, GLOUCESTER,
AND ITS CLAIM TO BE CONSIDERED THE WORK OF ALBERT
DURER.¹

By the Rev. J. FULLER RUSSELL, B.C.L., F.S.A.

It is presumed that all those whom I have now the honour to address are aware of the controversy on (what may not unfitly be termed the art-question of the hour) the claim of the stained glass windows in Fairford Church, Gloucestershire, to be considered the work of Albert Durer, which has resulted from an able Paper² which was read by Mr. Henry F. Holt, during the recent congress of the British Archæological Association, at Cirencester, in that county.

The following observations will be antagonistic to the paper in question, but offered in no unfriendly spirit, and simply in the interest of truth. I do not intend to combat all Mr. Holt's positions, but I am desirous to make some remarks (i.) in reply to his statement that the Fairford windows have been subjected to a "neglectful silence of 370 years"; and also (ii.) to accept the challenge recently given by him in the columns of a daily journal,³ and animadvert upon a portion of his arguments in proof of his supposed discovery that those windows were veritably and exclusively designed and executed by the "great artist of Nuremberg."

In reference to the asserted neglect of the windows I will mention the facts which follow. A full, although not very accurate, description of them, "taken from an old MS.," occurs at the end of a scarce volume which was edited by the antiquary Hearne in 1716.⁴ This account is introduced by

¹ Read at the Monthly Meeting of the Archæological Institute, Nov. 6, 1868.

² Published in *The Builder*, vol. xxvi. No. 1332.

³ See Mr. Holt's Letter in the *Standard*, Sept. 15, 1868.

⁴ *Guilielmi Roperi vita D. Thomæ Mori Equitis Aurati, lingua Anglicana*

contexta. Accedunt Mori Epistola de Scholasticis quibusdam Trojanos sese appellantis; Academiæ Oxoniensis Epistolæ et Orationes aliquam multæ; Anonymi Chronicon Godstovianum; et Fenestrarum depictarum Ecclesiæ Parochialis de Fairford in agro Glocestriensi Explicatio. 8vo. 1716.

“some occasional remarks by the publisher,” among which he observes that Fairford “is noted chiefly for its decent church, and the admirable painted glass that is in it. I had often,” he proceeds, “heard this glass mentioned in common discourse, especially when I have been talking with learned and curious men, who generally agreed that it was the finest of its kind they had seen in England.” Here is a testimony that the Fairford windows were not treated with “neglectful silence” by admirers of Christian art at the beginning of the last century ; but Mr. Hearne goes on to say that “the most celebrated Sir Anthony Vandyk often affirmed . . . , both to King Charles the First and others, that many of the figures were so exquisitely well done that they could not be exceeded by the best pencil. This made several curious, as well as virtuous and religious persons very solicitous about the preservation of the glass at the late Rebellion ; and yet, after all their care, some of the best figures were utterly lost, which is the reason that some defects (that are filled up with modern plain glass) appear in several places.” Some years before the Rebellion, Richard Corbet, Bishop of Norwich from 1632 to 1635, celebrated the Fairford windows in a poem, which comprises the quaint lines below :—

“I knowe no painte of poetry
 Can mend such colour'd imag'ry
 In sullen inke, yet (Fayreford) I
 May relish thy fair memory.
 Such is the echoe's fainter sound,
 Such is the light when the sunn's drown'd,
 So did the fancy look upon
 The work before it was begun.
 Yet when those showes are out of sight,
 My weaker colours may delight.
 Those images doe faithfullie
 Report true feature to the eie,
 As you may think each picture was
 Some visage in a looking-glass ;
 Not a glass window face, unless
 Such as Cheapside hath, where a press
 Of painted gallants, looking out,
 Bedeck the casement rounde about.
 But these have holy phisnomy ;
 Each paine instructs the laity
 With silent eloquence ; for heere
 Devotion leads the eie, not care,
 To note the cathechisinge paint,
 Whose easie phrase doth soe acquainte

Our sense with Gospell, that the Creede
 In such an hand the weake may reade.
 Such tipes e'en yett of virtue bee,
 And Christ as in a glass we see."⁵

The glass was treated of in a History of Fairford Church, which was published in 8vo. at Cirencester, in 1763; also in a 4to. pamphlet, entitled "An Account of the Parish of Fairford," &c., with four engravings, which appeared in 1791; and significant evidence of the popularity of this subject is afforded by the fact that the 22nd edition of a tract upon it was published at Cirencester in 1841.

The "description" in Hearne's volume was reprinted in the Cambridge Camden (now Ecclesiological) Society's "Illustrations of Monumental Brasses"⁶ in 1846, and is followed by the statement that the designs "have been attributed to Albert Durer; but, as Bigland observes, it is impossible that at the age of twenty he could have arrived at such proficiency in the art So great has been the havoc in this beautiful branch of church adornment through the parish churches of England, that we have but few specimens left, and perhaps none which for magnitude and preservation can compete with that of Fairford."

A slight sketch of the great west window at Fairford is given in the *Archæologia*.⁷ Our gifted friend and colleague, Mr. George Scharf, F.S.A., made a pilgrimage to Fairford Church in 1856, "for the express purpose," as he states, "of examining the painted glass" there, of which he gives a laudatory notice in the volume of the *Archæologia* just mentioned; and he also read a paper upon it before our Society in the April of the same year.⁸ Fairford Church was visited in the summer of 1860 by a party of the members of our Institute, under the guidance of Messrs. J. H. Parker and J. D. Niblett, and the following reference to its distin-

⁵ The Poems of Richard Corbet, late Bishop of Oxford and Norwich, &c., with Biographical Notes, and a Life of the Author, by Octavius Gilchrist, F.S.A. Fourth edition, pp. 239, 240. 8vo. 1807. This worthy and humorous prelate had a keen relish for some relaxations which were, perhaps, not quite in keeping with the "silent eloquence" of the Fairford windows. For example, Aubrey records, "His chaplain, Dr. Lushington, was a very learned and ingenious man, and they loved one another. The Bishop would

sometimes take the key of the wine-cellar, and he and his chaplaine would go and lock themselves in and be merry; then first he layes down his episcopal hood, 'There layes the doctor;' then he putts off his gowne, 'There layes the bishop;' then 'twas, 'Here's to thee, Corbet;' 'Here's to thee, Lushington.'"

⁶ Pp. 124, 126. 4to. 1846.

⁷ Vol. xxxvi. plate 31, p. 386.

⁸ The Arch. Journal, vol. xiii. pp. 274, 275.

guishing decoration is made in our Journal. "According to popular tradition, the glass was taken at sea, in a vessel bound from Flanders to Italy, and the church built expressly for it; with the exception, however, of some portions of the larger figures of the Old Testament story in the lower lights, &c., the glass appears to be English, and made for the windows in which it is placed."⁹ No. CLXIII. of the *Ecclesiologist* (published by the Ecclesiological Society) contains an earnest remonstrance against the "work of destruction which, under the name of restoration, is now [1864] going on in the church of Fairford, Gloucestershire, and threatens to deprive us of the most complete collection of the Flemish glass painting of the fifteenth century now remaining in the country."¹ This elicited a reply from "Sebastian Evans," who was engaged upon its restoration. Once more, in No. CLXX. of the *Ecclesiologist*,² will be found a reprint of the account of the Fairford glass in Hearne's publication, which is prefaced by some remarks by the writer of this paper, in reference to the similarity of the design of the west window to two important ancient paintings of the School of van Eyck, of which I shall have occasion to speak in the course of these observations.

Manifestly incorrect, therefore, is Mr. Holt's statement that from the date of their insertion at Fairford the windows "have been permitted to remain utterly unrecognised" until the visit of the Archæological Association in last August. To recapitulate, it has been shown on the contrary, that even before the middle of the seventeenth century they were well known and appreciated by men of taste, and that from the beginning of the eighteenth until the present time, they have not unfrequently been commented upon both by individual art judges and learned and artistic societies in terms of commendation. What Mr. Holt in his paper terms his "preliminary reproach," and considered "too just to be either repressed or concealed," is consequently undeserved.

I have already remarked that I intend to animadvert upon only a *part* of the considerations alleged by Mr. Holt in support of his theory. For example, I will not comment upon his assertion that Albert Durer was an artist in stained glass, further than by asking for proof of this statement;³

⁹ Vol. xvii. p. 333.

¹ pp. 202, 203.

² pp. 286—289.

See Mr. Macray's Letter in Notes

neither will I offer an opinion in opposition to Mr. Holt's personal conviction respecting the "distinctively Dureresque" character of the Fairford designs, nor dispute his repudiation of the tradition that the church was built "to accommodate a set of painted windows."⁴ Doubtless there are several gentlemen present who are better qualified than myself to speak as to the designer or designers, the age, the country, the architectural indications,⁵ and the technical treatment and quality of the Fairford glass; and also to criticise those portions of Mr. Holt's paper which I shall purposely leave unanswered. The line which I propose to follow is so distinct from the above subjects as not to require its pursuer even to have seen the Fairford windows, and concerns only the main circumstantial evidences,⁶ tests, or pillars (so to speak) looming out of the haze of unsupported assertion and mere opinion, upon which Mr. Holt endeavours to support his ascription of those windows to Albert Durer.

The first of these is stated by Mr. Holt as follows: "I would . . . claim (under correction) as a special invention of Durer, found in his noble sketch of the 'Crucifixion' at Basle, and in the Fairford design of the same subject, the presence of the angel and demon receiving the souls of the penitent and impenitent thieves. I am aware that this incident has been resorted to by other painters, but I have found no example of it in German engraving, or illuminations, or in pictures at all within Durer's reach."

and Queries, No. 38, September 19, 1868.

⁴ "Contrived purposely for the reception of the glass, the plan [of Fairford Church] is necessarily somewhat cramped.

. . . The church consists of a Chancel, Nave, a Tower between them, and two Aisles, which extend without any external break to about half the length of the Chancel. This arrangement, necessary to secure the required number of windows, somewhat injures the effect of the exterior, and makes the distinction between the Chancel and Nave less marked than might have been wished." *Illustrations of Monumental Brasses*, p. 121.

⁵ "The architectural part of much is entirely unlike anything German of the date, though it very much resembles a good deal of English work in various parts of England. That Albert Durer,

the most advanced man of his day, should have copied detail out of fashion in his country is about as unlikely as anything not absolutely impossible." *The Ecclesiologist*, No. clxxxix. (Dec. 1868) p. 368.

⁶ Advanced in his Cirencester paper, and, with one exception, in a more concise and trenchant form in his letter to the *Standard* of Sept. 15, where they are introduced by the challenge, before referred to, thus:—"I now propose attempting to induce those who differ from me, to meet me on a few distinct and important points, which will go far to definitely settle the main question. If they can prove me to be in the wrong, no one will more readily—I may add, thankfully—admit it than I will; but if they are unable to successfully controvert my declarations, I shall assuredly claim the victory as Durer's."

In reference to this position my accomplished friend, Mr. N. H. J. Westlake (to whom we are indebted for the drawings of portions of the Fairford windows, and some other illustrations now exhibited) has remarked, in a letter to a daily paper,⁷ that the "invention" thus claimed as Durer's "was very common in Italian art" long anterior to the time of Durer, who, to say the least, could hardly have been unaware of its existence. I have not, indeed, come across "this incident" in German paintings⁸ or engravings *before* 1500, but I have brought here for your inspection a volume printed by John Knoblouch in 1508, and containing a print of the Crucifixion, in which it occurs. This engraving is the work of van Gamperlin or Gamberlin, a cotemporary of Durer, who resided chiefly at Strasbourg,⁹ and (as it may safely be concluded) never saw the Fairford Crucifixion. To this artist (or "formschneider" in Mr. Holt's vocabulary) may consequently be as reasonably assigned the merit (if any) of the "invention" as to Durer. Far less improbable, indeed, is the supposition that Durer borrowed the idea from van Gamperlin than van Gamperlin from Durer, if, as Mr. Holt admits, the first undoubted work of his in which it appears is a drawing "signed in 1514."¹ Neither van

⁷ The Standard, October 7, 1868.

⁸ That justly valued artist and archaeologist, Mr. J. G. Waller, has acquainted me with a German painting in which the above incident occurs. It is situated beneath a sculptured tympanum immediately over the south door of the church of Andernach, upon the Rhine. "The subject," writes Mr. Waller, "which is the Crucifixion, is thus treated: Christ, extended upon the Cross, is bowing the head and giving up the ghost; on His right is the figure of the Virgin, on His left that of S. John, the beloved disciple; crucified, one on each side, are also the two thieves; a figure is at the foot of each, apparently in the act of breaking their legs, whilst above, from the mouth of the good thief, an angel receives his departing soul; from that of the bad thief the same office is performed by a demon; this, however, which is on the left side, is much effaced. The figures are very small, less than a foot in height, so that there is but little room for the introduction of much detail, yet there is enough in the style of execution, and the character of the costume, to assign it to the early part of the fourteenth century."

The Gentleman's Magazine, p. 61, vol. xxxv. new series.

The Very Reverend Canon Rock, D.D., possesses a wood carving of the Crucifixion, of Flemish workmanship, and of the 15th century, which represents the same incident.

⁹ Strutt's Biographical Dictionary of Engravers, vol. i. p. 319, 4to, 1785. Bryan's Dictionary of Painters and Engravers, p. 268, royal 8vo, 1858.

¹ See Mr. Holt's Discourse delivered in Fairford Church, reported in The Builder, vol. xxvi. No. 1333, p. 616. "We had," he remarked, "a drawing by Albert Durer himself, signed in 1514, in which the Saviour was represented as crucified on the worked wood, while the thieves were on the rough wood; and here were a white child, emblematic of purity, and a black child, emblematic of sin, issuing from the heads of the repentant and of the unrepentant sinners. Now, considering, as he should strongly contend, that Albert Durer executed these [Fairford] windows somewhere about the year 1500, and that he did not make the drawing until 1514, and that he had never been in England at all, we must

Gamperlin nor Durer has, in my opinion, any just claim to it, and to assume that the latter was ignorant of early Christian art to the extent which such an attribution involves; and, moreover, to base upon this assumption the further one that Durer consequently designed, and not merely designed but actually manipulated the glass at Fairford, is a flight of fancy which appears to me to rise far above the confines of the reasonable.

Mr. Holt's next statement upon which I beg leave to comment immediately succeeds that which I have just dismissed. Referring to "the lily and the sword" in the painting of the Doom at Fairford, "issuing from the Christ in the 'Judgment-seat'—the one directed to the Virgin, the other to the John the Baptist—emblems, the one of Mercy, the other of Justice," he adds, "which I believe to be of Durer's invention, and a modification of the two swords in the *Biblia Pauperum*."

It might have been a sufficient answer to this argument to point to the noble engraving of the Last Judgment in the *Chronicon Mundi* (or the Nuremberg Chronicle) of the physician and philologist, Hardman Schedel, of 1493, but since Mr. Holt does not hesitate to ascribe the designs in that volume to Albert Durer, regardless of the statement in its colophon that they are due to Pleydenwurff and Durer's master, Wohlgemuth,² I will not linger upon it. Other examples of a similar device of the lily and the sword occur in works long prior to the time of Durer. One such appears in a picture in tempera, of the Last Judgment, ascribed to the fifteenth century, in Gloucester Cathedral, which Mr. Scharf pronounces to be "one of the most important specimens of English painting I remember to have seen."³ A Book of *Hours*⁴ in my possession, of the early part of the fifteenth century, written and limned by an English hand, and after the use of London, contains a miniature of our Lord as Judge showing His wounds, and attended by two

conclude one of two things—either that he was a vile plagiarist or that he was the inventor of these devices." It is noteworthy that crosses of "worked" and "rough wood" occur in van Gamperlin's Crucifixion.

² "Michaele Wolgemut et Wilhelmo Pleydenwurff quarum solerti acuratisimaeque animadversione tum civitatum

tum illustrium virorum figure inserte sunt." *Figurae* or *typi* is the regular printer's word for all sorts of illustrations long after Durer's time.

³ The *Archæologia*, vol. xxxvi. p. 372.

⁴ This volume is described by Canon Rock, D.D., in the *Eccelesiologist*, No. clxii. p. 125.

angels—one holding a lily branch with three white flowers on it; the other, a sword. On the former angel is inscribed “*misericordia* ;” on the latter, “*justicia*,” the words, be it observed, which are visible on labels “in the heading of the lights on each side of S. Michael,” in the Doom at Fairford. A similar representation of the angels of Justice and Mercy is given in a facsimile of two leaves in an “*Ars Moriendi*,” in T. O. Weigel’s and Dr. Ad. Zestermann’s great work on the “*Infancy of Printing in Pictures and Writing*,⁵” which upon internal evidence those gentlemen assign to a date between 1470 and 1480.⁶ But yet more to the purpose is the circumstance that the sword and lily are figured on the left and right of the Judge in two very important pictures of the fifteenth century, and quite “within Durer’s reach,” viz., the great triptych assigned to Roger van der Weyden the elder, at Beaune in Burgundy, and the famous altar picture in the cathedral of S. Mary at Dantzic, which, indeed, the design of the east window at Fairford remarkably resembles.⁷ In regard to the second of these paintings, Mr. Holt (in a letter⁸ to a daily journal) observes upon a communication⁹ of my own, “the only portion of the letter . . . to which it is necessary I should now allude is to record the serious doubt I entertain whether the date assigned to the celebrated triptych at Dantzic is correct, or the attribution to Memlinc well founded.” “The date of

⁵ Die Anfänge der Druckerkunst in bild und schrift, vol. ii. p. 22. Leipzig, fol. 1866.

⁶ “The date may be inferred partly, from the hair which is combed partly back from the middle of the forehead, partly in puffs down the ears, as in Gunter Zeiner’s *Lives of the Saints*, 1472; partly, from the straight guard of the sword of the angel [of justice] as in Koberger’s German Bible; partly, from the glory round the Jesus Christ terminating in lilies; and partly from the long trains of the drapery. All these points considered we should place this *Ars Moriendi* between 1470 and 1480.” Ibid. p. 25.

“The west window,” writes Mr. Scharf, “appears to me to be of an earlier date than the rest of the glass at Fairford. It is especially interesting as exhibiting a close affinity to the frequently described picture at Dantzic. . . . The arrangement and general action of the figures, the Blessed ascending steps with the aid of S. Peter, and the violent action

of the Condemned on the opposite side, are common in both paintings. At Dantzic, the figures of the Blessed entering Paradise are entirely nude; whilst at Fairford, their habiliments, tiaras, mitres, and crowns, distinguish their former grades and position in life. At Fairford the Condemned are much more grotesque; and the demons are scaly with snouts, hideously formed limbs, such as beset S. Anthony in Martin Schongauer’s well-known engraving. A remarkable parallel exists also in the central and dignified figure of S. Michael holding the scales in one hand, and a processional cross in the other. He is fully armed, and the fashion of the armour in both instances belongs to the fifteenth century.” Notes and Queries, No. 38, p. 268.

⁸ Dated Sept. 4, 1868, and published in the Standard.

⁹ Published in the Standard of August 26, 1868.

this curious picture," writes Mr. Scharf, "is traceable in the centrepiece on a gravestone to the left of the figure of S. Michael. A woman wringing her hands is seated on it. The following letters are all that remain, 'Anno Domini CCLXVII. I. A. R.' At first the date was restored 1367, but Waagen has satisfactorily shown, by the space worn away at the commencement, that there must have been an additional c."¹ This is good evidence that the picture was completed in 1467; and the supposition of its date being fifty years later, or indeed of any portion of the sixteenth century, is, for other reasons, untenable. The style of the architecture (which is free from the least trace of the Renaissance) of the splendid Pointed Gate through which the Blessed are passing into Heaven, and of the burnished golden armour of S. Michael, is sufficient to limit the date of the painting to about the beginning of the second half of the fifteenth century. It has not been my privilege to see the original picture, but I have attentively examined an excellent photograph of it. I have also studied the productions of Memlinc at Bruges, Munich, and elsewhere, and have had constantly before my eyes for many years a choice specimen of that master in my possession; and the refined and dignified expression of the countenances, and the arrangement of the draperies of the principal personages in the Dantzic picture, the elaborate finish of its details, the masterly rendering of its several groups of the Lost, and above all, the pure and devotional sentiment which pervades its entire design—all combine to form my conviction that they conclusively claim that picture either for Memlinc, or for one of his great *cotemporaries*, who was nearly akin to him in religious feeling and artistic excellence, and of the Netherlandish School.²

¹ The Archæologia, vol. xxxvi. p. 386, note.

² Since the above was written, I have received a letter from a gentleman than whom no one is better acquainted with the literature of Flemish art, Mr. W. H. James Weale, of Bruges, in which he observes: "The alleged discovery by me in the Archives here of a document in which Thierry Bouts engages to paint the picture of the Last Judgment now at Dantzic, for a Milanese nobleman, is a myth which has been going the round of the papers, and which I have already contra-

dicted several times, *e.g.*, in the *Chronique des Arts* of 27th September. The composition of the picture is very unlike any of the authenticated works of Bouts; as to the colouring and technical execution of the work, I cannot speak, not having seen the Dantzic picture. You are doubtless aware that this picture has been attributed in turn to almost all our great masters, and affords perhaps one of the very best examples of the little value that should be attached to attributions. The old tradition at Dantzic gives it to the brothers van Eyck. In 1807 it was

Mr. Holt continues, "In like manner I protest against the accustomed assumption of Dr. Waagen that the picture at Beaune, which I have very carefully examined, . . . was painted by Roger van der Weyden the elder, my belief being . . . that it was not painted until the early part of

carried off by the French, and exhibited at Paris as a work of Albert van Ouwater. When recovered from the French in 1815, it was exhibited at Berlin, and in Schadow's Catalogue figures as being by Michael Wohlgemuth! Mr. Hirt, in an article on the exhibition, assigned it to Hugo van der Goes, on the ground of its resemblance to the authentic picture by that master in the church of Santa Maria Nuova, Florence. In 1814, Waagen had compared the picture with van Eyck's altar-piece from Ghent, then also at Paris, and in his work on the van Eycks, published in 1822, declared it to be the work of John. Passavant in 1841, and Kugler in 1842, attribute it to Albert van Ouwater. In 1843, Hotho assigned it to Memlinc. Lubke, in his edition of Kugler's Handbook, published in 1861, adopts the opinion. Waagen, in his Handbook of Painting (English edition, 1860, p. 99), calls it the most important work of Memlinc that has descended to us, while in the Belgian edition (1863, p. 147) he adds that the vigour and transparency of the colouring reveal the influence of Thierry Stuerbout (he means Bouts). Now here are, I hope, attributions enough to deter anyone from adding to the confusion by venturing on another without proofs in support thereof.

"Now for some facts as to the Dantziger picture. In the early spring of 1473 there sailed from Bruges a galley named the *Saint Thomas*, belonging to Thomas Portunari, the agent of the Medici here. This vessel was captured on the high seas by the *Peter von Dantziger*, Captain Paul Benecke, who conveyed his prize home. On board the *Saint Thomas* was found the triptych now at Dantziger. Portunari used every means in his power to get back his property, but he appears to have been most especially anxious about the picture. Why? I shall attempt an answer presently; but before doing so, let us turn to the picture itself, and examine the armorial bearings thereon represented. Beside the portrait of the personage for whom the triptych was painted (exterior of right wing) is a shield: Or, a lion rampant sable, debruised by a bend argent; and beside his wife's portrait another shield: Gules, a lion rampant or, debruised by a bend

azure charged with three pincers of the second; in sinister chief, this remarkable device, a pair of compasses surmounted by a crown or, and interlaced with a scroll argent, bearing the motto, *POUR NON FAILLIR*. These last are undoubtedly the arms of the Milanese family Castiglione, but no one has yet discovered the donor's. Was there in Italy at that time any illegitimate descendant of a Count of Flanders married to a lady of the Castiglione family? The picture having been executed for Portunari as agent of the persons whose portraits are on the wings, it is not likely that he would have detained it at Bruges for nine and a-half years; this objection is fatal to the attribution to Roger de la Pasture (van der Weyden) who died 16th June, 1464. The composition, drawing of the figures, and especially the peculiar way of drawing the feet, is unlike Memlinc. Besides, this master was living at Bruges, and might easily have been commissioned to repaint the triptych. But if we suppose it to be by Hugo van der Goes, then the reason of Portunari's extreme anxiety to recover the picture becomes evident. That artist had determined on giving up his profession and seeking retirement in the cloister, and as soon as he had completed the engagements he had already contracted, he joined the community of Rouge Cloître, where he was professed in 1476, after having of course spent a year there as novice, and probably some months as postulant. In 1474, Portunari doubtless knew well that there was no chance of repairing his loss. The Dantziger artist flourished between Roger and Memlinc, and if he is not van der Goes, he must be an unknown master." Our distinguished colleague, Mr. John Gough Nichols, F.S.A., informs me that the arms of the family of Castiglione of Milan, are Gules, a lion rampant argent, holding a castle or. Crest, a demi-wild man proper, holding a compass or. Motto, "Pournon faillir." "This quite supports," he writes, "Mr. Weale's assigning of the similar coat to a Castiglione, but I could trace in the pedigree of the family no member that had settled in the Netherlands, or in Germany at the requisite period."

the 16th century ; and if I am correct in my assumption, it leaves the claim I have advanced of Durer being the inventor of the lily-branch and sword in the representation of the Last Judgment untouched."

It is, I am aware, just now the fashion to underrate the authority of the late Professor Waagen ; but I believe that few, if any, of the art-critics of our days have better understood the works of the painters of the *early* Italian, Flemish, and German schools, or had a fuller appreciation of their characteristic charms. But Dr. Waagen's "assumption" agrees with the opinion of Messrs. Crowe and Cavalcaselle, who state that "the noblest patron of" Roger van der Weyden "was the Chancellor Rollin, who founded the hospital of Beaune, in remembrance of the desolating plague that ravaged that city. Pope Eugenius the Fourth had granted his request to found the building under the invocation of S. Anthony, and he laid its first stone in 1443 (Gandelot, *Hist. de Beaune*, 4to., Dijon, 1772, p. 111). Van der Weyden painted for him, and for the adornment of that edifice, the largest altar-piece now extant, perhaps with the exception of the *Agnus Dei* of S. Bavon ; Rollin and his wife, Guigonne de Salins, figuring therein as donors."³ As reasonably, apart from external evidence, and judging solely from its design, colouring, costume, architectural details, and the like, might the van Eycks' grand picture, just named, of the "Adoration of the Apocalyptic Lamb" be ascribed, *e.g.*, to Mabuse, as the triptych at Beaune to any artist of the 16th century. The pure Pointed form of the Portal of Heaven on its right wing of itself attests (as in the Dantzig picture) to the date ordinarily assigned to it, viz. about 1447. I think that I have now disposed of Mr. Holt's assertion that the Fairford glass is the handiwork of Durer, because the lily and the sword, on the right and left of our Lord on His throne of judgment, is the exclusive invention of the painter, and are portrayed in the Fairford Doom.

In a letter, to which reference has been made, published more lately than his paper read at Cirencester,⁴ Mr. Holt writes : "I declare that the windows in Fairford church, which represent 'The Meeting of Joachim and Anne at

³ The Early Flemish Painters, by J. A. Crowe, and G. B. Cavalcaselle, c. viii. p. 163, 8vo. 1857.

⁴ See the Standard, Sept. 15.

the Golden Gate,' 'The Birth of the Virgin,' 'Her Presentation in the Temple,' and 'Her Marriage to Joseph,' are the original inventions of Albrecht Durer, and had never been represented by any painter than himself prior to 1500."

Surely the word "German," which, upon second thoughts or when better informed, Mr. Holt inserted before "painter" in the foregoing paragraph, denotes a virtual admission that Durer did not *invent* the pictures of the above incidents in the Fairford glass. The same subjects, I need hardly remark, are of frequent occurrence in early Italian art; and to come nearer home, are, *e.g.*, figured in the extreme westerly (almost, if not quite cotemporary)⁵ windows on the north side of King's College chapel, Cambridge. The "Golden Legende" (in my possession), printed by Caxton in 1483, contains on folio 284 a woodcut of the "Nativity of our Blessed Lady." A "Missale Parisiense," printed on vellum by John Prato in 1489, is adorned with coloured pictures of the Birth and Marriage of the Blessed Virgin, and a Horæ, printed on vellum by Simon Vostre a little later, with vignettes of the Meeting of Joachim and S. Anne, and of the Nativity and Presentation of S. Mary, and her Espousals with S. Joseph. Mr. Westlake has reminded me that her Marriage is represented in a painting attributed by Dr. Waagen to the elder van der Weyden, in the Berlin Museum, which I remember to have seen, and have indeed described in the *Ecclesiologist*.⁶ Its appearance in this picture has a strong *indirect* bearing upon Mr. Holt's declaration, because it is well known that under the influence of its author "the realistic tendency of the van Eycks pervaded all Germany," and Martin Schon, the greatest German master of the 15th century, a very old friend of Durer's father, and "Durer's idol,"⁷ is historically known to

⁵ In reference to the window which contains the painting of the Marriage of the Blessed Virgin, Mr. Scharf inquires, "May not this window prove to be a memorial window, referring to the Queen, or the King's sister, who died in 1503?" The *Archæological Journal*, vol. xiii. p. 49. Concerning the above design, the same gentleman also observes: "The draperies are angular, but simple and well arranged, partaking more of the early Florentine character, with minute attention also to the costume of the

painter's time, which seems to have been about the close of the fifteenth century." *Ibid.* vol. xii. p. 368.

⁶ Vol. xiii. p. 372. The picture represents the Birth of S. John Baptist, contained in a pointed arch in which is painted in *chiaroscuro*, with exquisite finish and minuteness, among other subjects, the "Marriage" mentioned in the text.

⁷ See Mr. Holt's Discourse in *The Builder*, vol. xxvi. No. 1333, p. 615.

have been his pupil.⁸ In *direct* contradiction of Mr. Holt's statement, I may observe that the chapel of S. Maurice at Nuremberg contains a picture, on a gold ground, of the Nativity of S. Mary, by a Cologne painter who, according to inscriptions on his works, flourished from 1463 to 1480, and who, from one of his principal productions (a representation of the closing scenes of our Lord's Life in eight compartments, once in the possession of M. Lyversberg), is usually designated the "Master of the Lyversberg Passion." In the Munich Gallery, among other specimens of this artist, are paintings of the Marriage of the Blessed Virgin and of the Meeting of Joachim and S. Anne.⁹ Once more, in the Stadel Museum, at Frankfort on the Maine, is a large altarpicture by Conrad Fyoll (of whom notices extend from 1461 to 1476),¹ in the central compartment of which is pictured the family of S. Anne; on the wings, the Birth and Decease of the Blessed Virgin.²

The next evidence advanced by Mr. Holt is, that the "lettering" in the scrolls of the Fairford windows "is in the identical character invented by Durer, and still known to printers as 'Albert Durer's Alphabet.'" The answer to this statement briefly is that the peculiarity of Durer's letters consists in their flat or square headings, which, in combination, present a series of rectangular forms; whereas, those at Fairford, on the contrary, are irregular in character, and their heads are not infrequently arched or semi-circular.³

The last evidence or argument alleged by Mr. Holt is ushered by him as follows: "I have reserved to the close of my paper an argument which I may call my private and peculiar property, for it turns on a view which has never yet been publicly propounded, and it is pretty safe to be sharply contested." He then *assumes* that Durer "was

⁸ Handbook of Painting. Flemish and German Schools, vol. i. p. 90.

⁹ They are numbered respectively, 20 and 32, Cabinet II., in the "Catalogue des tableaux de la Pinacothèque royale a Munich," 1858. The same collection contains a picture (No. 6, Salle I.), by the elder Holbein, of the Presentation of S. Mary.

¹ Passavant, Kunstblatt, No. 101, 1841.

² Handbook of Painting. Flemish and German Schools, vol. i. p. 30.

³ Mr. J. G. Waller remarks: "Among the many details that have been appealed

to to prove these works to be by A. Durer are the scroll inscriptions. . . .

We are told they exactly correspond with the alphabet called A. Durer's. I plead to an ignorance of this special alphabet, but having had thirty years' experience of Mediæval alphabets, and possessing a collection of inscriptions from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, I failed to see any speciality whatever beyond that perfectly familiar to me." The Builder, vol. xxvi. No. 1341, p. 764.

largely concerned in the designing and engraving on wood of the cuts" in a "set of German books containing Scriptural designs," which "were issued from the press of Anthony Koberger, the greatest Nuremberg printer and Durer's god-father;" and he proceeds to say, "there is found in them, only in them, and only between 1490 and 1500, the time within which the designing of the Fairford windows must fall, several peculiar forms of the nimbi of the Divinity. . . . You will find these nimbi—unique, remember—never occurring except in this set of books, and within this narrow interval of dates,—repeatedly in the Fairford windows.⁴ I know no other example of it in this country. If there be none, I maintain that it connects these windows with the designer of these woodcuts. Hence the importance of my view that the designer was Albert Durer. I may say that I had arrived at this conclusion years before I ever saw the Fairford windows. The Nuremberg nimbus ['used by nobody but Durer, and by him only for ten years—between 1490 and 1500'],⁵ therefore, as I may call it, came upon me, when I found it at Fairford, with all the force of a clinching blow." I will not dispute Mr. Holt's attribution of the designs and engravings in the books in question to Albert Durer (although I feel persuaded that the principal illustrations in the noblest of them, the Nuremberg Chronicle, are Wohlgemuth's), because I submit that the "force" of the "clinching blow" upon which Mr. Holt so much depends, may be, and is, annihilated by the consideration that the Nuremberg, or, correctly and technically, the cruciform fleur-de-lys nimbus, is neither confined to "the set of books," nor "within" the "narrow interval of dates," mentioned by Mr. Holt. The Nuremberg Chronicle lies on the table for the inspection of the nimbi figured in its engravings, which exhibit examples of the fleur-de-lys in (what I may term) its primitive and simple, and, as space allowed, its decorated or efflorescent forms. By the kindness of Mr. Westlake I am able also to exhibit exact copies of the nimbus in the Fairford windows. The nimbus, however, both of the Nuremberg Chronicle and of the Fairford windows (or specimens so

⁴ "I declare that Albrecht Durer invented the 'Nimbi' which designate the Trinity in the Fairford windows, and that no painter except himself ever used them

prior to 1500." Mr. Holt's letter in the Standard, Sept. 15.

⁵ Discourse in The Builder, vol. xxvi. No. 1333, p. 616.

nearly like it as to indicate that they are of the same family) will be found, for instance in England, on a "Trinity" belonging to a brass⁶ at Childrey, Berkshire; and in the painting, before alluded to, of the Doom in Gloucester Cathedral: in a French miniature of the 15th century, representing in human form the three Persons of the ever Blessed Trinity, of which a representation is given by Didron;⁷ in the engraving in the work by Weigel and Zestermann, to which I have invited your attention; in the tomes of an eminent French printer, Antoine Verard,⁸ who began to flourish in 1480; and in the books which I have brought from my own library for your examination, and which I will mention in the order in which they were given to the world. I. Devout Prayers on the Passyon of God, in early English verse, with rude paintings on every page, MS. cir. 1450; II. Missale Parisiense (to which I have already referred), printed in Paris in 1489; III. In die Innocencium Sermo pro Episcopo puerorum, printed by Wynkyn de Worde, before 1496;⁹ IV. Mons perfectionis, otherwyse in Englysshe the hylle of Perfectyon, 2nd ed., printed by W. de Worde in 1501; V. The volume of engravings illustrative of the Life of Christ (comprising the Crucifixion by van Gamperlin, and) printed at Strasbourg¹ in 1508; VI. The Pater Noster, Ave, and Credo, without place, name, and date, but from the press of W. de

⁶ In memory of Jone, daughter of Thomas Walrond, married to Robert Strangbow. For my knowledge of this fact I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. Waller, who says, "the date is partly gone; from what remains it was probably 1497 or 1507, but from the character of the brass most likely the former." The "Trinity" in question is figured in the Gentleman's Magazine, p. 579, vol. xxxii. new series.

⁷ Iconographie Chrétienne. Histoire de Dieu. Plate 150, p. 604. Paris, 4to., 1843.

⁸ See Dibdin's Bibliographical Decameron, vol. ii. p. 26, where will be found two facsimiles of Verard's engravings, in which the fleur-de-lys nimbus is represented.

⁹ This volume is presumed to be unique. Dibdin described it when in Heber's possession. (Typographical Antiquities, &c., vol. ii. p. 379, 4to, 1812.) That it was printed before 1496, appears from the fact of its containing a request to pray for the soul of Kemp, Bishop of

London, who deceased in 1489; and his successor Hill in 1495. A leaf with a print of the Crucifixion (in which appears the fleur-de-lys nimbus), concludes the tract. The same print occurs in the other volumes from the press of W. de Worde, mentioned above. As in van Gamperlin's engraving, the cross of our Lord is of "worked," and the crosses of the thieves are of "rough wood." Mr. J. G. Nichols has undertaken to edit the Sermon for the Camden Society.

¹ "There is a very interesting class of books of Strasbourg and Mayence, in which this nimbus is so common as to occur many times in the same volume. In the Hortulus Animæ, J. Schoffers, 1516, we have the very same form of fleur-de-lys nimbus that occurs in the Fairford designs: notably so in the Last Judgment, where the lily and sword occur, and our Lord, as in the west window, has the earth, with its cities portrayed on it, for His footstool." The Ecclesiologist, No. clxxxix. pp. 365, 366.

Worde, cir. 1509; VII. Missale Trajectense, printed by John Severin at Leyden, in 1514; VIII. A single Sermon by Martin Luther, printed in 1523;² IX. An imperfect black letter English treatise, containing woodcuts of the xv. "tokens" of the coming of the Last Day; X. The boke callyd the Myrroure of oure Lady very necessary for all relygyous persones, printed by Richard Fawkes in 1530; and XI. The Myrroure or Glasse of Christe's Passion, printed by Robert Redman, in 1534. In all the volumes I have named occurs, I repeat, the fleur-de-lys nimbus of the Nuremberg Chronicle and the Fairford glass; not one of them belongs to Mr. Holt's series of books, and more than one bear dates prior to 1490 and subsequent to 1500. The ease with which I have provided these specimens satisfies me that many more might readily be produced; two or three, however, are more than enough to prove that the occurrence of the Nuremberg or fleur-de-lys nimbus in the windows at Fairford, so far from having "all the force of a clinching blow," has really not a feather's weight towards the affiliation of those windows upon Albert Durer. With this remark I bring my criticism upon Mr. Holt's paper to a close. I believe I have fairly met him on (to cite his own words) the "few distinct and important points, which will go far to definitely settle the main question," and I submit that I have not inconclusively "controverted" his "declarations."³

NOTE.—The foregoing Discourse and the discussion consequent upon its delivery, have borne fruit in two elaborate articles, on the Fairford windows, by that able and judicious art critic, the Rev. J. C. Jackson.⁴ In its original form, it concluded with a few considerations in support of the theory, that some of the designs on the glass at Fairford may possibly have been made by Hugo van der Goes; a conjecture which, perhaps, is countenanced by the admitted resemblance of the Doom at Fairford to the altar picture at Dantzic, which Mr. Westlake assigns to the above

² Entitled *Ein Sermon Doctor Martini Luthers Nuf das Euangelion Jo. x. Von dem gутten hyrten. Durch yn uberlesin. MDXXIII.* Above this title is a woodcut of a wolf worrying some sheep whose shepherd is running away; at its foot is another, of our Saviour carrying a lamb

upon his left shoulder, and both our Lord and the lamb have fleur-de-lys nimbs.

³ Mr. Holt's Letter in the *Standard*, Sept. 15, 1868.

⁴ See *The Ecclesiologist*, No. clxxxix., and the *Building News* of Dec. 4, 1868.

master.⁵ In the "Builder" of Nov. 7, 1868, Mr. John R. Clayton attributed that painting to Memlinc, and was contradicted by the statement that Mr. Weale had lately met with a document in which Thierry Bouts engages to paint that picture for a Milanese nobleman. My inquiry of Mr. Weale, in regard to the correctness of this assertion, was answered by the communication which is printed in a preceding note. Close as is the likeness of the Last Judgment at Fairford to that at Dantzig, the Fairford *Crucifixion* as nearly resembles an important picture in the Brussels Gallery, to which attention has recently been directed by Mr. Westlake. "The picture," he observes, "is numbered 84 in the catalogue, and is a representation of the Crucifixion, with other scenes in the back-ground. It has the A of the Fairford work, on a blue banner, on the dexter side (not the A of Albert Durer or Aldegraver, as given in the article in the Gentleman's Magazine by Mr. Tom Taylor)."⁶ The following are its "points of similarity" to the Fairford Crucifixion. I. The floriated nimbus of our Lord upon the Cross. II. The good and bad angels over the Thieves. III. The planed and rough wood crosses. IV. The arrangements of the angels' heads, plain to the ears and then commencing to curl; and the manner of their draperies. V. The face, figure, and costume of the Blessed Virgin. VI. The armour and general costume. VII. The sentiment, tone of colour, and style of composition. "At one time," says Mr. Westlake, "the picture was attributed to Aldegraver, on account of the signature. This every critic now acknowledges to be a mistake, and I have some sketches of glass designed by that artist, which bear no resemblance whatever to the picture." It was in the Gallery of M. Weyer, of Cologne, and purchased at his sale for the Brussels Museum. Mr. Weale, who assigns to it the date of cir. 1485, remarks:—"Cette composition est très-remarquable; les groupes, surtout ceux des cavaliers à droite de la Croix, et des saintes femmes, sont disposés avec beaucoup d'habileté et témoignent du talent original de son auteur; et si le dessin manque sous le rapport des proportions anatomiques (têtes trop grandes et bras trop courts), celui des draperies et des détails ne laisse rien à désirer; le coloris, d'un éclat

⁵ The Standard, Oct 7, 1863.

⁶ The Builder, vol. xxvii, no. 1353, p. 27.

merveilleux, éblouit par sa splendeur, et le sentiment profond qui y règne rend ce tableau digne d'occuper un haut rang parmi les productions de l'Ecole du Bas-Rhin. Au commencement de ce siècle, il ornait l'église de Richterich, près d'Aix-la-Chapelle, dont la fabrique ignorante le vendit au général Ruhl von Lilienstern, qui le légua au ministre Von Schleiniz, de qui M. Weyer l'acheta."⁷

⁷ Notice sur la Collection de Tableaux anciens, faisant partie de la Galerie de M. J. P. Weyer, Architecte Honoraire de la ville de Cologne et Chevalier de l'Ordre

Royal de Leopold de Belgique, par W. H. James Weale, p. 18. Bruges, 8vo. 1865.