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Abstract

The study is set against a period of cultural and political change in Continental Europe and the United Kingdom at the beginning of the nineteenth century. As a result of the Concordat between Napoleon and Pope Pius VII signed on the 15 July 1801, the Pope agreed that he and his successors would take no action against the buyers of church property. In this way the secularising of church property, firstly in France and later in other countries, was legalised. The wholesale redistribution began during the Peace of Amiens in 1802, one of the “Goods” on offer being stained glass. The United Kingdom was the primary beneficiary of this redistribution with its emerging interest in historical objects, firstly antiquarian, then commercial and later intellectual.

Because of the extent of the trade in stained glass in this period the study concentrates on the trade between the Rhineland and the United Kingdom, with the focus being between 1815-1835, when a new constellation of buyers, sellers and installers of Rhenish stained glass appeared. The function of the appendices is twofold: firstly to remove detailed but relevant data from the main text so as not to obscure the main argument and secondly to provide the reader with data not strictly within the parameters of the thesis.

The analysis of the available and newly discovered data takes three approaches to acquisition and installation and is presented in three case studies. Firstly the activities of the Regency Contractor architects, highlighting Sir Jeffry Wyatville and William Wilkins who were responsible for the most significant Rhenish stained glass installations in this period. The second analyses Edward Spenser Curling (1771-1850) whose newly discovered diary (by the author) of his activities between 1827-36, sheds new light on the detailed mechanics of the stained glass trade of this period and the networks existing in Cologne and the United Kingdom. The discovery of this diary proves that Curling acquired all the Altenberg and St Apern stained glass panels presently in the United Kingdom. The third study analyses a number of facets that influenced the trade in the United Kingdom, particularly the activities of the stained glass painters Betton and Evans.
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CHAPTER I
Stained Glass and the Gothic(k) Sensibility

When plunder commences let it be complete; why did not Lord F- take all? Why does not Sir JB (who is antiquary and comes here sometimes) seize the rest?¹

Introduction: The Current State of Research into the Trade in Stained Glass

Wainwright defined a new area of research in his doctoral thesis of 1986,² and published his thesis in 1989 with the title of The Romantic Interior. He confirmed that ’In dealing with the sources of supply from which British antiquaries, architects, collectors and brokers of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries selected the ancient objects (including stained glass), to furnish their Romantic Interiors, remains largely uncharted territory. The role of the salerooms is clearer, but the way the brokers operated at auction sales is complex.’³ Research into the trade in stained glass has lain relatively dormant since the pioneering work of Rackham (in 1927 and, significantly, 1945, the latter in relation to the importation and installation of the stained glass at Ashridge Park),⁴ and Kent (in 1939), with his investigation of the stained-glass importer J.C.

¹ Lord F: Hugh Fortescue (1753-1841), 3rd Baron and 1st Earl; Sir JB: Joseph Banks (1743-1820). Quotation from the diaries of the Hon. John Byng, at Tattershall collegiate church on 2 July 1791. ’The Collegiate Church is, truly, a venerable pile, with beautiful pillars, and one paint’d window; it is now parted from the chancel by a deal door (the altar table standing in the middle aisle) to keep out the wind; as every pane of its wonderful stain’d glass has been pillaged-and not replaced by any other!’ Andrews, 1934-38: II, 356. See also Marks, 1984.
² Wainwright, 1986.
³ Wainwright, 1989: 68.
⁴ Rackham, 1927; id., 1945-47.
Hampp of Norwich.\textsuperscript{5} These researchers in the stained-glass trade foreshadowed and influenced the work of researchers half a century later.

The aim of this thesis is to follow Wainwright’s lead by investigating changing tastes and fashions in collecting stained glass, focussing on the traffic between England and the Rhineland, and the significant roles played by the stained-glass trader and the Gothic Revival architect in the period between 1794 and 1835. This trade has been little studied, and British studies (which mostly date from the middle years of the twentieth century) have tended to be restricted by international boundaries to data concerning trade at a national level. A similar phenomenon can be observed on the Continent, where, for example, detailed studies have been made in Cologne of the city’s stained-glass collections, only to conclude with statements alluding to unfinished research into the trade of the glass to the United Kingdom. The story behind the sale of the glass from the St Bernard series that was stored in the church of St Severin in Cologne and other glass that was sold in the 1840s to the Rev. W.G. Roland, the vicar of St Mary’s Shrewsbury is a case in point and until now has remained un-researched.\textsuperscript{6} The aim of this investigation is therefore to bridge the gaps existing in the international knowledge base by looking at the trade and appreciation of stained glass from both sides of the Channel, thereby providing new insights into the development of the stained-glass trade, its cultural implications, and

\textsuperscript{5} Kent, 1937b.
\textsuperscript{6} Schaden, 1995b: 118.
its effect on installation practice in the United Kingdom and (later) in
Germany.

The focus of this investigation is the trade in Rhenish stained
glass. Glass imports from France and the Low Countries at the turn of
the nineteenth century had a significant effect on the early
development of the trade, as discussed in chapter II, leading to the
establishment of a network of contacts, sales outlets, glass restorers
and installers, but to include them (except in passing in some entries
documented in Appendix I) would overstretch the remit of this
investigation. The reasons for the selection of the trade in Rhenish
stained glass as the focus for this study are twofold.

In the period around the Peace of Amiens of 1802, some
Rhenish stained glass was traded, if the glass was of secondary
quality, or did not conform with the aesthetic requirements of their
new owners is unclear; what can be said is that the significant
collections of stained glass remained in the Rhineland, principally in
Cologne. The major collections of stained glass only came onto the
market after 1815, with the lifting of the Continental blockade (as a
result of changes in the European economic climate) and auctions
following the deaths of the most important collectors. All the large
installations and subsequent museum collections of Rhenish stained
glass in the United Kingdom have their origins in this later period of
importation and installation; this phenomenon has not been
researched exhaustively until now. Clarification of the sales and
installations of the near complete series of Rhenish stained glass at
Ashridge Park from cloisters of the abbeys of Mariawald (Fig. I.1)\(^7\) and Steinfeld (Fig. I.2),\(^8\) forms the first objective of this investigation.

The second objective is to document the mechanisms of the sale, trade, resale and installation of Rhenish stained glass in England between 1815 and 1835. This investigation benefits greatly from a central case study, based on a primary source rediscovered by the author in 2010, the diary of Edward Spenser Curling, a trade consul from Deal in Kent who documented his activities in detail.\(^9\) His diary covers the years 1827–37, and of greatest importance are the entries for the years 1827–32. Curling’s diary is a unique document, the product of a businessman that reflects the late Georgian period in which it was produced, and includes observations of wide-ranging social and historical interest. In his diary he describes his official activities as a trade consul, the conditions prevailing in the hotel industry in the Low Countries and the Rhineland in the period, and the nature of the people he met. The diary’s importance for this study is that it documents his significant trading activities in stained glass. Curling documents the import of stained glass from Amsterdam, Bruges, Antwerp and Zürich, but of greatest significance are his imports from Cologne, as these now constitute a significant percentage of Rhenish stained glass in the United Kingdom; of particular importance in this respect are the Altenberg glass in

---

\(^7\) See Appendix I, entry for London, Victoria & Albert Museum: Cloister Glass from Mariawald Abbey (p.246).
\(^8\) See Appendix I, entry for London, Victoria & Albert Museum: Cloister Glass from Steinfeld Abbey (p.248).
\(^9\) The Curling Diary is currently in storage during refurbishment of the library; CL, ‘The Diary of Edward Spenser Curling Esq. 1827-1836’.
St Mary’s Shrewsbury,\textsuperscript{10} and the Ägidius-Kapelle glass now in the Victoria & Albert Museum.\textsuperscript{11} Curling’s diary presents a different perspective on the established narratives of the stained-glass trade. It was a market in transition. Traders, officials, clergy, conservators and politicians were often divided in their interests, on the one hand active in the restoration and conservation of glass, and on the other stimulating the trade in stained glass, going so far as to copy stained glass in order to sell it under another provenance; the career of Christian Geerling from Cologne illustrates this conflict. Case Study 2 (in chapter III) documents in detail the tortuous journey made by the Altenberg and St Apern glass from Cologne to its eventual place of installation in St Mary’s Shrewsbury, and illustrates the cultural and financial forces at work in the period.

Methodologies employed for historical narratives have their limitations, in that they tend to examine the individual collector (such as Horace Walpole) rather than the broader socio-economic and cultural developments of a specific period. A critical factor was that collectors of stained glass, whether they were individuals or religious institutions, could only exist where there was an infrastructure for the supply of significant cultural goods, and the necessary economic and cultural forces to drive this forward. This thesis aims to amend the emphasis in the traditional historical narrative.

A general desire to acquire historical objects, including stained glass, developed at the beginning of the nineteenth century. This study illuminates the rising discernment of collectors and a growing

\textsuperscript{10} See chapter III, Case Study 2 (p.141).
\textsuperscript{11} See Appendix I, entry for London, Victoria & Albert Museum: Glass from the Ägidius-Kapelle (p.253).
demand for antiquarian authenticity in the stained glass being acquired. In this regard, the methodology advanced by Riegl (1858–1905), particularly in his essay *The Modern Cult of Monuments*, is instructive. Written in 1903, it discussed primarily the value of architectural monuments; stained glass however can be discussed in the same manner, as it is a significant element of architecture. Riegl defined ‘historical value’, ‘age value’ and ‘art value’, all of which are dependent on the authenticity of the object, in this case stained glass. A lack of authenticity represented loss of value. This ‘loss’ is clearly illustrated in the stained glass transaction between E.S. Curling and the Cologne collector and dealer Christian Geerling in 1828–29. Geerling had sold Curling glass purporting to be original; it transpired that some of it was restored and had therefore lost value, and as a result Curling broke off his business relationship with Geerling (see p.119). These fluctuations between the historical and monetary value of stained glass are a recurrent theme that is examined in this investigation; they are often considerable during the period, being tied to the developing concepts of taste, fashion, and most significantly, levels of religious tolerance.

The research for this study has uncovered a considerable amount of new data on the stained-glass trader and the collections that resulted. The gazetteer in Appendix I integrates this new data into what is already known from primary and published secondary sources, offering corrections where necessary. The aim of this gazetteer is threefold: firstly, to assemble existing information on individual traders, installations and collections, provide new

---

biographical data; secondly, to try and correct misinterpretations and inconsistencies in the data currently in the public domain; and thirdly, to act as a source for future research into the stained-glass trade, the installations that resulted, and their effect on stained-glass practice in the Victorian period.

**Iconoclasts and the Remnants of Gothicism**

The iconoclasm during the English Civil War has been extensively documented by Spraggon, particularly the fate of stained-glass windows. One of the sources quoted by Spraggon is pertinent to this investigation: *The Arraignment of Superstition or A Discourse between a Protestant, a Glazier, and a Separatist*, published anonymously in 1642. The Protestant and the glazier defend images in glass against the separatist, on the grounds that they were ‘curious windows’ and ‘ancient monuments’ worthy of preservation; the separatist presented a counter-argument that was to be heard over the next hundred years, saying ‘scarce at noone day can we see to read/the holy Bible for the paint and lead’, a viewpoint diametrically opposed to that expressed by Milton twenty years before, ‘And storied windows richly dight Casting a dim religious light’. The Parliamentary ordinances of 1643 and 1644 enforced the separatist’s argument. The intention of the first ordinance of 1643 was that ‘all images and pictures of saints, or superstitious

---

14 Ibid.: 46.
inscriptions ... shall before the said first day of November, be taken away and defaced’, and that windows were to be ‘made up and repaired in good and sufficient manner’. In some parts of England stained glass was extensively destroyed, the best-documented account being of William Dowsing’s activities in the then seven counties of the Eastern Association.\textsuperscript{17} After the Restoration of 1660, most cathedrals and churches were patched up, but little investment was made in church fabric in the following years, so by 1750 churches had fallen into a state of general dilapidation.

This combination of destruction and neglect continued for about the next hundred years. The practical argument of the ‘separatist’, with its religious overtones, was reinforced by an architectural sentiment that will be discussed in the next chapter, on account of which Gothic was demoted into a ‘barbarous’ style in comparison with the enlightenment of Classicism, with its emphasis upon rationality and light. The cultural process behind these actions can be paralleled with the priorities of the Baroque throughout Europe. The first signs of a reaction against this new orthodoxy were recorded by William Stukeley. In 1736, Stukeley founded the Brasen Nose College Society at Stamford to protest against the destruction of stained glass in the local church of St George; it proved a short-lived and unsuccessful enterprise. Fifty years later, in his diaries written between 1781 and 1794 the Hon. John Byng documented changes to the situation, with some glass being protected, but destruction continuing elsewhere.\textsuperscript{18} His anger, as seen in the opening quotation

\textsuperscript{17} Cooper, 2001.
\textsuperscript{18} Andrews, 1934-38: v.1&2.
concerning the situation in the collegiate church in Tattershall,\textsuperscript{19} is typical of him, as was his experience at Spilsby on the 8 July 1789, when he wrote: ‘I enquired at an old glazier’s shop, for stain’d glass ... they made no account of it, for that month since, they took down a painted window from Bolingbroke Church, which was all thrown away, or broken by the Boys.’\textsuperscript{20} Byng commented on and echoed a version of the ‘separatist’ argument when visiting Doncaster on the 2 June 1792: ‘and now that stain’d glass is removed (which was intended for obstruction of the sun, and for meditation) must be like a greenhouse.’\textsuperscript{21} In the 1730s, Stukeley made a similar observation in St Martin’s, Stamford, where stained glass had been removed so that the vicar did not need to wear spectacles. Stukeley expressed his cultural affiliations with a little \textit{Schadenfreude}, noting that ‘soon afterwards blinds had to be fitted to the new clear-glass windows to cut out the glare of the sun’.\textsuperscript{22}

There was to be a dramatic change at the turn of the nineteenth century, with the rediscovery of a Gothic sensibility in Britain after a period of neglect. Gothic had survived, – indeed, as Brooks has documented, it had never gone away.\textsuperscript{23} This was partly the result of the antiquarian movement, partly of nationalistically and politically motivated reaction to the Napoleonic Wars, and partly of architectural taste. Gothic became an acceptable architectural style again. This change had a dramatic effect on attitudes to the installation of stained glass in Britain. Churches that had been

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.: 1935, v.2: 351 (July 2 1791).
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.: 1953, v.2:,374 (July 8 1791).
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.: III, 28.
\textsuperscript{22} Piggott, 1985: 115.
\textsuperscript{23} Brooks, 1999.
stripped, as illustrated in Fig. I.3, were re-glazed in the new century, and many new installations were made. There was however a significant problem: the techniques of stained-glass painting had mostly been lost, with exceptions such as William Peckitt in York. So in the early years of the nineteenth century, the shortfall in national production had to be made up by imports from the secularised churches and monasteries of Continental Europe (Fig. I.4).

**Antiquarianism, Consumerism and Value: Stained Glass in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries**

Crane has demonstrated that interest in collecting historical objects in Europe, particularly in Germany, moved from the domain of the idiosyncratic antiquarian to reflect wider political and national agendas.24 These wider issues are reflected in the name given by businessman Jacob Lyversberg (1761-1834) to the chapel in Cologne at Heumarkt 10 – ‘Kapelle Der Alten Deutschen’ – that from 1808 was used to exhibit medieval artefacts, including stained glass. The collection had been assembled for Lyversberg by Matthias Joseph de Noël (1782–1849), who was to become influential in stained glass conservation in Cologne, as well as its sale and export. In 1828, Noël became the curator of Cologne’s first city museum, the Wallrafianum at the Trankgasse 7 (later the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum).

The evolution of the European art market in the second half of the eighteenth century had given rise to a new profession, that of the art dealer.25 From the beginning, the dealer was not considered a

---

24 Crane, 2000b.
trustworthy character, and objects that had been in the hands of dealers were suspected of being fakes.\textsuperscript{26} This reputation continued well into the middle of the nineteenth century, as is documented by Forster’s \textit{Stowe Catalogue, Priced and Annotated} of 1848.\textsuperscript{27} In a period of expanding ‘cultural consumption’ a new consumer revolution was created, often in spite of the dubious authenticity of the objects on offer.\textsuperscript{28}

Throughout the second half of the eighteenth century, the commercial collecting economy outside the field of painting and sculpture concentrated on arms and armour, late-medieval ivories, ancient furniture, and stained glass. It is not possible to separate an object’s historical value from other values (aesthetic for example), in relation to its desirability as an object that tapped into contemporary notions of taste and fashion.\textsuperscript{29} Critical in this period was the perceived value of stained glass. In his book \textit{Rubbish Theory}, Thompson noted that when a durable object becomes rubbish, it entered a period of low or zero value through lack of appreciation. He also noted that objects of intrinsic value ideally last forever and increase in value over time; to regain cultural and monetary value, damaged artworks require conservation and restoration, and the antique dealer or stained-glass salesman moves an object from its transient or rubbish phase by emphasizing its durability and monetary value.\textsuperscript{30} This

\begin{enumerate}
\item Wainwright, 2000: 41.
\item ‘During the sale scarcely any respectable persons could enter the mansion without being importuned to entrust their commissions to persons of this class [brokers]: you were told that the applicant belonged to the London Society of Brokers’... that it was no use to offer personal biddings as the brokers attended for the purpose of buying and would outbid any private individual ... The villainy of the system will be judged when we add that four or five of these men generally work together.’; Forster, 1848: 102.
\item Campbell, 1987.
\item Westgarth, 2006: 11.
\item Thompson, 1979: 103–106.
\end{enumerate}
phenomenon was illustrated by the Rev. Hugh Owen in relation to the Herkenrode stained glass:31 ‘Mr Stevenson the Proprietor of the exhibition of ancient stained glass in London called on me a few days ago. I delighted him with a sight of this glass especially the Cardinal ... He valued, each square as those in the chapter house, at from 30 to 40 guineas each, if perfect.’32 In his valuation of the glass around the same time Francis Eginton (1736-1805) was confused, concluding that at Stevenson’s 40 guineas the glass was worth £14,000;33 Sir Brook Boothby had acquired the glass for £200.34

This commercial trade in historical objects, including stained glass, played a significant role in the establishment of museum collections.35 According to Thompson’s thesis, when an object’s value had regained status in the prevailing social hierarchy, the result was the creation of collections, which as Pomian has stated are ultimately ‘kept out of the economic circuit, and are afforded special protection and display under controlled conditions, the museum’.36 The move from collections of curiosities to a structured form of art collecting in Germany was documented by Gustav Klemm in 1837.37 Crane notes the change between Erinnerung (‘memory’, a form of curiosity cabinet), and Denkmal (‘memorial’), the first represented by collections such as those of Baron Johann von Hüpsch (1730-1805) and Ferdinand Franz Wallrath (1748-1824), who was criticised by Goethe: ‘[Wallrath] belongs to that sort of people who from a
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31 See Appendix I, entry for Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (p.239).
33 LRO, D30/6/3/3.
34 See Appendix I, entry for Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (p.239).
37 Klemm, 1837.
boundless desire to possess things, are born without any methodical sensibility or love of order.\textsuperscript{38}

**Stained Glass and Its Role in Architectural Practice at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century**

As Raguin has stated, when stained glass was “rediscovered” at the beginning of the nineteenth century, “the decorative needs of revival architectural styles of pre-baroque eras” were being rediscovered from what was an “increasingly attractive but relatively little known past”.\textsuperscript{39} She has likewise noted that the nature of the collections, public and private, influenced the taste of contemporary architectural practitioners in the revival styles.\textsuperscript{40} The lack of knowledge influenced the nature of early Gothic(k) Revival architecture and the resulting attitudes to stained glass. Much early glass had been destroyed in pursuit of the harmonious architectural whole. Frew has documented how the “improvements” undertaken by James Wyatt (1746-1813) were partly symptomatic of this tendency,\textsuperscript{41} provoking Pugin’s famous outburst: ‘The Destroyer [Wyatt] ... this monster of architectural depravity – this pest of cathedral architecture’.\textsuperscript{42} Pugin’s quotation was published in the 1860s, long after his death in 1852, but is representative of the new attitudes of the Victorian Gothic Revival. Whether Wyatt, in the context of his time, was reprehensible is debatable. Certainly, Pugin’s view was not universally shared, for, as Rickman wrote in 1813 on

\textsuperscript{38} Crane, 2000b:189, quoting Calov, 1969: 59.
\textsuperscript{39} Raguin, 1990: 311.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.: 310.
\textsuperscript{41} Frew, 1979: 368.
\textsuperscript{42} Ferrey, 1861: 65–66.
Wyatt’s death ‘the late J. Wyatt was the only person in England that understood Gothic architecture’.\textsuperscript{43} Rickman should have known, as in 1817 he published his *Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of English Architecture* that finally established a standard for Gothic nomenclature with definitions that are still used today, thereby ending a twenty-year debate on the origins of Gothic and providing a base for the development of a discourse on the Gothic Revival.\textsuperscript{44}

At the end of the eighteenth century, there were often heated discussion, recrimination and regret over stained-glass installations and their architectural context. In 1804, Joseph Faringdon wrote that ‘Wyatt and Lysons much regretted taking away the beautiful Gothick window work at the east end of Windsor Chapel – (1792) to make room for the painted picture by West, who has persuaded the King to do it.’\textsuperscript{45} That there was a conflict and division of opinion between the antiquarians, the clergy and the viewing public is well illustrated by John Byng’s reaction to Reynolds’s west window in New College Chapel, Oxford, painted by John Jarvis (c.1749–1804) He wrote: ‘Now I am sorry to dissent from this run of fine taste, I must own I prefer’d the old high coloured paintings … and to speak my mind, these twisting emblematical figures appear to me half-dress’d, languishing harlots.’\textsuperscript{46}

Spirited debate was to continue for the next forty years, both soberly, as expressed in the requirements laid down in the Church Building Act of 1818, and wittily, as in the *Hints to some*
Churchwardens published in 1825. The process of defining Gothic from an Anglican standpoint, and the role of stained glass within it, was eventually to be established through the publications of the Cambridge Camden Society and Pugin’s work, starting with the Apology of 1843. From that time, a new era began, and the period of this investigation formally comes to an end.

The effect of Pugin and the Ecclesiologists cannot be underestimated: our current architectural and cultural image of the English parish church – without box pews, galleries and triple-decker pulpits – is tinted by their work. But the actions of the Cambridge Camden Society remained controversial: they were still sometimes defined as a ‘Popish’ in terms reminiscent of the era of the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, with a pro-Catholic elite ranged against a Protestant public. Architecturally and culturally the reintroduction of stained glass into churches and public life in the period under investigation was slow; a stained-glass tradition had been lost, and imports of “foreign” stained glass were often regarded sceptically. What were needed were examples of stained glass in new architectural contexts.

The importance of James Wyatt, and subsequently his nephew Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyatville, 1766-1840), to the development of Revivalist Gothic and stained glass installation practice between the 1790s and mid-1830s cannot be underestimated. Both have been overlooked, yet both integrated new
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stained glass into their projects (Fig. I.5), and set the standard in this respect until their practices fell out of fashion and became the object of Pugin’s strictures. Pugin’s defamation of Wyatt more than fifty years later was misguided and reflects the values of a later generation. Wyatt’s obituary in the Gentleman’s Magazine for 1813 told another story: ‘at great expense, he employed draftsmen to visit the most celebrated and beautiful remains of our ancient monastic and baronial structures, and to collate from them their character and ornament; these he translated into structures of his own design’. In 1816, J.C. Loudon (1783-1843) was of the same opinion, praising Wyatt’s knowledge of Gothic. In the period prior to 1815, there was a conflict of interest between the clergy who wished to make churches usable again on the one hand, and antiquaries on the other. This is illustrated in the writings of a contemporary, John Carter, who would have preferred to see churches become unusable in practice, so long as they remained archaeologically correct; Carter’s case, argued in the Gentleman’s Magazine between 1798 and 1817, has been analysed by Mordaunt-Crook. Wyatt appears to have taken a pragmatic course, as illustrated by his work at Lichfield Cathedral in 1787, where he noted that ‘the windows are to be new glazed entirely making use of the old Glass as far as it is fit’. If his glazing scheme was executed is not known, but his philosophy was clear.
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50 Joseph Hale Miller at Ashridge Park, commissioned by James Wyatt, formerly in the ante-chapel, now in the corridor by the library.
51 Anon., GM. 83, 1813: 297.
52 Loudon, 1840: 425.
54 LRO, MSS 036, James Wyatt, accounts for 7 March 1787.
55 See Appendix I, entry for Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (p.239).
At this period, the way in which stained glass was used by architects, stained-glass painters, and their clients was very much in the Miltonian tradition, with effect and artifice usually triumphing, despite a growing demand for genuineness. Two examples involving important glass-painters studied in this investigation illustrate this phenomenon: Christian Geerling in Cologne and David Evans in Shrewsbury. In the 1820s, Christian Geerling argued that architectural success could only be guaranteed when stained-glass windows were made in a ‘true religious mystical manner’.\footnote{\textit{"eine wahrhaft religiöse mystische Weise"}, Geerling, 1827.} To a later generation this often implied deliberate deception, a practice commonplace among almost all stained-glass painters and restorers of the early nineteenth century. In Geerling’s case such deception is clearly evident in his restoration and “improvement” of the Peter and Paul window from Cologne now in the Victoria & Albert Museum.\footnote{See Appendix I, entry for London, Victoria & Albert Museum London: Glass from the Ägidius-Kapelle, Cologne (p.253).} An analysis of the angels in the main lights and tracery shows that nineteenth-century glass was included in a sixteenth-century window (Figs I.6 and I.7), and demonstrates Geerling’s concept for the window (Fig. I.8). In the case of Evans, his work at Winchester College Chapel (1821–22) is well documented, with the wholesale reproduction of the original glazing scheme.\footnote{Le Couteur, 1919 and 1920.} The original glass was sold on and is now partly in the Victoria & Albert Museum (Fig. I.9).\footnote{See Appendix I, entry for Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (p.264).} Henry Pidgeon’s description of Evans’s 1837 north transept work in St Mary’s Shrewsbury however illustrates the expectations and aspirations of the newly informed viewer: Pidgeon wrote that “the
'dim religious light’ which they shed around, imparts an impressiveness of character that at once bespeaks the sacred purpose of the place as a House of Prayer”. Finally, Henry John Todd – the first chaplain at Ashridge Park, author of a history of the place, and the first to preach a sermon in the chapel (in November 1817) wrote as follows in 1823, eulogising the architecture of the chapel in a manner typical of the period: ‘the highly wrought Gothick ceiling ... the windows filled with beautiful painted glass, throwing around their various-coloured and subdued light’ (Fig. I.10). At Ashridge Park Chapel the Wyatt’s not only achieved their architectural goals, conforming to the canons of their times, but they also set a standard for future stained-glass installations.

In conclusion, the following chapters will not only investigate the trade in Continental stained glass, its sale and installation, but also the methodology of sales and exhibitions, the successes and failures of the trade, and the reaction of the public.
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I.2. Cloister Steinfeld (Eifel): Cloister with one stained glass panel.
CHAPTER II
Origins of a Trade and the Development of a Taste for Stained Glass

On the 20 September 1794, the French painter Jean-Jacques-François le Barbier (1738–1828) proclaimed before the National Assembly in Paris: ‘There is the need to give artwork soiled by slavery a new home; that being the fatherland of Art, Genius, Freedom and Equality’ [France]. By October the same year, the “Sambre-et-Meuse” army was at the gates of Cologne.63

Introduction

This chapter deals with the background history of the stained-glass trade, firstly from the Continental perspective, examining the conditions prevailing in the Rhineland during the period of secularisation at the end of the eighteenth century, and secondly in relation to the United Kingdom, where a taste for stained glass was developing. The chapter continues with the development of the trade between the two areas, and the subsequent sales of Continental stained glass and the first installations of it in a totally different context. A second theme is the development of visual communication in the United Kingdom, particularly London, and the role played by coloured glass and light. This development, particularly in the theatre, was to be influential in the perception and reception of both local and foreign stained glass.

Satire of monasteries and nunneries had been a popular theme in European literature a tendency that had been gathering pace since the turn of the eighteenth century. In the works of Jean Aimé de Chavigney and the Abbé Barrins, for example, the supposed decadent conditions prevailing among the monastic orders were graphically ridiculed. However, in the critical period between 1792 and 1795 this tradition was continued as exemplified by Matthew J. Lewis with the publication of The Monk in 1796; this was translated into German in 1797 and became a popular criticism of religious institutions (Fig. II.1). La Religieuse ('The Nun') by Denis Diderot presented, in contrast, a sympathetic portrait of the conditions behind nunnery walls. Nonetheless, contemporary opinion was that these institutions provided little more than an easy life for the younger sons and daughters of the aristocracy. In his book Das Grab der Bettel-Mönche Franz Wilhelm von Spiegel zu Desenberg-Canstein (1752–1815) attempted serious intellectual criticism of the prevailing system, but in his Gedanken über die Aufhebung der Klöster und geistlichen Stifter im Herzogthum Westphalen of October 1802 he defined the members of the orders as no more than ‘an uneducated class of holy beggars’.
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64 See the ‘Umsturz der christlichen Moral oder der Kloster-Fasching’ ('The Collapse of Christian Morality, or Carnival in the Cloister'), in Todrowski, 2007: 25.
65 Lewis, 1794 and 1797-98.
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The effect of public perception together with the secularisation instigated by the French Revolution had a dramatic effect in the Rhineland. The French attitude towards secularisation reached back to the politically motivated transfer of church property that had started in 1648 after the Thirty Years War, a tendency that had been gathering pace during the French Revolution. The clergy, the “second estate” of the ancien régime, had legitimized the old regime, which the Revolution wished to neutralise politically through the nationalisation of church property. Secularisation in French eyes was not anti-religious or anti-Catholic. In 1801, Napoleon’s agreement with Pope Pius VII (The Concordat of 15 July) confirmed that the Catholic faith was the religion of the majority. However in the critical period between 1792 and 1795 when Robespierre’s “Cult of the Supreme Being” defined the political-religious agenda, destruction of religious monuments was the order of the day. Shepard has documented how Alexandre Lenoir (1761–1839) reacted to this cultural-political climate, with the establishment in Paris of the Musée des Monuments Français (1790–1816),68 and Wescher has noted that artworks in Cologne were not safe from the attentions of Lenoir’s agents in the closing years of the eighteenth century.69 The situation in Cologne in this period was similar to that of France, with the population, clergy and collectors exhibiting an opportunism driven by financial and cultural forces.70 The population’s attitude had been cemented in the previous fifty years, as stated above, and the arrival

68 Shepard, 2009: 499.
70 “Under the dealers were representatives of the clergy including canons and monks. Because of French Revolutionary policies towards the Church, members of the ‘second estate’ radically reoriented their lives using their competence in church administration to become consultants and speculators in property and credit.” Clemens, 2002: 334.
of the French provided the opportunity for a radical redistribution of the region’s artistic wealth.

Cologne was occupied by the French armies in 1794. This status was confirmed at the Peace of Campo Formio in 1797, when all the lands west of the Rhine were formally seceded to France. With the end of the Coalition War (1798–1801), the conditions of the Concordat were enforced: the Pope agreed that he and his successors would take no action against the buyers of church property. In this way, the secularisation of church property that had already taken place in France and that was to take place later in Germany and other countries was legalised. The so-called "Culture Law" was passed on the 8 April 1802. On 30 June 1802, it was published in the Rhineland départements and became law; it was implemented after a decree from the regional consul on 9 June 1802. This law was of interest to all denominations, not only Catholics, as it effectively opened the floodgates for the general sale and export of artworks of all kinds, with the sanction of both Church and State.\textsuperscript{71}

In the opening years of the nineteenth century, there were two distinctive movements towards secularisation in Germany: that imposed by the French invaders who had occupied the region west of the Rhine, and that instigated by the German principalities to the east. To the west of the Rhine secularisation was completed between 1802 and 1803; on the east side of the river the same process was repeated during the period of French occupation (1806–15), when only seven religious institutions survived out of a total of 186.\textsuperscript{72} In

\textsuperscript{71} Deeters, 2002: 271.
\textsuperscript{72} Todrowski, 2007: 35.
April 1795, Prussia had negotiated a secret treaty with Revolutionary France, whereby it would not intervene east of the Rhine if it were proportionately compensated for the loss of the lands west of the Rhine with religious properties east of the river; this arrangement was confirmed after additional negotiations in May 1802. In January 1801, Friedrich Wilhelm III ordered the secularisation of all monastic institutions. On 18 January 1803, the Prussian government published its General-Instruktion für die zur Aufhebung der Klöster in den Entschädigungsprovinzen angeordneten Kommissarien. These instructions detailed the method and extent of the State’s requisitions, and outlined the requirements for detailed inventories and that commissioners should take no consideration of “personal, artistic, or the requirements of the cult of the Church”. Everything of value was to be secured, and goods assessed according to their economic and not their spiritual value; goods were then to be auctioned. Prussia retained control of the provinces east of the Rhine for four years, but after her defeat at the battle of Jena in 1806 the provinces east of the Rhine seceded to France and on 6 November 1806 came under the control of the Dutch-French General Johan von Boecop. The secularisation process continued under conditions similar to those that had existed west of the Rhine since 1802. In the years that followed, the commercial base of Westphalia was destroyed on account of reparations paid to the French state of over seven million francs. The result was an uncoordinated and
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arbitrary programme of confiscations of church property, principally from the summer of 1810.\textsuperscript{76}

Many monastic institutions were sold \textit{en bloc}. Richter quoted the diary of Franz Joseph Gehrken (1771–1845), which says that the vaults of many abbeys in Westphalia were demolished to provide building materials for new public buildings, while everything else was auctioned, if it had value, or was destroyed (Fig. II.2).\textsuperscript{77} This process has been documented in detail in connection with the sale of Altenberg Abbey (Fig. II.3). In June 1805, a Düsseldorf commission decided to auction the abbey church and its ancillary buildings. In 1806, the Cologne businessman Johann Heinrich Pleunissen (1731–1810) bought the abbey, and declared that he would allow public worship in the church.\textsuperscript{78} Redlich has analysed the secularisation process for the abbey, and particularly the fate of the stained glass (Fig. II.4): “The Graf und Herzög von Berg can remove ... the painted glass windows in the cloister and bring them to Düsseldorf; this should however take place, if at all, by the end of May, so that the buyer’s building works will not be disrupted.”\textsuperscript{79} In Case Study 2 in chapter III a detailed analysis of the sale, distribution and later installation of the Altenberg stained glass is conducted. The history of this glass is now better known, on account of the discovery of the diary of the man who imported the stained glass to England.\textsuperscript{80}

Vanden Bemden has documented a similar history in connection with the secularisation of the abbey of Herkenrode near

\textsuperscript{76} Berding, 1973.
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\textsuperscript{79} Redlich, 1901: 128.
\textsuperscript{80} See chapter III, p.141.
Hasselt, Belgium. The nuns were forced to leave in December 1796, and the abbey was put up for sale, only to be repurchased in February 1797 by six former nuns, who then sold it on the same day to Pierre Libotton and Guillaume Claes, who used the abbey for personal and industrial purposes. In 1802, Libotton removed all the glass and filled the window openings with straw. A substantial percentage of the glass was then sold to Sir Brooke Boothby, and installed in the Lady Chapel of Lichfield Cathedral (Fig. II.5).

A further significant cause of disruption and potential lawlessness in this period was the *Reichsdeputationshauptschluss* of 25 February 1803, whereby over three million people changed state and about 10,000 square kilometres of land were redistributed. This “secularisation of wealth”, a euphemism for the confiscation and redistribution of church and monastic property, became a prime source of income for some at a period when the general social order was deeply unstable. The export of monastic property outside the newly established French tariff zone when it was not in the interest of the French was difficult, as Blanning has noted: ‘A more reliable method of bending the law was found in bribery ... As Lebrun, the Contrôleur aux visites et entrepôts des douanes nationales conceded, many of his subordinates had betrayed their trust. But what could one expect, he asked despairingly, when local merchants were prepared to pay 600 francs for a quarter of an hour of ‘inattention’,
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83 The “RDHS” was a compensation treaty defining spheres of influence established after the Peace of Lunéville, 1801, that concluded the Coalition War (1789–1801) between France, Austria, Russia and England.
and when any smugglers who were actually arrested were then set free by sympathetic German Justices?\textsuperscript{84}

The reaction of monks and nuns to the destruction of their way of life was generally lethargic and fatalistic. Schwarz humorously noted that on 31 March 1803, when the commissioners arrived to secularise the abbey at Pestel, they found all the monks drunk; before the requisition of all their possessions they had decided to drink all the best Rhine wine from their cellars.\textsuperscript{85} Many redundant clerics however welcomed the events as a means to personal enrichment; so was created a new class popularly called the ‘brigade noire’. A well-documented example of this group was Pastor Gerhard Cunibert Fochem (1771–1847), the Vicar of St Ursula’s in Cologne, who had a fine sense for trends and what was needed to accumulate a profit, buying collections at rock bottom prices.\textsuperscript{86} Later, at the end of the 1820s, Canon J.E. Linden, also from Cologne, operated in a similar fashion as a middleman in stained glass trades, particularly those to England (for example, the Altenberg and St Apern glass, Fig. II.6). He acted through the trade consul Edward Spencer Curling and also participated in an unsuccessful attempt to arrange a similar sale of stained glass from St Peter’s in Cologne with the same agent.\textsuperscript{87} The methodologies of these trades are documented in Case Study 2 in chapter III, using Curling’s diary as the primary source.

\textsuperscript{84} Blanning, 1983: 146.
\textsuperscript{85} Schwarz, 1828: 329.
\textsuperscript{86} Kronenberg, 1995: 127.
\textsuperscript{87} CL, ‘The Diary of Edward Spencer Curling Esq. 1827-1836’: ‘Cologne Thursday 29 Sept 1831. Visited the church of St. Peter … the Glass for Sale by the Canon Linden’.
Secularisation in Cologne

Cologne’s great artistic wealth was acquired during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Although there was no decline in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the period was however marked by a period of industrial and commercial stagnation. It is unclear to what extent the modernising tendencies of the period affected the region’s cultural riches, but around 1800 Cologne possessed more artworks from the Middle Ages than any other comparable city in the world. The reasons for the accumulation of these cultural riches were twofold: firstly the city’s importance in Catholic northern Europe, but principally, as Becker has noted, Cologne’s development in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as a premier art-trading city, similar to Antwerp.\(^88\) It was the upper bourgeoisie, rather than princes and prelates, who now collected and exhibited their collections in their homes. In the years after the occupation by the French, these collections were expanded, but later, after 1815, partially disbanded, usually by auctions held in private galleries, as will be seen in chapter III, in the cases of the Bemberg and Hirn stained glass collections (Figs II.7–8).

The years of the French occupation of Cologne, between 1794 and 1814, were years without parallel in the city’s history. In spring 1792, the war between Austria and the French Republic began. After the French victory at Fleurus (26 June 1794), the French army advanced towards Liège and Aachen, reaching Cologne on 6 October 1794. A delegation of the city council met the advancing French army at Melaten outside the city walls and handed over the key of the city.

\(^{88}\) Becker, 1995: 141.
to General Jean Championnet (1762-1800). So began the twenty-year French occupation of the city. On the 10 October, the “Art Commission” was established and all portable art works were at risk, particularly altarpieces and stained glass.89

The plundering by the French army lasted for three weeks; many clerics were quickly convinced to sell artworks from churches and monasteries as their rental income had disappeared. For collectors and speculators, as F.F. Walruff noted: “There were things and places that were now accessible and for sale that before never saw the light of day.”90 On the 8 October 1794, Gillet, the French representative of the Sambre-et-Meuse army, declared in Cologne that in the name of the Republic all citizens and property would be protected and respected; the reality was otherwise. On the 10 October 1794, Peter Paul Rubens’s Crucifixion of St Peter was removed from above the high altar of St Peter’s Church and, despite protests from the city authorities, transported to Paris. This requisition reflected the twin aspects of the French attitude to requisitioned art. There were firstly the political and cultural aspirations, represented by Vivant Denon and Lenoir,91 but equally significantly requisitions were a form of cultural-political humiliation. Krischel has noted that the Crucifixion was the most significant work by Rubens in the city and that until the early years of the nineteenth century the citizens of Cologne believed that the city was his birthplace.92 It is significant that the first art repatriated after

89 Blöcker, 2002: 373.
90 Ibid., 379.
91 Shepard, 2009: 500.
Napoleon’s defeat at Leipzig in 1814 and the resulting occupation of Paris was this picture, from Denon’s *Grande Galerie* of the Louvre. The initial action reflected however the philosophy of the *Commission temporaire des arts* founded at the very start of 1794, where Paris was to be the “Capital of the People” and should become the “European Capital of the Spirit and Culture”. This philosophy became codified in the Rhineland on 11 September 1796, when Antoine Keil became *Commissaire du gouvernement français chargé de recueillir les objets d’art et de sciences dans les pays conquis d’Allemagne*. On 1 November 1794, the churches of St Severin, St Pantaleon and St Aposteln were closed, and on the 9 November the Machabäerkirche was closed and converted into stables. Although there was no general confiscation of church property until 1798, there were undoubtedly some undocumented sales of stained glass to Cologne collectors at this time. The glass was analysed and sorted, and works then considered of secondary importance, or possible poor condition, were later sold on, mostly to England. The first known stained-glass auction after the 1802 secularisations decree is one advertised for 22 November that year, during which glass was to be sold from the churches of St Clara, St Apern and St Cäcilien.

In October 1796, a general expulsion of cloister residents was ordered, and under these conditions, as Diederich has noted, it became clear that the religious houses in Cologne and the

93 Ibid.: 92.
surrounding districts would be forced to sell off their property. On 4 February 1797, General Lazare Hoche (1768-1797) was appointed General Director of the lands west of the Rhine. In the first instance he appointed the church authorities to administer income from their requisitioned property, and to deliver two thirds of it to the French authorities. From the French standpoint this was insufficient: on 8–9 April 1797 the administration of all requisitioned church property was placed under French control, and from 12 April 1798 representatives of the French municipality started taking inventories of the property holdings and the fittings of religious houses of the city.

On 15 July 1801, the people and religious houses were forced to accommodate the conditions of the Peace of Lunéville, and in 1802 those of the Concordat between Napoleon and Pope Pius VII. The Concordat read: “Arrêté des consuls portant suppression des ordres monastiques et congrégations régulières dans les départements de la Sarre, de la Roer, de Rhin-et-Moselle et du Mont Tonnerre [Altenberg to the east of the Rhine]”. So began a well-documented flood of antiquarian exports of all kinds, particularly to England. The destiny of Canon Franz Pick (1760–1819) of the church of St Severin in Cologne illustrates well the dilemma of churches and religious houses at this time. In the 1790s, Pick had established and furnished a private chapel in his parish using stained glass and church furnishings from dissolved churches and monasteries, but in 1802 the social and political situation had changed. Pick wrote to Hofrath von
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Lückinghausen on the 20 August 1802 regarding his position as Canon of St Severin (Fig. II.9): “I will probably tell you in my next letter that I am an Ex-Canon. Tomorrow the French ‘Commission’ will be at St. Severin to make their inventory and expel us as if we were thieves”.101 Together with Matthias Joseph de Noël (1782-1849), Franz Wallraf (1748-1824) temporarily tried to check the actions of the French and the buying lust of the English, who after the Treaty of Amiens had renewed access to the Continental art markets.102 In October 1802, de Noël organised an inventory of the stained glass from St Apern and St Cäcilien and its storage in the Jesuit College. A protocol dated 1803 dated the glass to 1524–26. On the 27 and 28 February 1803, the glass was taken down and deposited in the city depot. Some of the glass from St Apern went in 1823 to Cologne Cathedral, under the auspices of Wilhelm Laurenz Düssel, stained-glass restorer for the cathedral resident at Am Hof 7 in Cologne, a neighbour of Franz Wallraf and prolific trader in stained glass. In a protocol of 1823 Düssel recorded that eighteen panels remained from the original fifty-four,103 eight of which required restoration, the remainder having been sold by Düssel to England in 1829.104 The

101 Schaden, 1995b: 113. “Morgen wird bei St. Severin die französische Kommission einrüken, ein Register formieren und uns fortjagen wie die Diebe”.
102 Matthias Joseph de Noël (1782–1849), Director of the City Museum in Cologne wrote to the city’s mayor, Adolf Steinberger, on 6 March 1828 concerning the problem of the loss by sale from the area of artworks, particularly to English collectors who had travelled to the Rhineland during the period of secularisation. This trade had continued into the 1820s, and he asked the State to take all necessary steps to protect remaining artworks; Schaden, 2002: 396.
history of this trade is covered in detail in the Case Study 2 in chapter III (p.122).\textsuperscript{105}

Stained glass came onto the market not only in Cologne, but also from the surrounding region, particularly from the dissolved monasteries of Mariawald, Altenberg and Schwarzenbroich. Some of this glass, mostly that that had not found a collector in Cologne, were exported between 1803 and 1804, probably through the agency of J.C. Hampp; Hampp’s first order book entry reads: “March 4 1803: of Cologne, By 6 Boxes of Glass, £267.1.3.”\textsuperscript{106} How much stained glass was exported in the opening years of the nineteenth century and what proportion was retained in private Cologne collections until after the end of the Continental Blockade in 1815 is unclear, although Wolff-Wintrich has calculated that in the first two decades of the century about 2,000 panels were traded.\textsuperscript{107} With the exception of Wolff-Wintrich who defined a period of redistribution between 1807 and 1887,\textsuperscript{108} the stained-glass trade around 1815, underestimated by earlier writers, has not previously been clearly delineated, and forms the basis of this investigation. In the main, the best stained glass was retained in private collections in Cologne until the 1820s and only auctioned off to English collectors later. Glass from this phase of the redistribution of Continental stained glass now forms the centrepiece of not only church collections of Rhenish stained glass in the United Kingdom, but also provides the core collections of international museums, including the Metropolitan in New York, the Burrell

\textsuperscript{105} See further Appendix 1, entry for Marston Bigot, Paris Church of St Leonard (p.258).
\textsuperscript{107} Wolff-Wintrich, 1995: 341.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid.: 351–52.
Early Collectors and Dealers in Cologne

As a result of the arrival of the French troops in Cologne in October 1794, the art trade expanded, albeit in a questionable manner. In fact, much of the available art did not go through the commercial art trade, but was transferred directly into private collections. Other groups of artworks were simply destroyed, and many of the buildings from which they came were demolished. Up to 1818, 8 churches, 7 monasteries, 29 nunneries and 15 chapels were demolished.\(^{109}\) One critical factor in the period around 1800 in the Rhineland was that apart from in an exclusive group of connoisseurs, medieval art was neither understood or valued. In a market driven by the compilation of inventories and the selling or destroying of art from secularised contexts, appointed officials usually possessed no art-historical knowledge and often regarded confiscated work with hostility or indifference. These conditions guaranteed to those with some business knowledge and/or artistic sensibility an opportunity to participate in a profitable art trade.\(^{110}\) At the simplest level, Elsholtz described a “street-wise” stained-glass salesman: “on one of the first days of my visit [in Cologne] I met a young man of the proletariat carrying part of a stained-glass window. In answer to my question if


\(^{110}\) Todrowski, 2007: 40.
he was selling the piece of glass he said that a foreigner had already offered him two large Thaler, but he had declined the offer.\textsuperscript{111}

The Boisserée brothers were among the earliest collectors in Cologne. In his diary Sulpiz Boisserée described the colourful street scene of the time: "Before the doors stood and waited the junk dealers and opportunist buyers; even if they were called Stein or Offermann they wanted to remain nameless. On big carts or by hand they took everything away, those who took heavy bells, and could take away heavy artworks received rebates."\textsuperscript{112} Under the dealers were representatives of the clergy, including canons and monks. Because of French Revolutionary policies towards the church the members of the "second estate" radically reoriented their lives using their competence in church administration to become consultants and speculators in property and credit.\textsuperscript{113} From 1802, travelling art dealers played an insignificant role in the Cologne art trade, apart from those who represented English interests; it became a specifically insider business. By 1805, the first art gallery in the city had been founded by Franz Katz, nominally an outsider from Antwerp, but as Antwerp and Cologne had established themselves as great art trading cities this represents an extension of the historical art-trade links between the cities, which were sufficiently close to overcome what had become a "closed shop" in Cologne. Katz ran a drawing academy in the Brückenstrasse and for an entrance fee of 5 Groschen the

\textsuperscript{111} "Gleich in den ersten Tagen meines Aufenthaltes begegnete ich einem jungen Menchen aus der Volksklasse, welcher einen Sherben gemaltes Glas trug, und auf meine Frage um dessen Bestimmung, mir denselben zum Verkauf bot, hinzufügend, dass von einem Fremden ihm schon zwei grosse Thaler dafür geboten seyen, er aber den Schatz nicht habe Losschlagen wolen." Elsholtz, 1820: 31.

\textsuperscript{112} Weitz, 1978-95, Blöcker, 2002: 385.

\textsuperscript{113} Clemens, 2002: 334.
public could view the art he had for sale. At this time, painters, dealers and collectors remained in continual contact, visiting each other and comparing what was on offer and the prices being asked.\textsuperscript{114}

The Brückenstrasse was to become a significant address in the stained-glass trade, being the commercial address of two generations of the Bemberg family, who were collectors and suppliers of stained glass. Rackham recorded that J.C. Hampp acquired three lots of stained glass from Peter Bemberg the Elder. Rackham records a payment for six boxes of glass to the value of £267,\textsuperscript{115} but omits the further payments for 18 May 1804: 5 Cases of Bemberg £216 and £428.1.6. for an unspecified quantity. The £448.1.6. may have however have been the total for the 11 boxes of glass. Rackham only quoted: ‘A card with the heading ‘Glass’ details sundry payments to, among others Bemberg and Oelmecher’.\textsuperscript{116} Bemberg’s sons would prove to be significant suppliers of stained glass when it came to auction in the 1820s.

The art trade and the Cologne commercial base developed together. Collecting and trading went hand in hand, the principal participants being the rich trading and banking families. At the end of the eighteenth century, Cologne boasted about twelve major private collections. These collections were assembled primarily to re-enforce their owner’s status, but also to demonstrate the cultural status of the city, which was diversifying. Jews and Protestants had been

\textsuperscript{115} Rackham, 1927: 90.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid: 91.
granted full civil liberties in 1797, and in 1802 the Protestant community was allocated the Antoniterkirche and its adjoining buildings. From 1798, the Zünfte (guilds) were abolished, so introducing industrial and commercial freedoms that were to affect the commercial life of the city fundamentally. The spinning jenny was introduced in Cologne in 1797, and its most prolific user was a member of the Bemberg clan. Production in the city grew from a modest start, and a dramatic expansion took place after 1801.\textsuperscript{117} The art and cultural enthusiasms of the wealthier citizens of Cologne at the beginning of the nineteenth century were defining characteristics of a new society.

In order to understand the socio-economic milieu in Cologne, which was to be severely tested after the lifting of the Continental Blockade and the Vienna Congress of 1815, a short overview of the principal collectors and the conditions prevailing in the city during the French occupation, is required.

Economically successful business people started collecting art, establishing collections in their houses and private chapels, and exhibiting them to interested parties in the community.\textsuperscript{118} Despite the industrial and social upheaval during the French occupation, old traditional business families maintained their control of Cologne’s economy until 1815, even though the Rhine was the customs boundary for the Continental Blockade. The trade in traditional goods, notably wine, linen and tobacco, was restricted during this period, and these products lost much of their significance as trade goods. The

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{117} Milz, 1962: 23.
\item \textsuperscript{118} Berghausen, 1995: 149.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
old trading families formed a close group of art collectors in order to optimise their position and not compete with each other in difficult times. As early as the 1790s, there were two significant collections – those of Johann Abraham Schaffhausen (1756–1824) and Jakob Johann Nepomuk Lyversberg (1761–1834).\textsuperscript{119} Schaffhausen, a banker, expanded his business into the financing of wine and cotton trading, and he was particularly involved with the cloth producers Heinrich Schieffer (1780–1847) and Casper Heinrich Bemberg (1744–1824). In 1802, the publisher and wool-dealer Johann Baptist Hirn (1755-1824) moved his cloth-production business into the dissolved Servitessen monastery. On his death in 1805, the business was taken over by his stepson Heinrich Schieffer. Jakob Johann Nepomuk Lyversberg was the cousin of Heinrich Schieffer’s mother, Maria Franziska Pleunissen. Her first husband was Johann Wilhelm Schieffer (d.1791), and her second Johann Heinrich Pleunissen, an important wine dealer who had become the owner of the dissolved abbey of Altenberg. Family connections and the profitable cloth-production business enabled Heinrich Schieffer to assemble one of the most important stained-glass collections in Cologne. These were dynasties whose fortunes and collections were to decline with the ending of the Continental Blockade in 1815. Against English competition, the Hirn/Schieffer business was no longer competitive; by 1822 it was only trading in wine, and in 1823 the firm went bankrupt. As a result, the stained-glass collections of Heinrich Schieffer and others were auctioned.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{119} Ibid.: 151.
\textsuperscript{120} Documented in Case Study 2 in chapter III (p.141-5).
The Bemberg family was also involved in cloth production and trade. The family had settled in Cologne in the eighteenth century, and by 1785 the Protestant Friedrich Wilhelm Bemberg (1711–1806) had bought land in the city.\textsuperscript{121} He was the owner of the firm Friedrich Wilhelm Bemberg & Co. in the Brückenstrasse. His sons Peter Joseph (1742–1814) and Casper Heinrich (1744–1824) were involved in the running and expansion of the business during the French occupation. Casper Heinrich retired from the business in 1810 to concentrate on his collection of glass and stained glass. It should be noted that the Bemberg family’s attitude to stained glass was a clear combination of aesthetic appreciation and business opportunism, with the devotional value of the glass being relatively insignificant. The founding Bemberg’s nephew also named Friedrich Wilhelm Bemberg (1777–1831) expanded the business and was the first to introduce steam engines into the production process in Cologne. In common with the other trader/collectors, the Bemberg business was no longer competitive with English producers after 1815.

In the period after the Treaty of Amiens, Peter Bemberg was the primary contact for Johann Christoph Hampp (1750–1825), the well-documented importer of stained glass into England.\textsuperscript{122} Hampp had emigrated to England from Germany and settled in Norwich in 1782. He is documented as trading in cloth in the Cologne region by 1781.\textsuperscript{123} His trade assistant in Europe was his nephew Christoph

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item[\textsuperscript{121}] Steimel, 1958: Ill. 385, n. 8.
\item[\textsuperscript{122}] See Appendix 2, Johann Christoph Hampp (1750–1824). (p.313).
\item[\textsuperscript{123}] von Witzleben, 1972: 227.
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Friedrich Häussermann (1772–1842).\textsuperscript{124} The full extent of what Hampp acquired from Bemberg has not been recorded, but it probably included works of secondary aesthetic importance to Bemberg, or works in poorer condition from the Peter/Casper Bemberg collection of Steinfeld cloister glass. Some of this glass is to be found today in various Norfolk churches and the Lord Mayor’s Chapel, Bristol, after being transferred from Lypiatt Park near Stroud in 1820 (Gloucestershire), where it had been installed by Thomas Baghott de la Bere in 1802.\textsuperscript{125}

Some of the Steinfeld glass that today is in Blickling Hall may have been acquired by Hampp at this time, as it was listed in the Pall Mall catalogue of 1804. It is more likely however to have been acquired by J.A. Repton for Lady Suffield for the east window of Blickling Church around 1824, where it was installed in 1829.\textsuperscript{126} The detailed history of much of the imported stained glass in the United Kingdom will be covered in Appendix 1. It should be reiterated here however that in the early period of importation of Rhenish stained glass, first-quality and complete series of glass remained in Cologne collections, with only items of subjectively secondary importance being exported. This is exemplified by the early Steinfeld glass imported to England; Some of the glass at Blickling and Chedgrave in

\textsuperscript{124} Häussermann was also Hampp’s agent in Paris. On 17 April 1803, Hampp recorded “Glass Account, rec’d from Hausermann CH 16.17.18.19 4 Cases sent from Paris containing a collection of 25 Subjects bought for £104.” As stated previously, Hampp made significant imports through Bemberg: (March 1803) “P Bemberg 6 Boxes of Glass £267 1s 3d” and (February 1804) “5 Cases of Bemberg £216”. On a card inserted in his sale book Hampp recorded that on 18 May 1804 he paid Bemberg a total of £482 1s. 6d., and at the same time £82 12s. for glass to Oelmecher of Aachen. Quotations taken from FM, ‘Account book of John Hampp, 1802-1804’; see further Appendix 2, Christoph Friedrich Häussermann (1772–1842).

\textsuperscript{125} Rushforth, G. Mc N. 1927: 301-331.

\textsuperscript{126} See Appendix 1, entry for Blickling and Erpingham (p.207); and Chambers, 1829: I, 183.
Norfolk, in the Lord Mayor’s Chapel, Bristol,\textsuperscript{127} falls into this category. The majority of the Steinfeld glass was only acquired in the 1820s from the Bemberg collection, which was auctioned off after the death of Casper Bemberg in 1824. August Wilhelm von Schlegel noted on the 14 August 1824 that each panel at the auction had realised between 16–20 Cologne Thaler,\textsuperscript{128} this rate being representative for the market rate of the period. The auctions and imports of the 1820s form the centre point of chapter III and will not be examined further here.

There was a clear difference in the extent of the stained glass series acquired from French and Flemish sources at the beginning of the nineteenth century, for example that from Rouen\textsuperscript{129} and Herkenrode\textsuperscript{130} around 1802, in contrast to that from the Rhineland that tended to be only parts of collections, not complete series; the first significant glass arriving after the Peter Bemberg auction of 1807, to be installed at Costessey Hall Chapel,\textsuperscript{131} and Dalmeny House, Edinburgh, Scotland.\textsuperscript{132}

Despite economic and cultural depredations, Cologne remained true to its cultural heritage in the early years of the nineteenth century. De Noël returned from Paris in 1802 and received a

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid. Rushforth.
\textsuperscript{128} Draft of a report on the suitability for acquisition of stained glass from the Hirn auction, by August Wilhelm von Schlegel, dated 14 August 1824; SLUB, MS. E.90, XIX, 2, No. 23. See also Cillesen, 1998.
\textsuperscript{129} See Appendix I, entries for Glasgow, Burrell Collection (p.229), and York, York Minster, The Crucifixion Window (p.269).
\textsuperscript{130} See Appendix I, entry for Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (p.239).
\textsuperscript{131} See Appendix I, entry for Costessey Hall, Chapel (p.218).
\textsuperscript{132} See Appendix I, entry for Edinburgh, Dalmeny House (p.224).
commission from his uncle Jakob Lyversberg.\textsuperscript{133} This period also saw the first steps towards collecting in the public interest. Ferdinand Franz Wallraf (1748–1824) and de Noël built collections that were controversial at that time but later their outlook changed and their collections later formed the basis of the Schnütgen collection of today. Their cultural aim was to preserve the remains of Cologne’s stained glass heritage, and for over twenty years they remained in contact with art traders and provided connections. As English trade consul Edward Curling confirmed in his diary in 1828: “Delivered Letter of introduction to Mr’s Fuchs & Denoel.”\textsuperscript{134} The next day Curling noted: “Cologne Saturday 27 September 1828, Mons. C. Geerling.” Curling then documented his five acquisitions of Rhenish stained glass made from Geerling (Fig. III.25).

The period also saw a move in Germany in general and specifically in Cologne from collections as assemblages of curiosities to what Klemm has described as “a structured form of art collecting”.\textsuperscript{135} The privately viewed collections of Bemberg or Schieffer probably belong to the former group. Pomian, however, is more succinct in describing these short-lived collections: “The social hierarchy results in the creation of collections of curiosities ... these objects are kept out of the economic circuit, affording special protection and display under controlled conditions.”\textsuperscript{136} In addition, Crane documents the change from Erinnerung (a form of curiosity

\textsuperscript{133} Jakob Johann Nepomuk Lyversberg (1761–1834), wine and tobacco trader, set up a private chapel at Am Heumarkt 10 in Cologne, in the style of ‘Der Alten Deutschen’ in 1808. See Blöcker, 2002: 387.

\textsuperscript{134} CL, ‘The Diary of Edward Spenser Curling Esq. 1827-1836’.

\textsuperscript{135} Klemm, 1837.

\textsuperscript{136} Pomian, 1990: 7.
cabinet) to Denkmal (memorial). This tendency was criticised in early Cologne collections, such as those of Baron Johann von Hüpsch (1730–1805) or Ferdinand Franz Wallrath. Goethe was scathing regarding this position: “[Wallrath] belongs to that sort of person who from a boundless desire to possess things, are born without any methodical sensibility or love of order.” Goethe’s observation is significant; it reflects a shift away from the motivations behind the short-lived private collections of curiosities of the late eighteenth century to those behind the more carefully constructed collections of the nineteenth century. In the field of stained glass, Goethe’s ideal is represented by the Bemberg and Hirn collections, which after their sale to England in the 1820s came to form the core of Rhenish stained-glass collections in museums and private collections in the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

The Motives and Mechanics of the Trade in Stained Glass

Outside the Perimeter of the Continental Blockade: an English Perspective

English men and women had been collecting European art since at least the end of the sixteenth century, their activities often related to the national and cultural aspirations inspired by the grand tour. Steyfarth has noted that art historically often flows from areas of instability or loss to more stable environments. For the turbulent period following the English Civil War and the establishment of the Commonwealth, she cites two instances in which art moved from

---

137 Crane, 2000b.
England to Cologne. Between 1649 and 1653, Franz von Imstenraedt with his uncle Everhard Jabach bought art in London from the disbanded collection of King Charles I; in 1655 they also acquired in Amsterdam Titian’s *The Flaying of Marsyas* (now in the State Museum in Kroměříž in the Czech Republic) and Holbein’s *The Triumph of Riches* and *The Triumph of Poverty*, from the estate of Lady Arundel, who had been living in exile in Holland since 1642. In the eighteenth century, the tide turned once again, as Waagen has noted, occasioned by the opportunities afforded by the Napoleonic wars: “... scarcely was a country overrun by the French, when Englishmen skilled in the arts were at hand with their guineas”. The reality was that flocks of agents, dealers, unsuccessful artists and adventurers of all kinds descended like vultures on Italy and other French-occupied lands whose citizens were obliged to pay the swingeing fines imposed by the invading French armies. The Edinburgh art-trader William Buchanan, the most authoritative source on the art trade at this time, said: “Bliss indeed was it to be a collector in that dawn, but to be a dealer was very heaven.” King George III noted wearily: “I know not how it is, but I never send a gentleman in a public capacity to Italy, but he comes back a picture-dealer.” Berserik and Caen document one of the first organised attempts to redistribute church property in the Low Countries: on 17 March 1783 Emperor Joseph II of Austria ordered “la suppression de
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139 Seyfarth, 1995: 33.
140 Waagen, 1838: I, 50.
141 Buchanan here is adapting the words of William Wordsworth (1770–1850) written in 1789: “Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive, but to be young was very heaven.”
quelques convents inutiles dans les Pays-Bas” and the establishment of the “Comité de la Caisse religion” to organise the sale of church property. Before official auctions the Comité distributed leaflets locally, in Amsterdam, Leiden, Utrecht, Antwerp and Ghent, as well as in other European cities, particularly in London.  

As Blanning has noted, all trade in the Cologne region in the period before 1801 was difficult, as the French tariff barrier created by the decree of 9 May 1798 was so high as to cut manufacturers off from raw materials and markets, to paralyse the transit trade, and to bring shipping and its various ancillary trades to a halt. Trade continued by other means however, and the most reliable method of bending the law was bribery.  

The appalling conditions in Aachen, where Hampp was certainly dealing in cloth and glass, were described by Ernst Moritz Arndt in August 1799: “No sooner had the traveller descended from his carriage than he was surrounded by small boys offering every kind of service. During his evening promenade he escaped from the pleas of a beggar, only to be accosted by an equally importunate prostitute.”  

As stated previously, an amelioration of trade conditions only occurred in 1802 following the Concordat between Napoleon and Pope Pius VII signed on the 15 July 1801. Under the agreement the Pope agreed that he and his successors would take no action against the buyers of church property.

The demand for art of all kinds in the United Kingdom was substantial, but the quality and condition of what was available was extremely variable. Much of the stained glass acquired in this period
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144 Blanning, 1983: 143.
145 Arndt, E.M. Reisen: vi, 249.
would appear to have been in second rate condition; this state of affairs was confirmed by Warrington when he described the stained glass bought and sold by Hampp and Stevenson: “The purchasers which Messrs’ Stevenson and Hampp were for a long time exhibited in Pall Mall and in Wigley’s rooms in Spring Gardens [Fig. II.12]. From the hurry of removing these works of art from their original situation, and from the difficulty of transmitting them to this country, they had suffered considerable injury. Therefore, before they could be advantageously offered for sale, it was absolutely necessary that they should be reinstated. So far as re-leading them was concerned, there was no difficulty, and this was accomplished by the late Mr Yarrington of Norwich.”\textsuperscript{146} Warrington’s general observation is not specific about the origins of the stained glass, if Rhenish glass was included in this classification remains unclear.

The value and appreciation of stained glass had been in decline on the Continent and in the United Kingdom for over the previous hundred years. In the eighteenth century however a new taste for the medium had established itself, and it is this cultural shift that is documented in the following section.

The Cultural Milieu and the Status of Stained Glass in the United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom there had been a long tradition of antipathy towards church decoration, including stained glass, a subject that has been covered in detail in chapter I. The Reformation in England and the break from Rome had formalised a tendency that

\textsuperscript{146} Warrington, 1848: 69.
had begun to find expression in Lollard criticisms, criticisms to peak in the English Civil War. In post-Reformation England Gothic had been considered barbarous since the early years of the seventeenth century. In 1624, Wooton wrote on the pointed arch: “... both from the naturall imbecility of the shape Angle it selfe, and likewise for their very Uncomlinesse, ought to be exiled from judicious eyes, and left to their first inventors, the Goths or Lumbards, amongst other Reliques of that barbarous Age.” As noted in chapter I, Spraggon has exhaustively documented the Puritan iconoclasm of the English Civil War, which resulted in the widespread mutilation and destruction of stained glass. A widespread practice across Europe at this period was the removal of heads from offending statues and figures in stained glass. As Dr Joseph Hall wrote in 1647 of the visit of Sheriff Tofts and Alderman Lindsey; “[They] came into my chapel to look for superstitious pictures and relicks of idolatry; and sent for me, to let me know they found some windows full of images, which were very offensive, and must be demolished ... gave orders for taking off that offence; which I did, by causing the heads of both the pictures to be taken off, since I knew the bodies could not offend.” Similar actions occurred at Gisleham Church, where the author noted that “but the heads of both of them are knocked off”. J.C. Hampp also noted this tendency in the glass he was importing and selling when he wrote to a “Miss M”: "Oh Miss M, my apostles are come without their

147 Wooton, 1624: 51.
149 Hall 1647: xv–xvi.
heads!" Whether Hampp is commenting on imported or English stained glass is not clear.

The reawakening of interest in stained glass in England should probably be credited in no small measure to antiquary William Stukeley (1687–1765) and aesthete and romantic Horace Walpole (1717–1787). As stated in chapter I, Stukeley documented the continuing wholesale destruction of stained glass. On the 28 November 1736, he wrote: "Walking past Exton the glazier’s door, I saw a cart load of painted glass, just taken from St George’s church windows to put clear glass in the room. I used my influence with Mr Exton, and got the glass." Stukeley enjoyed his stained glass acquisitions as he built in his garden at Stamford a “Temple of Flora”, the location of which unfortunately cannot be verified. Stukeley wrote to Samuel Gale: To summarise his observations: "The work is Gothic that suits the place best ... The building is theatrical, inside there are ‘bustos’ and other curiosities, the windows have stained glass rescued from the destruction of Stamford churches, and there is a cupola with a bell which I ring every morning, a most agreeable exercise."

Walpole’s first private, block importation of stained glass for Strawberry Hill had been made in 1750. He also records that in 1761 speculative imports from the Continent had already started, noting, "Paterson an auctioneer at Essex House in the Strand opened his first exhibition of painted glass, imported in like manner from
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151 Norwich and Norfolk Notes and Queries, Norfolk Chronicle, (14 March 1903) II, 401.
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Flanders”. Paterson’s catalogue was entitled *A collection of Rare Old Stained Glass, composed of such sizes as may be conveniently hung up against the squares of common windows and adapted to the Private Chapels, Saloons, Summerhouses, Grottoes &c.* In the same period, Walpole’s correspondent Thomas Grey confirmed Stukeley’s observation that “you can pick up some remnants of old painted glass, which are sometimes met with in farm-house, little out-of-the-way churches and vestries, and even at country-glaziers shops, &c.” Another source of stained glass for collectors was the “improved” English cathedral. In 1788, James Wyatt was employed as cathedral architect at Salisbury Cathedral, and a glazier at work on the cathedral wrote to Mr Lloyd of Conduit Street, London: “Sir, This day I have sent you a Box full of old stained and painted glass, as you desired me to doe, which I hope will suit your Purpos, it is the best I can get at Present: But I expect to Beate to Peceais a great deal very sune, as it his of now use to me, and we do it for the lead.” However, as will be seen in chapter III, James Wyatt clarified procedures in 1788 regarding Lichfield Cathedral: “All the old materials to become the Contractor’s property, and to be used again wherever they are proper for the purposes to which they may be applied.” Although he was a successful “contractor architect” of the period, James Wyatt also made a significant contribution to the development of neo-Gothic architecture around 1800, and had a
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significant influence on the installation and reception of stained glass, both imported or home-produced. “Improved” cathedrals were both the source and consumers of stained glass,\textsuperscript{159} though production of indigenous glass did not meet demand, and imports were required to cover the shortfall.

Continental importations continued throughout this period, but as Wolff-Wintrich has shown, these were individual or antiquarian exports dependent on personal contacts.\textsuperscript{160} One example concerned stained glass from Trier. Edmund, Baron de Harold (1737-1808), wrote from Düsseldorf on 6 August 1779 to Thomas Astle, a leading English antiquary: "I have got you an Entire Window with excellent figures and when I get some more that have been promis’d me I will send them to you carefully pack’d up ... I should [ha]ve sent them long since but as I was in daily expectation of getting some excellent glass from a Monastery here I postpon’d from Day to Day. I have not been successful yet do not as yet despair of getting them. I shewed them to Mr. Rohan who admired them, and thinks they are worthy of more Care and your acceptance, consequently shall use every endeavour to procure them for you."\textsuperscript{161} If some or all of this stained glass after a torturous fifty-year odyssey ended up being installed in St Mary’s Shrewsbury in the 1840s cannot be confirmed but is probable.

A similar pattern of stained-glass acquisition continued until the middle of the 1790s; in his diaries the Hon. John Byng

\textsuperscript{159} For eighteenth-century definitions of “restoration”, “necessary repairs” and “improvements”, see Frew, 1979: 368.
\textsuperscript{160} Wolff-Wintrich, 1995: 351.
\textsuperscript{161} Eden, 1909.
documented numerous anecdotes and acquisitions, particularly the plundering of the glass from the collegiate church at Tattershall. By the end of the eighteenth century, a new period in the stained glass trade had begun. In the 1790s, the first commercial Continental importations of antiquities, including stained glass, started. In 1791, the European Museum in London advertised for sale with the following subtitle: “A Grand, Scarce and Curious Assortment of Painted Glass, not to be equalled in this Kingdom; collected from the Convents and religious Houses during the late Commotions and Revolutions in France and Flanders”, so started a new period, in the opening years of the nineteenth century, that was to lead to the first major installations in Britain of Continental stained glass.

The cultural change in the eighteenth century regarding antiquities has been described by Bending as a shift from an “antiquarian response” to ruins at the beginning of the eighteenth century, to a looser “associative response” in terms of the picturesque by the end of the century. Crane has observed that “The antiquarians became figures of ridicule and contempt from the nineteenth century onward, their status reduced to that of ‘dilettante’.” The antiquarian is epitomised in Grose’s The Grumbler: “He also takes tours to visit ruinous castles and abbeys, vaults and church-yards, and has a closet full of broken glass, and

---
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brass plates, purchased of country sextons, by them stolen from the windows and grave-stones of their respective churches ... [and] begged leave to exhibit them to the Society of Antic-queer-ones.”

Westgarth confirms this: during the course of the eighteenth century, the merely curious collector began to be disparaged and compared unfavourably with the connoisseur. The stigma attached to “dilettante” derives from the early-modern association of curiosity with acquisitiveness, lack of seriousness, idiosyncrasy, and the desire to improve social status. In 1804, Bartell considered that stained glass was admissible in the design of the ornamented cottages, as it was “in general use if such situations in some measure warrant it ... the romantic character of the design is increased by it.” As Marks has observed however: “In England the Gothic was admired for its ornamentation rather than its structure”, and in contrast to Pugin’s stance later in the nineteenth century, stained glass was regarded in the manner described by Walpole in his Anecdotes of Painting: “the rational beauties of regular architecture and the unrestrained licentiousness of that which is called Gothic, which depends upon unregulated multiplicity of ornament and varieties of effect.” This stance was satirised by Thomas Love Peacock in his description of the library of Mrs Pinmoney and her daughter Miss Danaretta Contantina.

---
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in his 1817 novel Melincourt: “The apartment was Gothic and the furniture Grecian and the windows, which were of stained glass.”

This culture into which Continental stained glass was to be imported could best be summarised in the words of Osbert Lancaster: “Gothick ... Ninety per-cent of these productions had little connection with architecture at all but were simply the work of smart interior decorators trying their hand at landscape gardening, or literary amateurs of exhibitionist tendencies creating a suitable background for their carefully cultivated personalities. Nevertheless, out of this innocuous and rather charming chrysalis would one day come blundering the dreary great moth of Victorian revivalism” (Fig. II.13).

Some of the installations, such as that in Lichfield Cathedral’s Lady Chapel, had clear architectural qualities respecting the provenance of the stained glass, or were liturgically rigorous, such as the installation formerly in the chapel of Costessey Hall, Norfolk; others, such as Walsh Porter’s “Craven Cottage” remained, with a little deliberate irony, own goals, very much bound to Mrs Pinmoney’s notions of fashion.

The Exhibition and Display of Stained Glass in London between 1794 and 1815

The objective of this section is to give an overview of techniques adopted for displaying glass at the start of the nineteenth century.
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century, as these were significant in the presentation of stained glass for exhibition and sale. This fascinating subject, first explored in print by in J.A. Knowles’s article “Exhibitions of Glass-Paintings in London”\(^{176}\) has recently been revisited by Jasmine Allen in her article “Stained Glass and the Culture of the Spectacle, 1780–1862”.\(^{177}\) The present author has also found much contemporary material concerning modes of display that extends our knowledge of the subject.

From the middle of the eighteenth century, back-lit illuminations had been a popular ingredient of London’s entertainment culture. In 1745, there had been an exhibition in Vauxhall Gardens of transparent pictures on oiled paper of back-lit illustrations in the manner of stained glass. By the 1770s, stained-glass painters had started exhibiting their products across the capital for an entrance fee. In Samuel Foote’s play The Cozeners (1774) a character notes: “I promised precisely at twelve to call on Lady Frolic, to take a turn in Kensington Gardens to see both the exhibitions, the stain’d glass, dwarf, giant, and Cox’s Museum.”\(^{178}\) In the last quarter of the century, Thomas Jervais and Mr and Mrs James Pearson dominated the stained-glass trade. Walpole described the way in which Jervais’s stained glass panel titled The Nativity destined for the chapel of New College Oxford was first exhibited in a darkened room: “... and the sun shining through the transparencies, realises the illumination that is supposed to be diffused from the glory, and has a

\(^{176}\) Knowles, 1924b.  
\(^{177}\) Allen, 2012.  
\(^{178}\) Altick, 1978: 110. Cox’s Museum in Spring Gardens later became Wigley’s Auction Rooms, used by William Stevenson to sell stained glass.
magic effect”. At the same period, James Pearson and his wife Margaret Eglington were exhibiting at the Pantheon (in 1779), the Society of Arts in the Strand (in 1780), and their house in Great Newport Street. The 1780s and 1790s saw the development of new visual genres, with the introduction of the magic lantern and Chinese shadows, techniques used in public pleasure gardens but also increasingly in the theatre, particularly for pantomime: “Before the line of bright lamps ... were strips of stained glass; yellow, red, green, purple and blue [which] could throw a tint upon the scenery.” Philip James de Loutherbourg’s *Eidophusikon*, introduced to London in 1781, combining these technologies to create moving pictures, representing natural phenomena, the effect being achieved by mirrors and pulleys. By the end of the century, a visual culture embracing entertainment, display and sales had grown up; in the opening years of the nineteenth century this was developed in the salerooms and galleries of the Pall Mall area.

The importance attached to the correct display and lighting of sales objects is illustrated in the correspondence of the Edinburgh art dealer William Buchanan: “If however the Collection may consist of only three or four paintings, probably the best way might be just to take a Room in Pall Mall of good access and have it part covered with green Cloth where they might be shown privately to the Collectors.” In 1804, he wrote: “[The picture] should always be kept in a light where the cracks are not seen. This is either effected

179 Knowles, 1924: 375.
180 Altick, 1978: 111.
181 Hardcastle, 1823: 283.
by light from above, or a front light with one window shut, and the head angled towards the open window – by keeping a cover upon it always till placed in this light it would be seen at great advantage, and appear quite a different picture.”\textsuperscript{184} In his \textit{Letters from England} of 1807, Southey noted ”displays were ever changing, as the ingenuity of fashion are ever producing something new”.\textsuperscript{185} Haslitt compared the exhibition room to a brothel, suggesting that many of the shows were gender specific, and the ideal spectator being an intellectual male. In his \textit{Analytical Inquiry into the Principles of Taste} of 1806, Richard Payne Knight noted ”The ‘motley multitude’ included the aristocracy, gentry and a cross-section of the bourgeoisie as the exhibitions could not depend on an exclusive audience if they were to be profitable.”\textsuperscript{186} In 1816, the Royal Academy was described in \textit{The Champion} as ”one of the gay spring-amusements of the metropolis … at present … only a little eclipsed by the Bazaars”.\textsuperscript{187}

Hemingway considered that the early nineteenth-century understanding of the term “art” differed from that of today, as “art” at that time still had strong associations with craft and artisanal skills. The exhibition experience at the beginning of the nineteenth century was also significantly different. Those visiting exhibitions approached with an attitude neither reflective nor profound, and “People went to Somerset House on the Strand, to the British Institution at 52 Pall Mall, to the Society of British Artists in Suffolk Street (off Pall Mall) and the Water Colour Societies’ exhibitions at various locations

\textsuperscript{184} Ibid.: 212 (letter dated 21 March 1804).
\textsuperscript{185} Simmons, 1951: 49–50.
\textsuperscript{186} Anon., 1806: 302.
\textsuperscript{187} ‘The Exhibition at the Royal Academy’, \textit{The Champion}, 12 May 1816.
including Wigley’s Rooms in Spring Gardens [Fig. II.12], and acknowledged the commercial function of its exhibitions by pricing its catalogues.”\textsuperscript{188} Haskell has noted that Buchanan had realised the most important fact of all: the real power lay not with the collectors themselves, but with their advisers,\textsuperscript{189} and that the artist-dealer had become the arbiter of taste.\textsuperscript{190} The first major sale/exhibitions of stained glass were conducted in this context. Stained glass had become a discrete commodity, with panels isolated from their iconographic programmes. While they were valuable in themselves, they lacked any connection to their new context, a factor that probably contributed to the initial lacklustre response from the buying public.

The opening of the nineteenth century saw a change in the public perception of stained glass. From 1802, William Stevenson (1750–1821)\textsuperscript{191} exhibited stained glass in varying formats from his sublet premises at 97 Pall Mall (Fig. II.14), initially with little success.\textsuperscript{192} In 1806, Stevenson optimised his presentation techniques by backlighting with gaslight, a business synergy offered by the new leaseholder of 97 Pall Mall, F.A. Winsor (1763–1830), a pioneer of gas lighting and a charlatan.\textsuperscript{193} Stained glass was for a short time to become a focus of the exhibition and sales world of London. How the exhibition and sale of stained glass developed can be illustrated by

\textsuperscript{188} Hemingway, 1995.
\textsuperscript{189} Haskell, 1976: 29.
\textsuperscript{190} Ibid.: 85.
\textsuperscript{191} See Appendix II, pp.307-10.
\textsuperscript{192} Fletcher, 1924.
\textsuperscript{193} Frederick Albert Winsor, formerly Friedrich Albrecht Winzer.
the example of the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly, London, in the first thirty-five years of the nineteenth century (Fig. II.15).

Pearce has documented the development of exhibition techniques at the Egyptian Hall between 1816 and 1825 under the regime of William Bullock.\(^{194}\) She has noted the strong connection between display and sales to the paying visitor, who paid for admission to the saleroom, and expected to be entertained as well as edified. By 1825, the expectations of the viewing and buying public had changed, and that year Bullock sold the lease of the Egyptian Hall to the bookseller George Lackington (1777-1844); exhibitions continued, but Lackington turned part of the Hall into a bazaar in 1831 in order to make money.\(^{195}\) The initial reaction to the exhibition of Altenberg stained glass at the Egyptian Hall in 1832 – that it was “somewhat carelessly got up”\(^{196}\) – reflects this cultural change from exhibition space to saleroom or gallery in the modern sense of the word. This is in marked contrast to the professionalism displayed at William Stevenson’s sale at Christie’s Great Room in Pall Mall, in 1808, where D.J. Powell noted that the exhibition was “arranged in a church like manner in the room with wood divisions & would have an organ playing”.\(^{197}\) Stevenson and Christie were successful salesmen and employed display methods unknown to John Curling when he exhibited at the Egyptian Hall in 1832. These exhibition techniques

\(^{194}\) Pearce, 2008.
\(^{195}\) Pearce, 2008: 14.
\(^{196}\) Anon., 1932b.
were to not be used again until Pugin’s Gothic displays in the Crystal Palace in 1851.\textsuperscript{198}

**Sales Outlets for Stained Glass: Norwich and London 1794–1815**

In the first decade of the nineteenth century, the sale of stained glass in the capital was restricted to the auction rooms and two commercial gallery outlets. The principal importers of the period were the partners William Stevenson FSA and John Christopher Hampp, both residents of Norwich. Stevenson and Hampp have been extensively researched over the last seventy years, and need no further introduction here.\textsuperscript{199} Short biographies of these two businessmen are set out in Appendix 2, giving further insight into their personalities and trading activities.

As previously stated, Hampp was primarily responsible for the importation of stained glass from numerous Continental European locations; catalogues of 1804 and 1808 reveal that he was also responsible for its sale and distribution in the provinces. As E.A. Kent has shown, his business was probably based in his textile warehouse in Fisher’s Lane, Norwich, at the back of his house in St Giles Street, Norwich (Fig. II.16).\textsuperscript{200} From 1802, the London sales outlet, supervised by William Stevenson, was at 57 Pall Mall. As Hugh Owen, a buyer and Rector of St Julian’s, Shrewsbury, noted in 1806: “A splendid assortment collected chiefly from Rouen, by Mr. Stevenson,

\textsuperscript{198} Allen, 2012: 10.
\textsuperscript{199} Gühring, 2002: 590-92; Kent, 1937a; Kent, 1937b; Appendix II, pp. 307-10; Lafond, 1964; Rackham, 1927; Wandel, 1995.
\textsuperscript{200} Kent, 1937b: 195.
of Norwich, was exhibited in Pall Mall, in the years 1802 and 1803. Some pieces in brown and white, from the Carthusian Monastery, in that city, equal any production of the pencil.”²⁰¹

William Stevenson was clearly the arbiter of taste and determiner of price for stained glass in the opening years of the nineteenth century. Owen noted Stevenson’s expertise again when he visited Lichfield in 1802 to view the Herkenrode glass and that acquired by Thomas Johnes of Hafod:²⁰² “Mr Stevenson the Proprietor of the exhibition of ancient stained glass in London called on me a few days ago. I delighted him with a sight of this glass especially the Cardinal [acquired by Johnes] ... He valued, each square as those in the chapter-house, at from 30 to 40 guineas each, if perfect.”²⁰³ In this period there were huge differences in the assumed value of stained glass. A direct buyer like Hampp or Brooke Boothby paid little for what was considered virtually valueless in Continental Europe. This contrasts with the “hype” propagated by the likes of Stevenson, who appears to have understood the amounts that Englishmen were prepared to pay. The prices paid are also evidence for the importance of the taste for stained glass, and for the tilting of the balance of commercial and collecting power from the continent to the United Kingdom as compared with actions of various Continentals after the English Civil War. The Birmingham glass-painter Francis Eginton (1736–1805) was commissioned to assess the worth of Brooke Boothby’s £200 acquisition of Herkenrode glass and was placed in a

²⁰¹ Owen, 1808: 246.
²⁰² Rees, 1815: 419-20; Appendix 1, entry for Hafod House (p.231); Thomas, 1973.
²⁰³ Undated letter from H. Owen to the Rev. Archdeacon Woodhouse; LRO, D30/6/3/3.
dilemma. Eginton calculated £720, but concluded in his letter to Archdeacon Woodhouse, in disbelief, that the Herkenrode acquisition “at the price Mr Stevenson sells in Pall Mall, taking it only at 20£ per square, to £7,000, at 30£ to £10,500, at 40£ to £14,000!” In the ‘Short account of Lichfield Cathedral’ of 1811, it was suggested the value of the stained glass was £1,000. In 1831, White estimated its value as £10,000.

In 1804, William Stevenson had printed A catalogue of the ancient stained glass for sale at the warehouse in Norwich and No. 97 Pall Mall London, which listed 284 items. The title page read further: “To Fredric Earl of Carlisle, etc. etc. Who presented the original glass illustrated here to the Dean and Chapter of York Cathedral. This Print of an Ancient Glass Window is respectfully dedicated. London [Fig. II.17]. Published by the Proprietors, December 1804.” It can be assumed that the Earl had already bought the window that is now installed in York, (York Minster, CVMA. sIII). Orders were to be sent, carriage paid, to a Mr Comyns. William Comyns (c.1746 – 1815?) appears to have been the salesman for Stevenson and perhaps Hampp in Norwich, and seems subsequently to have organised a final sale of Stevenson/Hampp stained glass in 1815, the catalogue

204 LRO, D30/6/3/3 (Eginton)
205 “The total expense of purchasing, importing, arranging, and repairing this glass, and for fitting the windows to receive it, may have cost about One Thousand Pounds.”; WSL, bs 753/3. See also Appendix I, entry for Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (p.239).
206 White, 1831: 79.
207 See Appendix I, entry for York, York Minster, The Visitation Window (p.271).
208 Knowles, 1924: 292.
209 Comyns had purchased Veronese’s Vision of St Helena (now in the National Gallery) at a London auction sale in 1803, and it was seen in his possession the following year by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who wrote about it to Robert Southey, urging him to see it at “Comyn’s the picture cleaner in Pall Mall”. This picture was included in the Comyns auction at Christie’s on 6 May 1815. In London directories Comyns was variously described as a limner (in 1799), an artist (in 1802), a miniature painter (in 1808), and a picture cleaner (in 1811).
published with a similar title to that of 1804 being a, *Catalogue of Stained Glass at the Warehouse in Norwich and 97 Pall Mall.* In this later exhibition ancient and contemporary works in stained glass were exhibited together, the rooms were darkened, and the stained glass back-lit, a technique probably developed from the earlier Pall Mall exhibitions. The other two other significant sales of stained glass in this period were conducted by Messrs. Christie in 1808 and 1816. Many of the lots for sale correspond to those from the Stevenson 1804 Catalogue probably with other lots in storage in London and Norwich.

97 Pall Mall was the principal sales address in London for stained glass. This address had a mixed history. It was first the Star and Garter Inn, and then at the beginning of the nineteenth century it became a general address for exhibitions; the entry price was one shilling, the normal tariff in London at this period. William Stevenson exhibited stained glass there between 1802 and 1804, and by 1806 the address was known as the Theatre of Science: "The exceptional thunderstorm that had occurred the Thursday before afforded ample opportunity at the Theatre of Science, 97 Pall Mall, to Mr Hardie’s talents in defence of his new Theory of Lightning." In the same year, the premises were acquired by the flamboyant gas-lighting pioneer Frederick Winsor and for the next five years this address became a focus in London society, offering a mixture of theatricality, a little education, and some hard-nosed salesmanship. Griffiths,
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quoting William Murdoch the inventor of gas lighting, commented on the theatricality of the exhibition: “What folly to have a diamond necklace or a Correggio and not light your house with gas … better to eat dry bread by the splendour of gas, than to dine on wild beef with wax candles.”

Winsor embodied all the showmanship and financial cleverness typical of the entrepreneurs of the Regency period. His partnership with William Stevenson could only have been to the benefit of both parties, and 97 Pall Mall has been defined as their “pretentious headquarters in Pall Mall”. Lady Bessborough (Henrietta Ponsonby) wrote glowingly to her lover Lord Granville Levinson Gower about the premises (“... indeed as there is no other subject thought of or talk’d of ... It is the Light and Heat Company. It is Mr Winsor, and his Lecture, and his gas, and his patent, and his shares,”) and the gas lighting in Pall Mall (“That Shining Lamp which has lit up Pall Mall this year has all at once blaz’d up into a comet that bears everything along with it.”). Henrietta Ponsonby also mentioned that the Earl of Cholmondeley had bought twenty £50 shares from Winsor, and William Stevenson noted that he had at the same time bought stained glass: “The Gothic Windows of Cholmondeley Castle are enriched with passages from St. Barbara’s Life.” Winsor described 97 Pall Mall as “comprising a lecture room, a salon with a chandelier, committee room, drawing and dining rooms, a passage and stairs, a

213 Griffiths, 1992: 266.
216 Stevenson, 1807. See further Appendix I, entry for Cholmondeley Castle, Chapel of St Nicholas (p.216), and Wayment, 1988: 85.
yard and entrance – all lit by gas”. Whether William Stevenson was exhibiting stained glass at this address from 1806 onwards is not documented, but it is probable. It should be noted that the synergy between Winsor’s gas lighting and the exhibition and sale of stained glass would have appealed greatly to late Georgian society, as Powell wrote in 1815. Stevenson had developed a clear strategy when he was selling.

How successful the Pall Mall enterprise was for William Stevenson is unclear. La Quérière cites an “Englishman”, Teschmaker, who visited Rouen in 1826: “to facilitate the resale of the glass it was exhibited in London, admission one shilling. Buyers, however, were scarce and the exhibition remained open about 18 years. Most of the buyers were amateurs and very little of the glass was set up in churches.” Winsor maintained his National Light and Heat Company at the Pall Mall address until 1812, and was for a period leaseholder of numbers 95, 96 and 97. He remained resident at number 95 until 1815, when he was forced to flee to Paris due to insolvency. Exhibitions continued at 97 Pall Mall until Winsor’s departure, after which it became the Waterloo Museum, a typical emporium of the period, as can be seen from an advertisement dated 14 September 1820 relaying that a miniature horse was being

218 BL, Additional MS. 17462, fols 331, 334. It is not clear however to which sales outlet in Pall Mall Powell is referring.
219 Christie 1808.
220 La Quérière, 1841: II, 249. John Roger Teschmacher was a German merchant, originally from Hanover; Beerbühl, 2007: 432.
exhibited at 97 Pall Mall: "The Beautiful Little Mare ... Only Thirty-three inches high! And Nine Years Old!"  

Finding a Home: the First Permanent Installations

The history of the first installations of imported stained glass is documented in detail in Appendix I. Each installation has its own specific history, and many relate back to the activities of William Stevenson. The first installations were primarily of French and Flemish stained glass. Documented here are the St John the Evangelist glass from Rouen, originally in Blithfield Hall and today in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow, and installed at Ely Cathedral and Wells Cathedral. A further installation of Rouen stained glass, sponsored by the Earl of Carlisle, was made at York Minster in 1806, and a Crucifixion window formerly in Rickmansworth was transferred there in 1952 through the agency of the Dean, Eric Milner-White. Other installations that can be traced back to

222 See Appendix I, entry for Glasgow, Burrell Collection (p.229).
223 See Appendix I, entry for Ely, Ely Cathedral (p.227).
224 Ayers, 2004: II, 594–625. Ayers described two phases of acquisition, first 1812–13...quoting DC/Communar’s ‘Private Book of Accounts’, 1812-13: Mr Mills’s Bill for stained glass for the west window £271.'Composition and additions by W.R. Eginton. DC/LIB/PIC 16 (design central lancet). Glass in two groups: four scenes of St John the Evangelist (See Appendix I, Ely, Burrell, and Cossey) see Christie Catalogue 16-17 June 1808 including 'The Vision of the Golden Candlesticks' and three lots of a 'Passage of the life of St John the Evangelist' (Lots 62-65, (62-63) 'Watson' £16.16s.0d and (64) £18.7s.6d) Rackham considered these were the Burrell panels, (See Stevenson, Pall Mall, Bagot, Blithfield). The ‘Candlesticks’ panel may have been auctioned earlier (1804), or directly from Hampp. The glass passed through various hands before arriving at Wells. The second group represent scenes from the life of John the Baptist. See Hampp accounts, ‘Beheading of St John the B’ 21 December 1802, crossed out. Probably to W. Stevenson, Pall Mall. The glass was moved in 1926. Two additional panels were acquired for £600 through Roy Grosvenor Thomas. Offered in April 1952, acquired in 1953 and installed in 1955. Glass was acquired through Grosvenor Thomas from Costessey Hall in 1913. The St John the Evangelist panels were acquired by Sir William Jerningham from W. Stevenson (Powell) for hid chapel that was consecrated in 1909. (The date of installation of the Glass is not confirmed).
225 See Appendix I, entry for York, York Minster, The Visitation Window (p.271).
226 See Appendix I, entry for York, York Minster, The Crucifixion Window (p.269).
Stevenson are the Flemish stained glass now at Burton Constable,\textsuperscript{227} as well as (probably) the installations at Costessey;\textsuperscript{228} John Eardley Wilmot’s gift of French glass to All Hallows’, Tottenham, London;\textsuperscript{229} two figures, also French, of St James and St Simon, originally in Ram’s Chapel, Homerton, and now in St Andrew’s Whitehall Park, Islington, London;\textsuperscript{230} and an early Wyatt family installation of Rouen stained glass in the family’s local church, St Mary’s, Weeford (Staffordshire), sponsored by Sir Robert Lawley.\textsuperscript{231} Two significant early nineteenth-century installations that were not influenced by William Stevenson, but on which he commented were those at Lichfield Cathedral\textsuperscript{232} and Hafod House,\textsuperscript{233} both of which had significant influence on stained glass installation practice and understanding of the medium in the early phases of the Gothic Revival in England.

One collection however, similar to that at Hafod, typifies the early nineteenth-century reception of stained glass in England, very much in line with the aesthetic precepts of the eighteenth century: that of Walsh Porter (d.1809). Porter was described by Faringdon as a ‘picture dealer and fastidious connoisseur’ and ‘very eccentric & entertaining’, and he became a friend of the Prince of Wales.\textsuperscript{234} Craven Cottage was described in 1816 as ‘a short distance from Lord Cholmondeley’s’ and ‘a small villa of tasteful and highly embellished

\textsuperscript{227} See Appendix I, entry for Burton Constable Hall (p.209).
\textsuperscript{228} See Appendix I, entry for Costessey Hall, Chapel (p.218).
\textsuperscript{229} See Appendix I, entry for London (Haringey), Parish Church of All Hallows (p.256).
\textsuperscript{230} See Appendix I, entry for London (Islington), Parish Church of St Andrew (p.244).
\textsuperscript{231} See Appendix I, entry for Weeford, Parish Church of St Mary (p.267).
\textsuperscript{232} See Appendix I, entry for Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (p.239).
\textsuperscript{233} See Appendix I, entry for Hafod House (p.231).
character, and having a chapel of moderate proportions’. Fulham FC, the present owner of the site, may be slightly different in character, but the team is still known as “The Cottagers”. Porter’s cottage, reputedly extended for £4,000 in 1805, included extensive themed stained-glass installations focusing on the dining room, which according to Croker represented the ruins of Tintern Abbey on a small scale, and where “Mr Porter had frequently the honour of entertaining Prince of Wales”. Croker estimated Porter’s investment in stained glass at “above 800 guineas”. The source of Porter’s glass can be surmised: in 1807 Porter posted to two friends a programme for admission to a meeting of the National Light and Heat Company at 97 Pall Mall, William Stevenson’s stained glass sales outlet.

**Conclusion**

It is significant that the installations of imported stained glass made in the opening years of the nineteenth century were principally of Flemish and French origin; this reflected a pattern of availability. Rhenish stained glass was scarce and, apart from that at Costessey Hall and Cholmondeley Castle, usually of poorer condition. This fact bears out the author’s hypothesis that there were two very distinct periods of stained-glass export from the Rhineland. Initially, complete glazing series in good condition went into German collections,
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principally in Cologne, and only glass of secondary interest and condition was sold, principally through J.C. Hampp. The major collections of Rhenish stained glass were disbanded after the lifting of the Continental blockade in 1815 for two reasons. Firstly, there was a distinct change in the economic climate: many of the products of the Cologne manufacturers that had collected stained glass became uncompetitive; some collectors became bankrupt, and their collections were auctioned off as a result. Secondly, there was a new generation, and the collections of the older generation were disbanded by the younger inheritors. The export and installation of the high-quality Rhenish stained glass after 1815 forms the central theme of chapter III (Fig. II.18).
II.1. Frontispiece of ‘Der Mönch’, by M.G. Lewis (German translation, 1787).

II.2. Ruin of the Abbey of Altenberg near Cologne, c.1815.
II.3. Altenberg Abbey, after Sartor 1707 (Täube, 2007, Pl. 2).

II.4. Stained glass from Altenberg, ‘St Bernard on a Preaching Tour’, Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire). CVMA. nI.2b.
II.6. Triple lancet window, with fourteen stained glass panels from Altenberg, Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire). CVMA. nI.
II.10. Stained glass from the Mariawald Cloister; 'Esau Trades His Birthright for a Bowl of Soup'. London (Kensington and Chelsea), Victoria & Albert Museum.
II.11. Stained glass from the Altenberg Cloister; ‘Bernard Dictates a Letter Outdoors’. Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire). CVMA. sVII. 1b.
II.13. 'Gothic’ (Osbert Lancaster, 1938).

II.15. Egyptian Hall (1842).
II.16. The house of J.C. Hampp, St. Giles Street, Norwich.
II.17. ‘Visitation Window’ York Minster (GM, 1806, p.401).
II.18. Rhenish stained glass; Hingham, Parish Church of St Andrew (Norfolk). CVMA. I.
CHAPTER III
The Redistribution, Importation and Installation of Collections of Rhenish Stained Glass in the United Kingdom after 1815

Introduction

Many Englishmen have inspected the glass and I expect that they have made offers.\textsuperscript{240}

(August Wilhelm von Schlegel, Cologne, 14 August 1824)

This chapter analyses the trade in stained glass between the Rhineland and the United Kingdom between 1815 and 1835, with the focus on auction and private sales activity in Cologne. This subject has not been studied in any detail by either German or British scholars, the focus of previous studies being on the nature of the stained glass traded, its iconography, and the installation of medieval glazing schemes. This study is concerned with the neglected mechanics of the trade, the resulting redistribution of stained glass, and its effect upon installation practice in the United Kingdom up to the mid-1840s. The centre section of the chapter, Case Study 2, concentrates on the analysis of a long-lost primary source rediscovered by the author, the diary of Edward Spenser Curling. Between 1827 and 1835, Curling documented in detail not only his official business as trade consul, but also his extensive activity trading in stained glass, his network of contacts (particularly in Cologne), and his acquisition methodology (Fig.

\textsuperscript{240} ‘Einige Engländer haben die Sammlung genau betrachtet, und wie man vermuthet Aufträge vertheilt.’ Commentary on the pending Hirn auction in Cologne, 14 August 1824; SLUB, MS. E.90, XIX, 2, No. 23.
III.1). Between 1828 and 1831, Curling bought all the Altenberg and St. Apern stained glass now in British collections.

The 1820s was a critical period in the establishment of art collections in all their forms in the United Kingdom, as new money generated by the industrial revolution sought social and cultural legitimisation within a rigorously structured social hierarchy. This resulted in a growing taste for historical artefacts, a phenomenon witnessed principally in London, but also in the provinces. As Waagen noted in 1838,²⁴¹ the golden age for collectors in London had been immediately after the end of the Napoleonic wars.

Stained glass was just one ‘product’ in the transfer of cultural property from the Continent to the United Kingdom after 1815, and the three case studies set out here illustrate specific aspects of the stained-glass trade and installation mechanisms at this period. The first examines the role of the Regency architect/entrepreneur, particularly members of the Wyatt clan and William Wilkins and the installations in their Gothic Revival projects, focusing on the installation of Rhenish stained glass in Ashridge Park Chapel. The second focuses on the activities of the antiquary and businessman Edward Spenser Curling, who combined astute business acumen with an appreciation of quality and authenticity in what he was acquiring. The third concerns the relationships between the clergy and the British stained-glass artist and supplier of imported stained glass, here specifically David Evans of Shrewsbury.

²⁴¹ Waagen, 1838: I, 50.
Economic and Cultural Factors Resulting in the Redistribution of Stained Glass from Cologne after 1815

It is necessary to outline here the general conditions prevailing at the time. Haskell has drawn attention to the post-revolutionary period in France and England, suggesting that “flocks of dealers and agents emerged in response to the expanding art market that had been set in train by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars”, and that one of the primary drivers was the desire of the British aristocracy to portray themselves as a “cultivated patriciate”, by taking advantage of the new financial and transport opportunities available to them. The same could be said of Germany at this date; there had been art traders prior to the French Revolution and until 1802, but, as Faringdon has observed, this was principally the period when the Prince of Wales sent “gentleman in a public capacity”, on diplomatic missions only to become art traders.

Until recently, the conditions surrounding the art trade of the period were poorly understood. Recent studies by Wainwright and Westgarth have made the first significant steps towards shedding light on these years from a British point of view, but substantiation of the German/Rhenish perspective and a synthesis between the two are still lacking; the aim of this study is to rectify this. In his pioneering book The Romantic Interior of 1989, Wainwright included a short chapter on the trade in antiquities in general, but concluded that the field was mostly uncharted territory, except for
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243 Faringdon, II: 18. 8 August 1803.
the role of the London dealers and salerooms. Westgarth published an extensive study of London’s antique and curiosity dealers between 1815 and 1850, and his observations on trade conditions in north Germany have particular relevance for the present study. It has been observed that interest in collecting historical objects moving away from the personal, idiosyncratic and elite networks of the eighteenth century illustrated by Faringdon’s antiquarian collecting, to more market-driven collecting activities that reflected broader political and national agendas; these are significant in the context of the stained-glass trade. Bending has noted that at the beginning of the nineteenth century “... the objects of consumerism may be different, but both polite culture and antiquarian culture were driven by the desire for commodities both physical and aesthetic.”

That appreciation of all things Gothic waned in Cologne and the Rhineland could be attributed partly to the adopted “son of the city” Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1660), who in 1622 expressed his artistic preferences clearly, dismissing Gothic in the process: “We come at last to another sort of work called German ... They are so far removed from the beauty of our buildings that they are not worth any further discussion.” Rubens was only reiterating the anti-Gothic view first formulated by Vasari, who described Gothic as “German” or “the German manner” (“maniera tedesca” or
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245 Westgarth, 2006.
246 Crane, 2000b.
248 See chapter II, p.50.
249 Rubens, 1622: ‘la maniera d’Architettura, che chiama Barbara, ò Gothica’.
“maniera de’ Gothi”). This standpoint was accepted in Germany by Eggers, who in 1768 defined Gothic thus: “Gothic is the name given to everything in architecture which is constructed without taste.” Here Eggers was only restating eighteenth-century orthodoxy, which survived in Germany until the 1820s and constitutes a contributing factor to the sale and export of all forms of Gothic artefacts. Stained glass formed a significant proportion of these exports. Westgarth confirms this in his analysis of the trades of the curio dealer John Coleman Isaac. Isaac spotted the earlier cultural shift in appreciation of Gothic among his British clients, and often combined armour with stained glass in his sales according to his stock and sales books.

Some of the driving forces behind the Gothic Revival in Germany at this period were intellectual and political. Germain has noted that two of the most prominent protagonists in the Revival in the Rhineland were the brothers Sulpiz and Melchior Boisserée, with the support of Friedrich Schlegel (1772–1829), whose collected works, published in 1823 under the title Grundzüge der gotischen Baukunst (“Foundations of Gothic Architecture”), became the Revival’s intellectual corner-stone. The Boisserée brothers had a long-standing friendship with Matthias Joseph de Noël (1782-1848), the first Director of the Städtisches Museum in Cologne and an early defender of the city’s Gothic heritage. Lewis has stated that the German Revival was driven by
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250 Maclehose, 1907: 83–84.
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Protestant-Catholic competition, and that it was political in nature.\textsuperscript{255} The competition was most pronounced in the Catholic Rhineland, then a Protestant Prussian province, and it was here that the German Gothic Revival took shape. The contrast between the development of the Revival in Britain and Germany, especially in the Rhineland, was extreme. Robson-Scott has shown that the Gothic Revival in Germany was focused on two buildings, the cathedrals of Strasbourg and Cologne (Fig. III.2);\textsuperscript{256} this was a defining difference to the English Revival, which had no such outstanding focal buildings. One reason for the emphasis on the cathedral in Cologne was that it became the centre of the city’s cultural life, its completion after hundreds of years of building inactivity becoming a necessity for the survival of Cologne’s cultural wellbeing and the establishment of a unifying national monument and a counterpoint to the city’s intellectual bankruptcy and avarice of some of its citizens.

This intellectual bankruptcy and avarice is well illustrated in the activities of Christian Geerling (Fig. III.3). Geerling was a controversial figure in the cultural and antiquities trade of the city. He was well connected politically and culturally, as will be seen below in relation to the sale of the Altenberg stained glass. Geerling was acquainted with de Noël and the then Mayor of Cologne, Adolf Steinberger. Yet in his activities he was playing a

\textsuperscript{255} Lewis, 1993.  
\textsuperscript{256} Robson-Scott, 1965: 19.
double game – a stained glass and antiquities trader, also purporting to be a conservationist.\textsuperscript{257}

In his diary entry for 23 May 1832, Sulpiz Boisserée referred to Geerling as “a common and disgusting businessman”, and on the 6 June of the same year he wrote: “The plagiarist Geerling caught me on the stairs and inflicted on me for over an hour with his low worthless chatter.”\textsuperscript{258} In October 1832, Geerling was officially charged with plagiarism in relation to his position as Conservator der rheinischen Alterthümer (“Conservator of Rhenish Antiquities”), “having copied paragraphs from books almost to the word”.\textsuperscript{259} There was a Faustian symbiosis between leading figures of the Gothic Revival, as de Noël, and stained-glass traders, such as Geerling or Wilhelm Düssel, the trader and stained-glass restorer at Cologne Cathedral. Düssel’s activities, together with those of the clergy in the city, were documented by E.S. Curling between 1828 and 1832. Curling’s mercantile activities and cultural observations provide a fleeting glimpse of the trade and cultural conditions in Cologne in the late 1820s, and they form the subject of analysis later in this chapter. This new source of primary data however also ties together many incomplete threads found in German research into the stained-glass trade and gives a new perspective into the sales network of the period. 

\textsuperscript{257} In January 1828, Geerling sent a written proposal to de Noël for the establishment of an “Institute zur Erhaltung der in den Rheinprovince verhandenen Althertümer und Kunstgegenstände”; see Schaden, 2002: 397. 
\textsuperscript{258} “das erwischet mich der Plagegeist Geerling auf der Treppe und pienigt mich nun auch noch in Person über eine Stunde lang mit seinem niederträchtigen nichtswürdigen Geschwätz.” Boisserée, 664 & 674. 
\textsuperscript{259} “Aufsätze theils aus Büchern fast wörtlich abgeschrieben”. LHAK, 404, 1114, 18 October 1832; Schaden, 2002: 400.
The critical factor that released a flood of artworks from Cologne and the surrounding region at this time however was economic. Traditional trade goods – wine, linen and tobacco – had lost much of their significance during the period of the French occupation and trade in them was subject to a rigorous centralisation process. It is significant however that the old trading families formed a close group of art collectors. A central figure was the banker Johann Abraham Schaffhausen (1756–1824), who with the wine trader Jakob Johann Nepomuk Lyversberg (1761–1834) expanded his business by financing wine- and cotton-trading businesses, particularly those of the cloth-producers Heinrich Schieffer (1780–1847) and Casper Heinrich Bemberg (1744–1824), both of whom were significant collectors of stained glass. The production and trade in cloth in Cologne during the period of the French occupation experienced a boom as a result of the exclusion of English competition through the Continental blockade. The situation prior to and after 1815 can be encapsulated in the destiny of the Hirn/Schiefer family and the rise and fall of the Bembergs.\footnote{See especially Wolff-Wintrich, 1995.}

In 1802, the publisher and wool-dealer Johann Baptist Hirn (1755–1824) moved his cloth-production into the dissolved Servitessen monastery. On his death in 1805, the business was taken over by his stepson, Heinrich Schieffer.\footnote{Berghausen, 1995: 149.} Schieffer’s mother, Maria Franziska Pleunissen, inheritor of the abbey of Altenberg and all its remaining contents from her second husband, Johann Heinrich Pleunissen, appears to have motivated her son to develop
a stained-glass collection. Over the next ten years, family connections and the profitable cloth-production business enabled Heinrich Schieffer to assemble one of the most important stained-glass collections in the city. The end came after the ending of the Continental blockade in 1815. Against English competition his business was no longer competitive, and by 1822, the Hirn/Schiefer business was only trading in wine. The firm went bankrupt in 1823, and as a result the stained glass collection of Heinrich Schieffer was auctioned. This was one of the best-documented stained-glass auctions of this period, and took place in 1824. The catalogue was written by de Noël (Fig. III.4).

The Bemberg family as stated in chapter two (p.59-60) was also involved in cloth production and trade. The family had settled in Cologne in the eighteenth century, and by 1785 the Protestant Friedrich Wilhelm Bemberg (1711–1806) had been allowed to acquire land in the city, a significant step and confirmation of the growing socio-religious tolerance in the city. Bemberg was the owner of the firm Friedrich Wilhelm Bemberg in the Brückenstrasse and dealt in manufactured goods and cloth. His sons Peter Joseph (1742–1814) and Casper Heinrich (1744–1824) were involved and influential in the running and expansion of the business during the French occupation. The most significant person in the stained-glass trade from this family appears to have been Peter Bemberg. He is credited with making the first stained glass sales from the city to the Norwich based J.C. Hampp, and was certainly selling stained

---

262 FM, ‘Account book of John Hampp, 1802-1804’. See the entry for March 1803 ("P. Bemberg, 6 Boxes of Glass [£] 267") and a card headed 'Glass' in the back detailing sundry payments to Bemberg and Oelmecher, among others ("1804
glass from his, and his brother Caspar’s collections. Caspar
Heinrich retired from the family business in 1810 to concentrate on
his glass and stained glass collection. His nephew Friedrich Wilhelm
Bemberg (1777–1831) expanded the industrialisation of his cloth
manufactory in this period, and was the first to introduce steam
engines into the cloth production process in Cologne.²⁶³ Production
ended after 1815, as the business, like that of Hirn/Schiefer, was
no longer competitive with English producers.²⁶⁴ In 1822, he was
reduced to dealing in clocks, jewellery and clockmaker’s tools.²⁶⁵

That a period of redistribution of Cologne art of every
description took place after 1815 was inevitable. Culturally the
triumph of the Gothic sensibility in Germany was, as seen earlier in
the chapter, still fifteen years away; art collectors were becoming
impoverished, and the mercantile dominance of the United
Kingdom was becoming apparent. Another factor crucial to the
redistribution of Cologne art, a development of the early Industrial
Revolution that became critical to trade of all types, was the
advent of communications technology. In the period in question,
railways were in their infancy and played an insignificant role, as
confirmed by Seth William Stevenson in his book of his European
tour with his friend, the stained-glass salesman Christoph Friedrich
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²⁶³ On 10 July 1810, an application was made for a cotton-spinning factory
("Filature et Tissage de Coton"), and in 1811 permission was received from
Aachen prefecture for a "pompe à feu pour activer la filature de coton". In the
Gewerberegister for 1812, 20 of the 21 mule-jennys in Cologne are recorded as
being operated by Bemberg & Co., there were 92 hand-weaving looms in the
city, four of which were with Bemberg & Co. There were 7 factories in the city
employing 480 workers, 80 of whom were employed by Bemberg & Co.
²⁶⁴ Berghausen, 1995: 149.
²⁶⁵ Thiriart, 1822: 137.
Häussermann:266 “On the 12 July [1825], accompanied by my friend, Mr Häussermann, I set out from Paris on a journey to Milan. We travelled extra poste, in an English built calèche, taking the high road from Fontainebleau.” This reflects the reality of the period: land transport was simple, and British hegemony of nineteenth century industrial production was beginning. The opening up of the world to trade that was starting to affect the Bemberg’s and other German industrialists was tied to the development of steam shipping on the main rivers of Europe, in the case of the Rhine, between Antwerp, Rotterdam and Koblenz. With the introduction of steam-powered ships on the Rhine in 1815, the Cologne business community believed, correctly, that their trading potential could be dramatically improved. Regular test trips were conducted after 1816. In 1823, the Nederlandsche Stoomboot Maatschappij (Dutch Steamship Company) was founded in Rotterdam. Cologne businessmen quickly became shareholders in this company so that the steamship connection between Rotterdam and Antwerp could be extended to Cologne. Significantly, Bernhard Boisserée (1773–1845), elder brother of Sulpiz and Melchior,267 was a backer of steam shipping on the Rhine, and one of the co-founders of the Kölner Dampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft (Cologne Steamship Company) in 1825.268 That the eldest Boisserée brother possessed a substantial share in this company may well have had some effect in the establishment of the younger brothers’ art collections, since the

266 Stevenson, 1827: 1.
267 Berghausen, 1995: 156.
268 Ibid.: 157. The Kölner Dampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft was founded on 28 July 1825.
new method of communication may have optimised the transport of artworks.

The introduction of a regular steamship service on the Rhine to the North Sea ports gave a stimulus to tourism and trade. The numbers of tourists moving up and down the Rhine had increased from 18,624 in 1827, to about 150,000 in 1836; by 1838 it was more than 200,000.\textsuperscript{269} In 1815, Johann Andreas Demian (1770–1845) had recommended the art collections in Cologne, including that of Bemberg, to visitors;\textsuperscript{270} by 1820 Bemberg is no longer mentioned.\textsuperscript{271} Tourists in this period collected not only impressions, but also works of art. In his description of the region, Elsholtz noted that the increased tourism up and down the Rhine had stimulated the art trade in Cologne. He wrote: "In particular the English, who are often found here looking for painted glass."\textsuperscript{272} The importance of steamship communication on the Rhine was confirmed in the diary of Edward Spenser Curling, who was in Cologne in 1828. In his diary he made an observation regarding the export of the Altenberg and St. Apern stained glass:

"Wednesday 22 October 1828. The whole of this splendid Ancient Glass (200 square ft) bought by John Curling for £162 taken with us to England by steam ship to Nijmegen."\textsuperscript{273} Seth William Stevenson when he visited Cologne in the summer 1825 also noted the once-weekly steam ship connection from Cologne to Rotterdam.

\textsuperscript{269} The official statistics of the Prussische Schifffahrtsverwaltung between 1827 and 1835 are extremely detailed. See Steckner, 1995: 179–81.
\textsuperscript{270} Demian, 1815: 317.
\textsuperscript{271} Demian, 1820: 99. See also Steckner, 1995.
\textsuperscript{272} Elsholtz, 1820. See also Steckner, 1992: 179–181.
that took two days; Stevenson and his business partner Christoph Friedrich Häussermann (1772–1842) continued their journey to Aachen,\textsuperscript{274} if they acquired stained glass on their visit to the city is not recorded.

Curling’s newly discovered diary confirms the importance of steamships in this period in optimising the transportation of goods, in this case stained glass. The diary contains many references to this new mode of transport, such as “left the next day on the steam-ship Concordia for Coblenz”,\textsuperscript{275} “from Margate on the Spitfire Mail Steam Packet”,\textsuperscript{276} and finally (in 1831) “Left Cologne in the Concordia Steamer”.\textsuperscript{277}

**The Trade in Stained Glass and Auctions in Cologne 1815–35**

The state of antiquities trading in the period after the lifting of the Continental blockade was documented in part by Rode in 1967: “It is calculated that in the first two decades of the nineteenth century about 2,000 stained glass panels were traded”,\textsuperscript{278} and Wolff-Wintrich has confirmed that Cologne had by 1824 established itself as the recognised trading centre for stained glass.\textsuperscript{279} In the correspondence from 1824 between Zwierlein and Roth, Roth noted “He would have gladly paid over a thousand Gulden for glass paintings, if such astronomical prices had not been demanded” and “if you do not buy on the first or second day,

\begin{footnotes}
\item[274] Stevenson, 1827: 767. Stevenson also noted the glass in the church of St Peter, describing it as “the remains evidently of a large collection:” ibid: 766.
\item[275] Ibid., entry for 27 September 1828.
\item[276] Ibid., entry for 4 June 1828.
\item[277] Ibid., entry for 2 October 1831.
\item[278] Rode, 1967: 335.
\end{footnotes}
you get nothing!” The Isaac archive at the University of Southampton has been analysed by Westgarth. In letters to his wife from Frankfurt am Main in 1833, Isaac complained that prices were astronomical in comparison with two decades previously: “you would be surprised to see the prices the dealers give for goods here ... a bargain is almost impossible to meet with, there are so many purchasers now”. Isaac appears to have acquired stained glass on his German trip: five months later he is recorded as selling nineteen stained-glass panels. In this period, major collections were disbanded, as previously noted. Goethe wrote on local reaction to the impending loss of the Hüpsch collection: "Findet er in seinem Wohnort nur Gleichgültigkeit, er wird sich in der Fremde des Dankes erholen.”

The principal facilitators in the transfer of Cologne stained glass to British collectors were Christian Geerling and Wilhelm Düssel, mentioned above. Wolff-Wintrich quotes sources that show that Geerling was in many ways a dedicated art collector, and that “Following generations accused him of exporting stained glass, particularly to England.” Täube in an unpublished study by Heinrich Latz/Steinfeld (1998), footnote 13. highlights that on the 13 July 1821 a Christian Joseph Geerling, the uncle of Christian Geerling, died in Cologne. It remains open whether it was this Christian Geerling who was involved in the stained-glass trade at

280 Roth, 1901: 81.
282 Ibid.: Letter from Isaac to his wife, 26 August 1833.
284 Colonia 13 (March 1822), ed. D.G. Schier.
the beginning of the century. An example of the activities of Christian Geerling (1797–1848) is detailed in the Appendix I entry for London, Victoria & Albert Museum, Glass from the Ägidius-Kapelle (p.219), which was sold to Edward Spenser Curling in 1828 (Fig. III.5).287

In 1827, Geerling published a sales catalogue of stained glass in his collection,288 which was lauded in the Kölnischer Zeitung of the 19 March 1826: "Herr Geerling’s artistic commitment to these rare and beautiful works which were in the past so common have been saved! Such a commitment from a private person deserves applause and support!"289 There is a more sober analysis of Geerling’s activity:290 that he was the agent and buyer for Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm von Preußen in Cologne291 and other undefined clients. That Geerling was an unscrupulous dealer with a tendency to over-restore and add to the windows he was selling was recorded by Curling in his diary after buying glass from Geerling in 1828.292 On the 25 January 1829, he noted: “Read letter from C. Geerling of Cologne; -answered declining having anything to do with his collection.”293 A good example of Geerling’s work is the glass from the Ägidius-Kapelle in Cologne depicting the apostles Peter and Paul, now in the Victoria & Albert Museum,
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287 CL, ‘The Diary of Edward Spencer Curling Esq. 1827–1836’, entry for 27 September 1828 at Cologne: "No.3. about 10 feet high by about 2 feet wide. 2 of these 700 Fr."
288 Geerling, 1827, which was published by subscription in a print run of 260, with 12 pages of lithographs.
291 Roth, 1901: 80.
293 Ibid., entry for 25 January 1829 at Deal.
The tracery lights clearly do not belong with the two main lights (see Figs 1.6–7), and the originality of Geerling’s additions compared with the early sixteenth-century angels in the main lights requires no discussion here. Geerling was certainly a blatant enhancer of the glass that came into his possession, a situation reflected in German auction catalogues. Curling’s reaction confirms Wainwright’s thesis that: “It is a curious aspect of objects which have been in the hands of dealers that if they have ever been suspected of being fakes, or of having been in some way altered or improved, then this reputation clings to them however hard scholars try to dispel it.” Geerling appears to be a late representative of the school of Alexandre de Lenoir, who in the Musée des Monuments Français in Paris displayed reproductions and recreations mixed in with authentic historical material. As Wolff-Wintrich writes: “Geerling was criticised in relation to his ‘restoration’ work particularly when his position as ‘Conservateur der rheinischen Kunstdenkmäler’ is considered. It would appear that preferential additions and over-painting were not adverse to his cultural, or, his business interests.” This is in contrast to Bann, who writes concerning the Musée de Cluny, established by Alexandre du Sommerard (1779-1842) in 1834, that works that only “represented” the past were excluded, and only “authentic” historical material was installed. Curling appeared to represent a new school of traders and collectors who were able, albeit at a

294 See Appendix 1, entry for London, Victoria & Albert Museum, Glass from the Ägidius-Kapelle (p.253).
second glance, to distinguish between original work and modern optimisations. Whether the tracery additions to the Peter and Paul window in the Victoria & Albert Museum were the cause of the trade break between Curling and Geerling is not documented unfortunately. In conclusion, it should be noted that on the 14 February 1828 de Noël wrote to Adolf Steinberger, the Mayor of Cologne, concerning the problem of the uncontrolled art exports to England and elsewhere in which Christian Geerling was supposedly involved, despite in the same year presumably against his own cultural interests provided details of Geerling’s sales activities to Curling in 1829.

In the period under discussion certain professions predominated among the stained-glass collectors and traders. The majority were cloth traders, cloth manufacturers, wine traders, or a combination of these professions. To this group belong the well-documented cloth manufacturer, trader and stained-glass importer, John Christopher Hampp and his lesser-known nephew Christoph Friedrich Häussermann. Various members of the Bemberg family in Cologne were cloth manufacturers, traders and stained-glass collectors. Peter Bemberg was Hampp’s principal supplier in the early years of the nineteenth century, and after his death in 1814 his collection became the source of the Mariawald glass that was installed in Ashridge Park Chapel; similarly Caspar Bemberg’s collection was the source of the Steinfeld glass at Ashridge after the owner’s death in 1824 and the subsequent auction. The
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299 See Appendix 2, pp. 317-19.
Schieffer/Hirn family situation resembled that of the Bembergs: they were cloth manufacturers, traders and stained-glass collectors, their collection being the most significant auctioned in the 1820s.

To the wine traders belonged Christian Geerling, who in the 1820s ran his father’s wine and vinegar trade situated “am Blaubach” Cologne, and Johann Heinrich Pleunissen, wine merchant and acquirer of Altenberg Abbey and its stained glass. Witzleben has noted that Hampp was dealing in Rhine wine as early as 1781.\textsuperscript{300} Blöcker has observed that in 1808 Jakob Johann Nepomuk Lyversberg (1761–1834), a wine and tobacco trader in Cologne, set up his private chapel at “Am Heumarkt 10” in the style “Der Alten Deutschen” (“of ancient Germans”).\textsuperscript{301} The stained glass and other artefacts were acquired and installed by Matthias Joseph de Noël, Lyversberg’s nephew,\textsuperscript{302} and the collection was a popular attraction for tourists interested in art the 1820s. Although the distinction between exhibition and sale in this period was blurred, as Geerling’s exhibition demonstrates, no sales are recorded from Lyversberg’s chapel. The relationships between the wine- and textile-dealing families was complex: Lyversberg was the cousin of Heinrich Schieffer’s mother, Maria Franziska Pleunissen. Her first marriage was to Johann Wilhelm Schieffer who died in 1791; after that date she ran his business in “wine and cloth”, which was situated at Am Malzbüchel.\textsuperscript{303} Wolff-Wintrich lists the principal wine traders involved in the stained-glass trade –

\textsuperscript{300} von Witzleben, 1972: 227.  
\textsuperscript{301} Blöcker, 2002: 387.  
\textsuperscript{302} Ibid.: 387.  
\textsuperscript{303} Verzeichnis, 1797: 38. See also Berghausen, 1995: 149.
Pleunissen, Hirn, Schieffer, Geerling, Leiden, Mumm and von Zwierlein – and notes that “they were often also collectors in their own right”.\textsuperscript{304}

That there was a significant association between the trades in wine and stained glass in other parts of Germany can be illustrated by the activities of John Waugh Brougham (1785–1832) proprietor of J.W. Brougham & Anderson, Wine Merchants and agents for Pelican Life at 12 Royal Exchange, Edinburgh. Brougham imported 220 panels of Swiss stained glass via Nuremberg through his German wine agent Bucher in 1827.\textsuperscript{305} Cillessen noted the existence of the Cologne collections of Wilhelm Düssel, Christian Geerling and Johann Baptist Hirn, and that the Freiherr Carl von Zwierlein obtained glass through them.\textsuperscript{306} (Roth 1895)

If there was some connection between these professions and the collection and sale of stained glass is unclear, but the methods by which stained glass was sold and acquired were still the same at the beginning of the 1830s. Edward Spenser Curling noted in his diary for Thursday 29 September 1831, when he was in Cologne: “Visited the church of St. Peter ... the Glass for Sale by the Canon Linden, sold to Mr. Dussel ... the Cathedral.”\textsuperscript{307} In this case Curling used his established network by writing to Düssel the same day, but was apparently unsuccessful in buying the stained glass.

\textsuperscript{304} “die mehr oder weniger in die Vermittlung, den Verkauf und Kauf von Glasmalerien verwickelt und teilweise selbst sammelten”. Wolff-Wintrich, 1995: 342.
\textsuperscript{305} London, University College Library, Brougham MSS. JW. 38. See also Martin, 2006.
\textsuperscript{306} Cillessen, 1998.
The significant figure in the Cologne network of collectors and traders in stained glass in this period was Wilhelm Laurenz Düssel (1765–1856), “Domglasermeister” (“master glazier at the cathedral”), and by profession an optician. Düssel was employed on the restoration and "improvement" of the windows of the old and new Cologne Cathedral between 1810 and 1834. Wolff-Wintrich has speculated that when Düssel restored damaged old glass in Cologne Cathedral, he replaced old work with copies made by him, enriching his own collection with the original glass. This was a common, respected, and often applauded practice at the time, as the work of Betton & Evans at Winchester College chapel illustrates. The liturgical and aesthetic concerns of the clergy took precedence, and original glass was sold on, sometimes locally and sometimes abroad, as will be later studied in detail with his sale of the Altenberg and St. Apern glass to Curling in 1828. Düssel’s acquisition of the St Apern glass, which will be studied in detail later, illustrates his methodology well. The stained glass from the church and cloister (together with stained glass from other locations) was offered for sale in the Welt- u. Staatsbote no. 153 vol. 4. November 1802. Today eight panels are installed in the north transept of Cologne Cathedral; through the agency of Düssel, two are now in St Mary’s, Shrewsbury, and one is in St Leonard’s, Marston Bigot.
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308 See Brinkmann, 1996.
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312 See Appendix 1, entry for Marston Bigot, Parish Church of St Leonard’s (p.258).
Düssel is documented as an intelligent workman and businessman. In 1820, Freiherr Carl von Zwierlein from Geisenheim (1768–1850) acquired twenty-three stained glass panels from Düssel for 200 Kronthaler, and in 1824 Düssel packed the glass bought by von Zwierlein at the Schieffer auction and charged for the work. It appears that Düssel sold on all the significant stained glass he acquired during his working career: when his effects were auctioned after his death in 1857, a total of 115 stained glass panels were offered, but the majority were small-format pieces of 16th–17th-century date.

**Auctions in Cologne of Collections of Stained Glass**

The most significant auction of the period was that of the Hirn collection, the catalogue for which was written by de Noël. The exhibition of the stained glass opened on the 3 July “im Filzengraben” in Cologne (Fig. II.8), and auctioned on the 13 September 1824. Prior to auction, the exhibition was described in detail by August Wilhelm von Schlegel, on 14 August 1824. Von Schlegel had been instructed in a letter of 2 August 1824 from a Prussian ministry to go to Cologne and report on the Hirn stained glass and its suitability for acquisition. Von Schlegel noted that in the previous twenty years the majority of the glass from secularised churches and monasteries had been sold to England, or

---

314 Ibid.: 348; Roth, 1901: 84, n. 25.
316 Denoël, 1824.
317 SLUB, MS. E.90, XIX, 2, No. 23.
destroyed, that the de Noël catalogue was well written so as to optimise the sale of the glass, but that at the same time the glass had been realistically valued.

The glass was divided into three groups: lots 1–48; lots 49–113, and the rest of the collection. For the first group von Schelegel noted that all the pieces were damaged or had poor repairs or additions, that lots 1–3 were fragments and very old, and that some lots could be seen as groups to be auctioned together (nos. 3–13, 10 items; 14–17, 4 items; and 18–22, 5 items). Von Schlegel then continued with a general description of the lots up to lot 48. The second group was glass from Altenberg; lots 49–104 constituted a series of twenty-eight pairs, and the rest were separate panels. Von Schlegel noted that some of the panels had Roman instead of Gothic lettering and valued them less. (The prolific architectural critic and antiquary Edward John Carlos (1798-1851) in the Gentleman’s Magazine, made similar observations when viewing some of the Altenberg glass exhibited at the Egyptian Hall in London in 1832; Fig. III.6.) The Altenberg glass was set in rectangular wooden frames with white glass set between the original glass and the frame. The third and final group of panels were dismissed by von Schlegel as being mostly modern-mannerist in style and of limited value.

Von Schlegel appears not to have been present at the auction, but he noted that, “many Englishmen had inspected the glass and that he expected that they had made offers”. It is

---

318 Ibid.: “Einige Englander haben die Sammlung genau betrachtet, und wie man vermutet, Aufträge vertheilt.”
probable that some glass was acquired by English buyers, including possibly lots 38 and 39, which are today in the Victoria & Albert Museum. The most significant panels from the auction that are now in England (in St Mary’s, Shrewsbury) were from Altenberg. These were bought by Moritz Werner von Haxthausen (1780–1842) (Fig. III.7), and the details of this acquisition be analysed later in this chapter. Roth has noted that the principal buyers at the auction were von Haxthausen and Major von Flotho; von Zweirlein also acquired glass – 14 pieces for 287 thaler including commission. In his draft report von Schlegel also noted that there had recently been an auction of “Brenbergisch” (Bemberg?) glass, and that it had been similar to the glass at the Hirn auction. The price per piece reported for this glass was between 16 and 20 Cologne thaler. As Curling, the eventual buyer of von Haxthausen’s Altenberg stained glass, regularly noted in his diary, the exchange rates between the various German currencies were a minefield. Assuming some form of parity between the currencies, and ignoring the extreme fluctuations in the 1820s, 16–20 Cologne thaler in 1824 could compare with the average price of 21 Reichsthaler paid by Düssel in 1828 for the Altenberg glass from the church of St Severin in Cologne, and his average sale price (with profit) in the same year to Curling of 26 Ecude Berlin. That

319 Von Haxthausen also acquired three Altenberg panels that were not exported (Hirn lots 49, 71 and 92), extending his collection to thirty-five panels. See Schaden, 1995a: 210.  
320 Roth, 1901: 82–84.  
321 SLUB, MS. E.90, XIX, 2, No. 23. The relative value of German currencies of the period is unclear.  
323 Schaden, 1995b: 114.  
there were extreme differences in the prices of stained-glass panels, depending on their quality, was symptomatic of the period; first-class panels would realise around 50 Cologne thaler, good work (as represented by the Altenberg rectangular panels) between 25 and 30 Cologne thaler, and the rest 3–17 Cologne thaler. The price of complete windows was significantly higher, probably around 250 Cologne thaler; examples are the windows at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge;325 Hingham, Norfolk (Fig. III.8);326 Hirn lot 42, now in the Hermitage, St Petersburg (Fig. III.9); or Hirn lots 38 and 39, now in the Victoria & Albert Museum, London.

As will be discussed in the next section, some of the glass from the “Brenberghisch” auction was the Steinfeld cloister glazing that went to Ashridge Park Chapel, having been acquired by Sir Jeffry Wyattville and his trade associates. The majority of this stained glass was installed by Wyattville at Ashridge; the remainder was redistributed by him as ‘seconds’ after 1830, later forming the base of installations such as that at Disley Church in Cheshire.327

325 See Appendix 1, entry for Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Chapel (p.211).
326 See Appendix 1, entry for Hingham, Parish Church of St Andrew (p.234).
327 See Appendix 1, entry Disley, Parish Church of St Mary (p.221).
Case Study 1. A Reappraisal of the Installation of Rhenish Stained Glass in Ashridge Park Chapel (1815–1831)

‘The early 19-century Chapel at Ashridge, Hertfordshire, showing the German Renaissance glass panels installed by Sir Jeffry Wyatville’, (see Fig. 1.10).328

The most important installation of Rhenish stained glass in Britain in the 1820s was that in Ashridge Park Chapel (Hertfordshire). Ashridge was designed for John William Egerton, 7th Earl of Brigewater, by the architects James Wyatt (1746-1813), and after the latter’s death, Wyatt’s nephew Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyattville, 1766-1840). The story of the Ashridge installation provided a glimpse of how much Continental stained glass was acquired and installed in England in this period, and highlights the key role of the architect. The function of the architect prior to 1834 was radically different to that of the Victorian period: he was a contractor, a supplier not only of design services but also of goods and antiquities, and in the case of Wyattville and his close friend William Wilkins (1778–1839) for many of their projects, stained glass, principally of Rhenish origin.

Wilkins and Wyattville

Wilkins and Wyattville are classic examples of the Regency contractor-architect, a species doomed to extinction with the establishment of the Institute of British Architects in 1834. A royal charter was granted in 1837, when rules for fees, practice and

328 Strong, Binney and Harris, 1974: Fig. 375.
conduct were also formulated. Johnson’s *Dictionary* of 1755 makes ‘surveyor’ and ‘architect’ synonymous terms, and eighteen years later an anonymous author, possibly George Dance, judged that any distinction between the two was merely one of competence.\footnote{Dance, 1773: 22.}

Wyattville ended his association with the building trade and embraced the newly established professional standards in 1834, when he became an honorary fellow of the Institute of British Architects.\footnote{Cooney, 1955: 176.} Pont has documented this change: architects detached themselves from long-standing and profitable, but not always entirely honourable connections with builders and (in this case) traders in European art.\footnote{Pont, 1967: 110.} As Wyattville declared to the Treasury on the 4 July 1826 in relation to undefined contracts that he did not pay the measurer from his commission: “if I did, there would not be much left for me”.\footnote{Ibid.: 104. See also PRO, Treasury 1/4389, 100.}

In 1795, William Wilkins Senior (1751–1815) read a paper to the Society of Antiquaries on Norwich Castle, to which he added some remarks on Anglo Saxon and Norman architecture.\footnote{Archaeologia, 12 (1796): 155.} Wilkins’s paper conveniently symbolised the changed character of medievalist research at the end of the eighteenth century; there was now, for the first time, “a feasible base for interaction between medievalism and contemporary architectural practice”.\footnote{Frew, 1976: 51.} Wilkins Sr was, as noted in chapter II, a member of the Society of United Friars at Norwich, and had contact with the Stevenson’s from which his son and his architect friends presumably profited. In his *The
History and Antiquities of the See and Cathedral Church of Norwich

of 1816 John Britton thanked the following for their contributions: the Rev. Henry J. Todd (then the chaplain at Ashridge), William Wilkins, Esq., and Thomas Starling Norgate, Esq. It would appear that the stained-glass trade network from the turn of the nineteenth century had been transferred to the next generation. By nature a Greek Classic Revival architect, William Wilkins had apparently extended his knowledge of Gothic through his friendship with Jeffry Wyattville.

In 1814, Jeffry Wyatt (as he was then) prepared drawings for Dalmeny House (Fig. III.10). Wilkins did likewise in 1815 (Fig. III.11). Details of the design and the installation of the Mariawald Abbey glass are documented in the gazetteer entry for Dalmeny, but the connection between Wilkins, Wyatt and the imported Mariawald glass cannot be overlooked here. Within the space of two years, architects designed custom-made tracery lights for stained glass imported from Mariawald, albeit from the abbey in the case of Wilkins and the cloister in the case of Wyatt. Wolff-Wintrich has detailed the Dalmeny windows, and the RIBA Library Drawings and Archives Collection holds Wyatt’s drawings for Ashridge Park (Fig. III.12).

In 1815, Wilkins inherited from his father the lease of the Theatre Royal in Norwich and the tenancy of theatres at

---

335 Britton, 1816: iii.
336 Chaplin at Ashridge Park at the time, and author of, Todd, 1812/1823). Todd described the Mariawald stained glass that had been installed.
337 Architect, installer of Rhenish stained glass in Cambridge (particularly Corpus Christi College Chapel), and the probable supplier of the Mariawald glass for Dalmeny House.
338 See Appendix 1, entry for Edinburgh, Dalmeny House (p.224).
340 RIBA/LDAC, SB13/WYJ[1](121-123).
Cambridge, Bury St Edmunds, Colchester, Great Yarmouth, Ipswich and King’s Lynn. The circuit prospered, the income being £1,150 in 1825.\textsuperscript{341} The profits enabled Wilkins to begin collecting paintings, porcelain and stained glass; the quality of the porcelain in particular was noted by G.F. Waagen, Director of the Berlin National Gallery.\textsuperscript{342} The glass was principally for personal use; some was installed in his Cambridge house, Lensfield (Fig. III.13), but some was gifted to Corpus Christi College Chapel, where he was the architect.\textsuperscript{343} On Wilkins’s death in 1839 his collection was dispersed. Some Mariawald Abbey glass went to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; this was sold in 1920 and subsequently bequeathed to King’s College for installation in the chapel there.\textsuperscript{344} The Mariawald stained glass from Lensfield was eventually also installed in King’s College Chapel.\textsuperscript{345} It is highly probable that the Mariawald Abbey glass at St Stephen’s, Norwich (Wilkins’s home town), gifted by a Mr Norgate in 1842, also originated from his collection.

William Wilkins was the link between many of the Rhenish stained-glass imports after 1815, but the extent of Wilkins’s network requires further research, but his connection to the English architect John Adey Repton (1775-1860) has been established. Between 1798 and 1800, they published \textit{Norwich Cathedral at the End of the Eighteenth Century}, with Repton

\textsuperscript{341} Liscombe, 1980: 81.  
\textsuperscript{342} Waagen, 1838.  
\textsuperscript{343} See Appendix 1, entry for Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Chapel (p.211).  
\textsuperscript{344} See Wayment, 1972: 118–19; and Appendix 1, entry for Cambridge, King’s College Chapel (p.214).  
\textsuperscript{345} Ibid.
providing the drawings and Wilkins the descriptive notes.\textsuperscript{346} In 1823, Repton acquired Steinfeld stained glass for Lady Suffield that was installed in Blickling Church in 1829.\textsuperscript{347} It is known that Hampp and Stevenson made the first Mariawald imports in the early years of the nineteenth century through the agency of Peter Bemberg in Cologne, and that there was a Bemberg auction in Cologne in 1807;\textsuperscript{348} this was probably the collection of Mariawald Abbey glass subsequently owned by Wilkins and that installed by Hale Miller through the agency of Stevenson at Costessey.\textsuperscript{349} Exactly what stained glass arrived later cannot be confirmed, but in all probability it included the large-scale works such as those at Corpus Christi College Chapel,\textsuperscript{350} and Hingham Church, Norfolk,\textsuperscript{351} together with the Mariawald and Steinfeld cloister glass at Ashridge Park Chapel. The explanation of this pattern is tied to the activities of the Wyatt clan.

**Jeffry Wyatt and the Two Phases of Installation of Rhenish Stained Glass in Ashridge Park Chapel**

As early as 1797, Joseph Faringdon recorded a discussion between James Wyatt and William Beckford “where Wyatt apparently privately desired His nephew Jeffry Wyatt to write for him to Eggington, who resides near Birmingham to know his terms for such stained glass work. Eggington replied 50 guineas a figure,”

\textsuperscript{346}Ketton-Cremer, 1967.
\textsuperscript{347}See Appendix 1, entry for Blickling and Erpingham (p.207).
\textsuperscript{348}Wolff-Wintrich, 1995: 351.
\textsuperscript{349}See Appendix 1, entry for Costessey Hall, Chapel (p.218).
\textsuperscript{350}See Appendix 1, entry for Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Chapel (p.211).
\textsuperscript{351}See Appendix 1, entry for Hingham, Parish Church of St Andrew (p.234).
7 Feet 6 Inches high & 3 Feet 6 Inches wide – and to finish 8 figures in two years.”

The extent of the Wyatt family industry was to be shown at Ashridge Park. Faringdon noted that on the death of James Wyatt, Jeffry Wyatt had “written 15 letters to different persons soliciting their interest to get something that his uncle enjoyed”. Jeffry secured the majority of his uncle’s contracts, one of these being Ashridge Park. In contrast to his uncle’s work, the surviving Wyatt working drawings for Ashridge Park, now at the RIBA, show how thoroughly his buildings were thought out and detailed. Britton wrote, “as he had studied the subject well, and was influenced by zeal, industry and knowledge, it is reasonably inferred that some of the best features of the building are to be ascribed to him”.

Linstrum has described how the Earl and Countess of Bridgewater were treated almost as sovereigns as they sat under Wyatt’s elaborately pinnacled canopies in their stalls in the chapel, elevated above their servants, but one step lower than the altar to indicate their deference to the Almighty. The insertion of fifteenth-century glass must have added to the chapel’s impression of “genuineness” (Fig. III.14). Rackham notes that the installation of the glass took place over a period of twenty years, and quoted the inscription scratched into one panel by the “on-site” glazier:

---

353 Ibid.: entry for 18 September 1813. See also Linstrum, 1974: 15.
354 Jeffry Wyatt told Faringdon he had “deplored the neglect of my relation, which destroyed the Office of Works as it was”, Report from the Select Committee, 1828: 99.
355 Linstrum, 1984: 16.
356 Britton, 1840: 18.
357 Linstrum, D. Sir Jeffry Wyatville, Architect to the King (Oxford 1972), 36, and 102.
“An humble individual of the same name as the Prophet Amos, the Top Figure in the Head of this Window, first commenced fixing these windows in the year 1811 and finished the Windows in 1831.”\textsuperscript{358} Although William Warrington implied in 1848 that Hampp and Stevenson had supplied more than 100 panels to Earl Brownlow, for the latter created eleven double windows each containing ten panels in his private chapel at Ashridge Park,\textsuperscript{359} the documentary record paints another picture. In a letter of 16 February 1813, James Wyatt wrote to John William Egerton, and sent with his letter sketches of stained glass from Joseph Hale Miller: “having waited for Mr Miller to supply sketch No.2” (Fig. III.15).\textsuperscript{360} Wyatt commented at length on the design of a window and noting “he (Wyatt) will give instructions on the exact shape of the arch to Mr Wynne”.\textsuperscript{361} At this point neither Egerton nor Wyatt was in possession of suitable stained glass for the chapel, and Joseph Hale Miller, who was later to restore the imported stained glass, was contracted to design suitable windows. The Hale Miller window from 1815–16 is now in the back corridor of the east wing, next to the library (Fig. I.5).

Peter Bemberg died in 1814. In the same year, Jeffry Wyatt inherited the Ashridge Park contract from his uncle. In 1815 and 1816, Wyatt was designing tracery lights for the chapel specifically dimensioned for the Mariawald cloister glass (Fig. III.12). It is

\textsuperscript{358} Rackham, 1945–47: 1.  
\textsuperscript{359} Warrington, 1848: 69.  
\textsuperscript{360} The design referred to by Wyatt is now in RIBA/LDAC, SA41/WYJAS [1](108 no. 2). Wyatt noted: “This drawing is not correct as to the shape / & proportion but merely shows the general effect of the enrichment in Glass without any part of the frame.”  
\textsuperscript{361} RIBA/LDAC, MSS. WYFAM/1/17; Linstrum, 1974: 69.
unlikely that this is entirely coincidental; Bemberg had previously supplied Mariawald glass through the Norwich network, and it is likely that a second generation of traders was employed in acquiring suitable stained glass for Wyatt through the agency of his friend William Wilkins. That Wyatt was the supplier of the stained glass, from which he presumably also profited, fits well with what is known of his character. On one side, he was a consummate and respected businessman, “a delightful man, good, simple like a child, indefatigable, eager, patient, easy to deal with to the highest degree” to his clients.362 To his peers, such as the architect Charles Robert Cockerell (1788-1863), he was no gentleman, vulgar minded, good-natured, a great boaster.363 Wyatt was essentially a Regency, not a Victorian architect, and was the perfect person for the installation of stained glass in Ashridge Park Chapel. The current opinion of the curatorial staff at Ashridge today is that Wyatville both supplied the stained glass and designed its installation in the chapel.364

To explain the chronology of the acquisition and installation of the stained glass at Ashridge Park, which continued until 1831 that was confirmed by Rackham. Amos the glass installer identified by Rackham had engraved on the Amos window,365 an analysis of
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362 Cavendish, 1845: 238.
363 Diary of C.R. Cockerell (unpublished), entry for 1 November 1823. Linstrum, RIBA 1984: 16. Wyatt’s character fits well with that of E.S. Curling, the importer of the Altenberg stained glass: Curling’s diary contains many “vulgar” references to the feminine attributes of the “ladies” he met.
364 A detailed discussion was conducted with the Archivist of Ashridge Park, Mr Mike Tompson at Ashridge on 10 August 2011. He confirmed that the current opinion is that Wyatville acquired and installed the stained glass in a period between 1815-31.
365: ‘An humble individual of the same name as the Prophet Amos, the Top Figure in the Head of this Window, first commenced fixing these windows in the year 1811 & finished the Windows in 1831.’ Rackham, 1945-47, x: 1.
drawings and published illustrations is required. The relevant
drawings at the RIBA come from the collection of W.J. Donthorne
(Wyatt’s pupil 1817–20) and are presumably by him and part of
the office record of preliminary and finished designs. The
illustrations are from Todd’s description of Ashridge Park of
1823. Appendix I document the history of the Mariawald and
Steinfeld stained glass after it was removed and came into the

Wyatt’s first drawings for the chapel windows are numbered
121–23, and they relate to three stages of the process (Fig.
III.12), the left sketch gives the general concept of the window.
The second gives the dimensions of the Mariawald panels to be
inserted: in the bottom left light dimensions are given for two
panels (2’ 3” by 2’ 2”, and 2’ 3” by 2’ 6”; that is, 68.6cm x
66.0cm, and 68.6cm by 76.2cm), and Wyatt also specifies a base
frieze 4” deep and an intermediate frieze 5” deep. The third sketch,
on the right, gives the final dimensions of the windows. None of
the drawings is signed or dated, but the handwriting is that of
Jeffry Wyatt, and taking the chronology of the drawings in the
collection into consideration, date from about 1815–16. Going by
the catalogue of the Mariawald stained glass by Dagmar Täube,
the 38 documented panels have an average width of 68.2cm and
an average height of 69.2cm, with about 50% of the panels being
taller than 70cm. Wyatt had thus accommodated the height
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366 Linstrum, 1974: 16.
367 Todd, 1823.
368 See Appendix I, entries for London, Victoria & Albert Museum (pp.246-52).
369 RIBA/LDAC SB13/WYJE[1](121–123), pencil, 320mm x 535mm.
differences with his intermediate frieze of 5” (10cm), the highest panel at Ashridge being 75cm tall; this was a practical solution, to be expected from an experienced architect such as Wyatt.

A parallel analysis of the Steinfeld panels tells a different story. Fifty-eight panels are documented in Täube’s catalogue.\(^{371}\) Seven panels have been excluded from consideration here, as they appear to have been sold or auctioned after the completion of the Ashridge Park Chapel windows.\(^{372}\) The average width of the remaining 51 panels is 54cm. The difference between this and the width of the lights in Wyatt’s windows of 1816–17 was made up with glass inserted by Hale Miller, which appears to have been destroyed, but is visible in the illustrations in the Sotheby’s auction catalogue of 1928.\(^{373}\) Todd described the initial Mariawald installation in 1823, but the illustrations to his book conflict with his text.\(^{374}\) The engravings of the chapel illustrate in detail only the Mariawald stained glass behind the altar (see Figs I.4 and I.10) and it is implied by the subtle use of perspective that two other windows might be glazed; this could be artistic licence however as other illustrations show these windows as being unglazed. The engraving shows a “First Installation”, and confirms that in 1823 twenty-seven panels from the Mariawald cloister had been installed at Ashridge Park (Fig. III.16). Looking at another illustration by

\(^{371}\) Ibid.: II, 252–419.
\(^{372}\) Six panels today at Disley with an average width of 50.3cm, and one at Kimberley 46 cm wide made up of scrap glass. See further Appendix 1, entries for Disley, Parish Church of St Mary (p.221) and Kimberley, Parish Church of St Peter (p.237).
\(^{373}\) Sotheby & Co. 1928.
\(^{374}\) Ibid.
Todd, entitled “South front of Ashridge”, the chapel windows are rendered in a manner different from the rest of the picture: the two windows visible at the east end are shown as being dark and non-transparent, three north windows are rendered as transparent and lit by the four on the south side of the chapel, but the north-west window is not transparent (Fig. III.17). Another engraving of the east front and a view of the north side of the chapel confirm these observations (Fig. III.18): the three east windows house stained glass, as does that at the north west end of the chapel; the three other north lights are clearly transparent.

Today 39 complete panels of Mariawald glass are extant; 35 of these are from Ashridge Park, auctioned in 1928 and now in the Victoria & Albert Museum, London. Using the catalogue numbers assigned by Täube, the following conclusions can be drawn: 27 panels can be identified from the Todd engraving published in 1823 (Fig. III.16); 4 panels are not illustrated (110, 111, 116 and 120); 1 panel, the Transfiguration, is a copy (105); 1 panel is created out of two left over panels (119, St Peter with a donor); and 2 panels are depictions of murder scenes, which were probably deemed unsuitable for the principal windows of the chapel (85, Massacre of the Sons of Ahazial by order of Queen Athalia; 99; and the Massacre of the Innocents).
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375 Ibid.
376 Ibid., illustration opposite p. 76.
377 The placing of the plates varies between editions. The page numbers given reflect the version in the National Art Library. Three of the copies at Ashridge Park have a number of plates missing.
378 Ibid. See Illustration opposite page 73.
379 See Appendix 1, entry for London, Victoria & Albert Museum, Cloister Glass from Mariawald Abbey (p.246).
380 Täube, 2007: II.
The installation of the Steinfeld cloister glass took place after 1824, and is documented in detail in the gazetteer entry for Steinfeld at the Victoria & Albert Museum.\textsuperscript{381} Importation occurred after the death of the Cologne stained-glass collector Casper Bemberg in 1824. At the "Brenbergisch" (Bemberg) auction documented by von Schlegel, the average price for each panel was between 16 and 20 Cologne thaler,\textsuperscript{382} which compares favourably with the price of 21 Reichsthaler paid by Düsseldorf in Cologne in 1828 for the Altenberg stained glass. The importation methodology was the same as for the Mariawald stained glass, and the restoration and installation work was executed by Hale Miller and completed in 1831. The remaining Steinfeld glass not required for the chapel was sold on by Hale Miller to constitute installations at Disley (Cheshire, 1835–37), Warham (Norfolk, c.1830–36), and Stisted (Suffolk, 1844).\textsuperscript{383}

\textbf{Conclusion}

The installation in Ashridge Park Chapel reflects an established pattern of acquisition and installation of stained glass. In 1995, Wolff-Wintrich defined three periods for the collection and sale of Rhenish stained glass.\textsuperscript{384} Her classification can now be extended and clarified.

\textbf{Period 1: 1750–1802.} Antiquarian. Until 1802, individual exports and imports were dependent upon personal contacts.

\textsuperscript{381} See Appendix I, entry for London (Kensington and Chelsea), Victoria & Albert Museum Cloister Glass from Steinfeld Abbey (Eifel), (p.249)
\textsuperscript{382} SLUB, MS. E.90, XIX, 2, No. 23.
\textsuperscript{383} See Appendix I, entry for Disley, Parish Church of St Mary (p.221).
Period 2: 1802–1824. Formation of primary collections and the first exports. The creation of the first stained-glass collections in Cologne and the first exports of glass have been seen to fall in the years 1802–1824. During this twenty-two-year period, all demounted stained glass had either been exported or found its way into a Cologne collection.

Period 3: 1807–1887. Redistribution. Collections were redistributed by the next generation as swiftly as they had been created, owing to financial difficulties or a lack of interest on the part of those who inherited the collections. Many collections came to auction. The Bemberg auction of 1807 marks the beginning of this period, which ended with the von Zwierlein auction of 1887.

Using this outline, an acquisition timeline for the Steinfeld/Mariawald stained glass can be established and the importance of the installation at Ashridge Park can be defined.

The Steinfeld and Mariawald cloister glass was part of the Casper and Peter Bemberg collections, and was probably acquired in by them in 1802. Peter Bemberg sold the panels that were in poor condition or of minor interest to him (donors from lower registers, etc.) to J.C. Hampp between 1802 and 1804. Hampp sold them mostly in Norfolk, but also through William Stevenson at Pall Mall. We know from the drawings in the collection at the RIBA that the Mariawald glass was acquired by Jeffry Wyatt between 1815 and 1816, with the agency of Seth William Stevenson and Christoph Friedrich Häussermann. It remains unclear from which collection they came, but they probably came from that of Peter Bemberg, who died in 1814. The glass may however have been
acquired at the Bemberg auction of 1807, stored, and then sold to Wyatville for the Ashridge Park Chapel windows.

Like the Schieffer/Hirn families and their business, the Bemberg’s also found themselves in financial trouble after the lifting of the Continental blockade. We know from Todd that there was no Steinfeld stained glass at Ashridge Park in 1823, and nothing is mentioned in the earlier 1812 edition. After the death of Casper Bemberg in 1824, the Steinfeld glass from the Bemberg was imported by Wyatt, Seth William Stevenson and Christoph Friedrich Häussermann. Most was installed at Ashridge Park by 1831; the remaining glass was sold on after this.

Case Study 2. The Trade of the Altenberg and St. Apern Stained Glass to Shrewsbury

Introduction

Earlier studies of the stained glass trade between the Rhineland and the United Kingdom have often been inconsistent and incomplete. Until a normalisation of trading conditions was established in the Rhineland after 1815, the history of stained glass during the period of secularisation and up to the 1820s has been (with exceptions) documented meticulously; we then have nothing from the following period. Schaden’s commentary on the Altenberg stained glass, which was stored at the church of St. Severin in Cologne, is symptomatic of this problem. Analysis of the trade in

---

385 “The story behind the sale of the stored glass from the St Bernard series and other glass that was sold to the Rev. W.G. Roland, a vicar of Shrewsbury"
the United Kingdom fares little better, with glass often only reappearing months or years after it was demounted, when it was acquired or installed. Using a previously un-researched primary source, the diary of Edward Spenser Curling, which sheds new light on the mechanisms of the stained glass trade in the late 1820s and fills the gap between the German and British narratives, the aims of this case study are firstly to document in detail the trade of the Altenberg and St Apern stained glass from Cologne to St Mary’s Shrewsbury, and secondly to provide a new perspective on the stained glass trade in general and to suggest directions for future research. The journey of the Altenberg and St Apern glass started on the 22 October 1828 from the Cologne atelier of the glass-painter, restorer and dealer Wilhelm Düssel. As Curling notes: “The whole of this splendid Ancient Glass bought by John Curling for £162 taken with us to England by steam ship.” The first independent report on the stained glass in England was however recorded only some four years later in 1832, by Edward John Carlos in the Gentleman’s Magazine in a letter to the editor regarding an exhibition in the Egyptian Hall, London. Here the St Bernard panels are documented in detail: they were for sale. 

Cathedral, in the 1840s and is today installed in the west and north windows of the cathedral, remains unresearched.” Schaden, 1995b: 114.


387 E.I.C., 1832.
The History of the Altenberg and St. Apern Stained Glass

1802–1828

The valuation of the Altenberg Abbey inventory (Fig. III.19) was taken by a Herr Langer from Düsseldorf on the 29 August 1803. It was noted that “Apart from the interesting stained glass there are no paintings worthy of attention”, and that “There are 11 windows with painted and vitrified glass showing Saints and Bible scenes of exceptional beauty, the best I have seen, well drawn and in relative good condition, a total of ninety-seven panels.” As many as 44 of the panels attributable to the Altenberg St Bernard group can be identified, dispersed among American and European collections: 18 are now in St Mary’s, Shrewsbury; as many as 19 are in the Schnütgen Museum in Cologne, 6 of which were previously in the Ludwig collection in Aachen; 2 are in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York; 3 are in Schloss Stolzenfels near Koblenz; and 2 have been returned to Altenberg (Fig. III.20).

In November 1803, after the inventory of the abbey had been completed, the artworks, furniture, contents of the library, and liturgical vestments were taken from the abbey to Düsseldorf and auctioned off. The remaining monks and the abbot Johannes Graff, were pensioned off, and left the abbey by the end of the same month. In June 1805, a Düsseldorf commission decided to

---

388 Redlich, 1901: 102-142.
389 Ibid.: 23.
390 Täube, 2007: II, 12. There is currently discussion regarding panel widths; some of the panels in St Mary’s, Shrewsbury, previously attributed to Altenberg may belong to the St. Bernard cycle from St Aern.
sell the abbey church and its ancillary buildings at public auction.\textsuperscript{392} This took place on 4 February 1806, and the buildings and all the abbey’s lands were sold by the government of King Maximilian Joseph of Bavaria to the Cologne businessman Johann Heinrich Pleunissen (1731–1810). In 1805, Pleunissen, a tobacco and wine dealer, was owed money for wine by the abbeys of Heisterbach and Seigburg; he offered to write off these abbey’s debts against the purchase price of Altenberg Abbey.\textsuperscript{393} Paragraph six of the contract of sale paradoxically states that “The Count and Dukes of Berg can remove the painted glass windows in the cloister and bring them to Düsseldorf, this should however take place, if at all, by the end of May so that the buyers building works will not be disrupted.” The removal of the stained glass was foreseen in the contract as taking place between April and the end of May 1806. It remains unclear whether this took place at this time. On the death of Pleunissen in 1810, the abbey, including the stained glass, was inherited by his daughter Maria Franziska Hirn. The stripped abbey buildings were used as saltpetre works until 1815, when a fire in the cloister buildings spread to, and destroyed the roof of the abbey church. Maria Franziska Hirn sold the abbey to the factory owner Burghart Lebrecht August von Bülow from Düsseldorf. Von Bülow died in 1819, and Altenberg was sold again in 1820, to the Freiherr Leopold von Fürstenberg, who used the site as a stone quarry (Fig. II.2).\textsuperscript{394}

\textsuperscript{392} Ibid.: 163.
\textsuperscript{393} Wolff-Wintrich, 1995: 345.
\textsuperscript{394} Zurstrassen, 2002: 164.
It was Heinrich Schieffer (1780–1847), son of Maria Franziska Hirn from her first marriage, who brought the Altenberg glass to Cologne. In 1802, Franziska’s second husband, the publisher and wool-dealer Johann Baptist Hirn had moved his cloth production as stated in chapter two into the dissolved Servitessen monastery in the city, and on his death in 1805 the business was taken over by his stepson Heinrich Schieffer. As seen in chapter II, Schieffer assembled one of the most important stained-glass collections in Cologne. It would appear that the glass was for him not only of monetary but also artistic value. His business failed after the ending of the Continental blockade in 1815. His cloth business was no longer competitive against English competition, and by 1822 the Hirn/Schieffer firm was only trading in wine. In 1823, the firm became bankrupt and as a result Schieffer’s stained-glass collection was auctioned in 1824.

The auction catalogue was distributed throughout Germany and was also available in London. The auction was held in the Zunfthaus, Filzengraben 12, in Cologne on 13 September 1824 (Fig. II.8), the glass having being exhibited at the same address since 3 June 1824. There were 247 panels of stained glass for sale, 64 of which were from Altenberg, and about 100 of which were large-scale works dated between 1400 and 1550.\(^{395}\) The catalogue had been written by Mathias Joseph de Noël, a pupil of Ferdinand Franz Wallraf, and as a result some of the Altenberg panels were acquired by de Noël; in 1852–53 they were donated to the city of Cologne, and today they belong to the collection of the Schnütgen

Museum. Other panels, as previously discussed, found their way to England to form some of the principal installations of the mid-1820s.

At the auction Werner Moritz von Haxthausen (1780–1842) bought a substantial quantity of stained glass: he acquired twenty-two panels, of which fifteen reputedly came from the St Bernard series of Altenberg. Eckert has documented four stating that von Haxthausen acquired lots 57, 61, 63, 64, 67, 84, 88, 93, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 111, 112, 113, 121 and 126. Von Haxthausen also acquired lots 49, 71 and 92, bringing the total number of panels in his stained-glass collection to thirty-five, the source of the other thirteen panels remains unclear.

The installation and storage of Haxthausen’s stained glass acquisitions at the Hirn/Schieffer auction in the church of St Severin in Cologne (Fig. III.21) was documented in Schaden’s history of the church.

Schaden notes that in 1822 the parish council of St Severin was in financial difficulties and had appealed to Vicar General Fonch in Aachen. Fonch appears to have contacted Werner von Haxthausen, who lived near the church of St Severin, at Beyengasse 27. Between 1822 and 1825, von Haxthausen appears to have supported financially and culturally the church. His

\[396\] Von Haxthausen had been installed as Regierungsrat (Government Minister) to Cologne in 1815, where had been commissioned to catalogue and save dispersed art objects. The project collapsed in 1822; Schaden, 2002: 397. It was at this time that he started his collection of stained glass. He retired in 1826, under political pressure, and spent the rest of his life administering his family estate and pursuing his antiquarian interests.

\[397\] Eckert, 1953: 81.

\[398\] Schaden, 1995a.

\[399\] Schaden, 1995b, 113-20.

\[400\] Ibid.: 114.
acquisitions at the Hirn/Schiefer auction were, in part, installed in the church or stored in the crypt (Fig. III.22). "The finest of the glass, an eight-figure group portraying the Crucifixion by the Master of St Severin was installed in the apse window of the high-choir."\textsuperscript{401} In 1879, this piece was moved to its present position in the west window of the south aisle.\textsuperscript{402} An English visitor to the church of St Severin in 1822, the Rev. Henry Barry, noted: "Behind the High Altar is a beautiful stained-glass window in shades of yellow." (Fig. III.23).\textsuperscript{403}

By 1828, the parish was again in financial difficulties, as it had lost von Haxthausen as a financial supporter. As a result, the church decided to raise funds by selling the remaining stained glass. On the 31 December 1828, the glazier and stained glass trader Wilhelm Düssel according to the Pfarrarchiv of St Severin acquired nineteen Altenberg panels stored at the church for 475 Reichsthaler.\textsuperscript{404} Düssel sold the glass on with seven additional panels (most of which were fragments of lower value) the same year to Edward Spenser Curling for 588 Reichthaler; this represented £162 in 1828, according to Twigger about £8,000 today\textsuperscript{405}. The contractual arrangements of this purchase reflect Curling’s business acumen that he demonstrated in all his entries in his diary, he always paid about two-thirds of the asking price. Curling bought the glass on the 21 October 1828, and paid a deposit of £100; Düssel paid what he owed to the church of St

\textsuperscript{401} Ibid.: 114.
\textsuperscript{402} Ibid.: 114.
\textsuperscript{403} Giesen, 1932: 218.
\textsuperscript{404} Schaden, 1995b: 120; Pfarrarchiv Köln St Severin, 702 G, H.
\textsuperscript{405} Ibid., Twigger, R.
Severin at the end of the year, but Curling only paid his outstanding balance in 1831, so Düessel had to wait three years for his 10% profit. A study of exchange rates and inflation in this period would be illuminating: did Düessel actually make any profit?

The history of the St Apern glass in this period is much shorter, and has been established by Täube, Bellot and Lymant.\textsuperscript{406} The cloister was probably finished about 1500. Seven windows there were glazed with fifty-four panels in a reduced version of the St Bernard cycle found at Altenberg Abbey. In 1802, the cloister was secularised. The stained glass from the church and cloister of St Apern, together with stained glass from the churches of St Clara, and St Cäcilie were offered for sale in the Welt- und Staatsbote No. 153 v.4. in November 1802.\textsuperscript{407} Between February and May 1803, through the intervention of Ferdinand Franz Walrath, 147 panels from the St Apern cloister were transferred to the Jesuit College;\textsuperscript{408} this included the seven windows from the St Apern cloister version of the St Bernard cycle. In 1823, the remaining glass that had survived the conditions of the Jesuit College, were transferred to Cologne Cathedral under the custodianship of Wilhelm Düessel. A protocol from 1823 recorded that eighteen panels remained of the one hundred and forty seven, and that eight required restoration. Today eight are in Cologne Cathedral; possibly two are in St Mary’s, Shrewsbury; and one is in St Leonard’s, Marston Bigot (Somerset).\textsuperscript{409}

\textsuperscript{408} Rode, 1959: 79–82.
\textsuperscript{409} See Appendix I, entry for Marston Bigot, Parish Church of St Leonard (p.258).
The Altenberg and St Apern stained glass found today in St Mary’s Shrewsbury, was bought from Wilhelm Düssel by Edward Spenser Curling for his brother John Curling, a Justice of the Peace at Hitchin, with a view to its being installed in the church of St Mary in Hitchin (Hertfordshire). The history of the sale was recorded in E.S. Curling’s recently discovered diary. Curling’s diary has been alluded to since 1860, and was last referenced in 1971. Its rediscovery by the author sheds new light on details of the stained-glass trade at the end of the 1820s and the network of the principal protagonists in Cologne. Curling’s diary documents the hitherto unknown link between the sale of the Altenberg stained glass to the United Kingdom and its eventual installation in St Mary’s Shrewsbury.

The Purchase of the Altenberg and St. Apern Stained Glass by John and Edward Spenser Curling

On 24 May 1817, Edward Spenser Curling (1771–1850), of Blackheath and Beach Street, Deal (Kent), became Hanoverian trade consul at Ramsgate, Deal and Dover; he was also Vice Consul for Bremen at Ramsgate, and “Knight of the Netherlands, Order of the Lion, and for many years Consul at Deal for that kingdom”. E.S. Curling was in partnership with his younger brother William in the firm Goodwin, Curling & Co., which traded between 1784 and 1836 and was involved in shipping, salvage and

411 Harthoorn, 1971.
413 Staats Calender der Freien Hanserstadt Bremen (1838): 99.
414 Anon., 1850.
Another brother, John Curling (1785–1863) was Justice of the Peace for Hitchin (Hertfordshire) and lived at Offley Holes Estate, located on Hitchin Hundred, which had been acquired by their father. It was for his John and the church of St Mary, Hitchin, that Edward acquired the Altenberg and St Apern glass.416

Although E.S. Curling’s first documented trade was dated 5 December 1827,417 it appears that he had some interest in stained glass at an earlier date, as it was recorded in the annual report of the Canterbury Philosophical and Literary Institution that in September 1827 “The Committee consider it a pleasing duty to call particular attention to the valuable donation by Edward Spenser Curling, esq., of Deal, of the window of rich, curious, and highly ornamental stained glass, in the Museum.” Curling was consequently elected an honorary member (Fig. III.24).418 It is not known if Curling was involved in the stained glass trade prior to 1827, as no diary prior to that date has been found, but is referred too in his diary of 1827 to 1837.

E.S. Curling noted in his diary that John Curling, together with Mr Emilius Henry Delmé Radcliffe (1774–1832) of Hitchin Priory and other gentlemen, had organised a subscription to acquire stained glass for St Mary’s church, Hitchin. From the mid-1820s, E.S. Curling was documenting his relationships in his diaries both for his official business activities and his secondary business, the buying and re-selling of stained glass from numerous European

415 The firm was apparently dissolved after the death of Medmer Goodwin in 1834.
417 On this day Curling records sending ‘1 box Stained Glass from Amsterdam’ to England from Rotterdam by Kundig and Blockhausen.
418 Thornton, 1899.
locations, including Cologne, Bruges, Amsterdam and Zurich. The rediscovery of Curling’s diary casts important new light on the pivotal nature, the influence, and opportunities of a trade consul in this period. European networks were open to him through his patent, and it is clear from his diary that he both took his responsibilities seriously, and took advantage of his privileged position.

On 26 September 1828, E.S. Curling presented a letter of introduction to Johann Jakob Peter Fuchs and Matthias Joseph de Noël the co-directors of the Wallrafianum in Cologne.\(^{419}\) Curling noted in his diary "in the afternoon they accompanied me to the Museum... the windows are really filled with Coloured Glass".\(^{420}\) The following day, Curling recorded a visit to the collection of Christian Geerling, from which he bought five works in stained glass to the value of 3820 Francs,\(^ {421}\) which ‘Franc’ is not defined, but probably French. Two of the panels acquired were probably Hirn lots numbers 48 and 49 (Bernard receives a visit from his sister Humbeline, and Abbot Stephen Harding appoints Bernard to found the abbey of Clairvaux; Fig. III.25). Although Curling provided no description of the glass, he noted the exact panel dimensions, and as these are the two missing panels from Shrewsbury not described by him one month later in his purchase of Haxthausen’s

---

\(^{419}\) In 1828, de Noël became the curator of Cologne’s first city museum, the Wallrafianum, at Trankgasse 7. He took over from curator Johann Jakob Peter Fuchs (1782–1857) the works of Ferdinand Franz Wallraf, whose collection had been donated to the city. De Noël’s own extensive collection became the basis for the Kunstgewerbemuseum in Cologne, and he was responsible for the art-historical section of the first guide to the city of Cologne, commissioned by the Mayor of Cologne Johann Adolph Joseph Steinberger (1777–1866) and published in 1828; see Westfehling, 1982.


\(^{421}\) Ibid., entry for 27 September 1828.
Altenberg stained glass from Düsseldorf. We can be fairly certain of their origin. Curling paid 570 Francs for each piece.

Curling left Cologne for Koblenz on 28 September 1828, but returned to the city on 20 October. On 21 October, he recorded his acquisition of the Altenberg and St Apern stained glass from Wilhelm Düssel through the agency of Canon Linden of the church of St Severin in Cologne. In the two pages after this entry he recorded a detailed breakdown of his purchases, listing Hirn catalogue number, format, size, a brief description (in French), condition (in English), and the price in Ecude Berlin (Fig. III.26).

On 22 October 1828, Curling left Cologne by steamship for Nijmegen. In the previous twenty-four hours, he had bought twenty-four panels of stained glass from Düssel, seventeen of which were from Altenberg. Sixteen can be traced directly to St Mary’s, Shrewsbury; one (Hirn lot 78: Bernard and Satan before the Holy Trinity) appears to have been lost, or possibly destroyed on account of its content. The panel was probably not an ideal subject for an English church bearing in mind the anti-Catholic sentiment prevailing at this period among the minor clergy and their parishioners. Curling defined this piece as "fine", and paid the average price from this transaction for this piece: 28 Ecude Berlin. Curling also acquired lots 111, 112, 113, 121 and 126 from the Hirn collection, and two other unidentified panels, the total price paid to Düssel being 588 Ecude Berlin. E.S. Curling paid a deposit of £100 of a total of £145 to Düssel for the glass via a "Mr. Stein".

---

422 Ibid., entry for 21 October 1828.
423 Curling was accurate in his descriptions. For Hirn cat. no. 99 ("Bernard heals a woman of gout"), he noted: "good, wants 2 corners"; in the Täube analysis the two upper corners are clear replacements (Täube, 2007: II, 115).
The sale of the Altenberg and St Apern stained glass to England was completed in 1831. On 17 September 1831, E.S. Curling left England from Deal with his brother John. He noted in his diary that the parishioners of St Mary’s Hitchin were the proposed purchasers (by subscription) of the Altenburg and St Apern glass. On 22 October 1831, John Curling paid the outstanding £45 for the stained glass to Düssel via his brother’s agents in Rotterdam, Kundig & Blockhausen. In his diary for Wednesday 22 October 1831 E.S. Curling succinctly described the end of an old story and the beginning of a new one: “The whole of this splendid Ancient Glass (200 square ft) bought by John Curling for £162, and taken with us to England by steam ship.”

The Initial Reaction to the Altenberg Stained Glass in England

In 1848 two years before his death in 1850, E.S. Curling edited his diaries. His account of the Altenberg/St Apern purchase was the subject of an addition, pasted into his diary. This addition, reproduced verbatim here, confirms the sale and the subsequent events:

“The splendid glass here described was, in 1827, the property of M. le Chanoine Linden of Cologne, and minutely examined then whilst in the crypt of one of the churches, and during the time of service, When and where the worthy Canon was officiating overhead. The following year in 1828, he had sold the

---

glass to Mr Dussel, a glazier near the Cathedral, of whom it was purchased by John Curling, of Offley Holes, near Hitchen, intended for the church there, for about £150 (in square feet about 240); was to have been taken at prime cost, and duty by subscription. ... Owing however, to influential Quakers of the place objecting to Popish subjects being introduced into a Christian church, the subscription ceased and the glass returned to London.”

Which Popish subjects particularly offended the Hitchin Quakers was not specified, but the now lost or destroyed Hirn cat. no.78 (St. Bernard and the Devil before the Holy Trinity) imported by Curling was certainly a candidate. The reason for the rejection of the glass by the citizens of Hitchin reflects the fervour of the No Popery Movement supported by lesser Anglican clergy and nonconformists at the time. The Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, one of the last acts of parliament before the Reform Act of 1832, was essentially enacted by a pro-Catholic commons despite anti-Catholic sentiment in the populace. This appears to have been reflected in the marked difference between the parochial sensibilities of a market town such as Hitchin and the chapters of British cathedrals and the aristocracy, the example of the Herkenrode glass at Lichfield Cathedral installed at the beginning of the century being a case in point.

In a memorandum in E.S. Curling’s diary, the buying price from Düssel is quoted as being £145, and the price paid by John

---

425 Last documented by Edward John Carlos 1832; E.I.C., 1832.
427 See Appendix I, entry for Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (p.239).
Curling, including transport and customs duties, was £162.\textsuperscript{428} It appears that before the rejected glass was sent to London for resale, John Curling may have offered the glass to his brother Edward for a church in Ramsgate. Curling’s diary entry noted that “it would have been bought for St. George’s (new) church at Ramsgate but the figures and subjects were too wide and large for the mullions of the east window to admit without cutting them” (Fig. III.27).\textsuperscript{429}

The Altenberg Stained Glass on Show at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly: and the Exhibition and Sale of Antiquities in London in the early 1830s

In the autumn of 1832, an editorial appeared in the Gentleman’s Magazine recommending an exhibition of 240 sq. feet of stained glass at the Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly, London.\textsuperscript{430} The Curling acquisitions formed part of this exhibition/auction. The nature of exhibitions at the Egyptian Hall had been defined in the magazine The Repository, where at “Bullock’s Egyptian Sale-rooms” as it was known, goods were “tastefully arranged for the display of every article in demand”, and that, “the works were to be sold by private sale, and, the sales conditions were defined as “to be exhibited for two months free of cost, after which a charge of ten-per-cent-per-annum would be made”.\textsuperscript{431} In the Gentleman’s Magazine editorial it was confirmed that the glass originated from

\textsuperscript{428} CL, ‘The Diary of Edward Spenser Curling Esq. 1827-1837’ entry for 21 October 1828.
\textsuperscript{429} Ibid. additional entry undated, probably from when Curling edited his diary in 1848.
\textsuperscript{430} Anon., 1832a.
\textsuperscript{431} The Repository, v.viii. 153.
Altenberg and contained chiefly “a series of the events in the life of St Bernard”. and that “it has been bought to England from the vaults of the Church of St Severin at Cologne”. The series of events surrounding John Curling and the parishioners of Hitchin was alluded to, and the exhibition was stated as being held “in the room with the Clarence Vase”.432

In chapter II the nature of the exhibition and the sale of art, particularly stained glass, in the opening years of the nineteenth century was analysed. By 1830, the expectations of the viewing and buying public had changed, as previously noted. A letter to the editor of the Gentleman’s Magazine regarding Curling’s exhibition at the Egyptian Hall received on 7 November 1832 reflects the new sensibility and expectations of such a show: the correspondent was critical of the exhibition, noting that it was “somewhat carelessly got up”,433 a factor that may have contributed to John Curling’s selling none of the glass. The correspondent also noted the condition of the glass, writing that “no pains having been apparently taken to clean it, or repair the very slight fractures that a period of three centuries has inflicted”.434 The identity of the correspondent, “a constant reader and lover of the art” is not known, but his or her familiarity with exhibition technique and the medium of stained glass is apparent, suggesting a significant increase in knowledge and the ability to evaluate critically that was missing from the responses of the previous generation. It has been suggested by Helga Giersiepen that the Altenberg and St Apern

432 Ibid.  
434 Ibid.
panels were perhaps restored together in Christian Geerling’s atelier in 1823, but this seems to be contradicted by the evidence of this eyewitness, who in 1832 apparently saw it in its original condition. A second letter to the *Gentleman’s Magazine* contradicted the observations of the first to some degree. Dated 14 December 1832, it bore the initials of the architectural critic Edward John Carlos (1798–1851).

Carlos was a regular contributor to the *Gentleman’s Magazine* on architectural topics and was best known for his contribution to the later phases of the “Englishness of Gothic” debate conducted between himself in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* and Francis Cohen in the *Quarterly Review*. Carlos was clearly impressed by the intrinsic artistic value of the glass he viewed, and concluded his letter with a patriotic call for its retention: “it is to be hoped, for the honour of the country, that the windows will not be allowed to return to the Continent, but that some appropriate place will be found in the Metropolis for the preservation of relics of ancient art so truly valuable as these specimens”. Carlos’s notes on the stained glass contained in his letter gave the first description in Britain of the glass that is today in St Mary’s, Shrewsbury, and confirmed that it originated from Altenberg and St Apern. He wrote: “There are in all twenty-five subjects, eighteen of which appear to relate to events in the life of the celebrated monk St Bernard. Under each subject is an inscription in the black letter of the sixteenth century, except two, which have inscriptions

436 E.I.C., 1832: 517–18.  
437 Bradley, 2002.  
438 E.I.C., 1832: 518.
in Roman capitals.” (These are Bernard Heals a Canon and Takes Him into the Order (Fig. III.28), and Bernard heals a Woman of Gout.)

Carlos continues: “These latter subjects do not appear to me to possess equal merit with the others, and the ornamental tracery is of a more modern character, I am inclined to attribute them to a period less remote ... beside those which relate to St Bernard, there is a crucifixion [Fig. III.29], and the circumcision of the Infant Jesus, with two other compartments, the subjects of which I cannot determine, all evidently by the same hand. The remaining subjects have formed the heads of lancet shaped windows, and two of them seem to have suffered very greatly. They represent the Ascension, and the Second Advent of our Saviour; and the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin; the first and last evidently were intended as companions.” Carlos then noted certain details: “An angel bearing away a redeemed soul in the form of an infant, and a demon lashing a body of the condemned are worthy of notice”.

Carlos finished by describing the heraldry of two panels: “I shall close this letter with a few heraldic memoranda, taken from the compartments relating to St Bernard. On one subject, representing a side chamber with a man lying on a bed in agony, an angel appears holding a shield, which bears a merchants mark resembling an arrow-head rising from two

---

440 “Diese Scheibe gehört offensichtlich zur dritten und spätesten Stilstufe der Altenberger Scheiben.” (‘This panel [Bernard Heals a Woman of Gout] clearly belongs to the third and last Altenberg stylistic period.’); Täube, 2007: II, 113.
441 Both the Crucifixion and the Circumcision are now in the first window of the south aisle at St Mary’s, Shrewsbury, CVMA sVII.
Whether this panel came from Altenberg or St Apern remains open to question, because of the difference in panel widths between it and the format of the other St Bernard panels. It is possible that some of the glass previously accredited to Altenberg came from St Apern. (Fig. III.31).

Carlos’s commentary on the stained glass is even more valuable when he comments on the glass not belonging to the Shrewsbury St Bernard group and whose present existence can no longer be confirmed. Carlos questioned the authenticity of some of the glass, and suggested that contrary to the first correspondent’s opinion, some restoration had already taken place. Carlos showed himself knowledgeable of the art-historical context of the glass, particularly relating to the now-missing stained glass from the Hirn catalogue (nos. 111, 112, 113, 121 and 126). Commenting on Hirn 112, the Virgin Mary, Carlos wrote: “... but the winged heads flying about, in the parish churchwardens taste, can only be attributed to some attempt at repair subsequent to the original construction of the windows”. Of Hirn no. 78, St. Bernard and Satan before the Holy Trinity, he wrote: “The arch-fiend is represented in a form I never recollect to have before witnessed.” That this latter panel belonging to the core group of the Altenberg St Bernard panels has subsequently disappeared can, as previously stated, probably be attributed to its content. Representations of the Trinity were hardly acceptable in England in the 1830s because of their strong Roman

---

444 Taube, 2007: II, 139–41 (Bernard’s Vision during Christmas Eve), from St Apern.
445 See also Appendix I, entry for London, Victoria & Albert Museum, Glass from the Ägidius-Kapelle (p.253).
446 E.I.C., 1832: 518.
Catholic connotations. Support comes from the fact the Trinity scene in St Mary’s Shrewsbury, the eventual home of the exhibited stained glass, was adapted. Carlos’s call for a metropolitan home for the glass went unheeded; John Curling sold none of the glass. It was exhibited again at Charing Cross (the dates of that exhibition are unknown); but nothing was sold there either.\(^{447}\)

E.J. Carlos had been an active member of the committee for the restoration of Crosby Hall.\(^{448}\) In 1832, he published a pamphlet entitled *Historical and Antiquarian Notices of Crosby Hall*, which was later reproduced in the *Gentleman’s Magazine*. It is all the more surprising, then, after the praise he had given to the Altenberg glass, that he ignored, or at least, did not support John Curling’s request for its inclusion in the oriel window of Crosby Hall. Curling wrote in 1834: "I am anxious to draw the attention of the Committee to the very beautiful and genuine collection of that material in my possession, containing, more or less, 240 square feet, which I brought from Germany at considerable expense ... It has received the highest praise from a considerable number of our first-rate antiquaries and artists."\(^{449}\) Curling’s appeal went unheeded, as "Mr. Willement, FSA, has very liberally offered to Present Painted Glass for the Oriel window of Crosby Hall; and is

\(^{447}\) CL, ‘The Diary of Edward Spenser Curling Esq. 1827-1837, entry for CL, ‘The Diary of Edward Spenser Curling Esq. 1827-1837’. Curling inserted an extra page signed E.S.C., Deal, 1848, The insert was placed between his entries for Heidelberg 11 August 1829, and Constance 17 August 1829.

\(^{448}\) Crosby Hall was built by Sir John Crosby, who obtained a lease of the ground in 1466. The hall was the only significant medieval building in the City of London to survive the Great Fire of 1666. In 1672, it was converted into a Presbyterian meetinghouse; later it was relegated to being used as a warehouse. The lease expired in 1831, and a subscription was raised to restore the hall to its original state. The first stone of the new works was laid on 27 June 1836, and the hall re-opened on 27 July 1842.

\(^{449}\) ‘Minor Correspondence’, *GM* (1834), vol.1, 234.
proposed to admit into each window six or eight shields of arms of
the Subscribers to the restoration; a species of decoration very
appropriate to the style of the 15th century.” (Fig. III.32) The
reason for the rejection of the Altenberg panels was threefold: the
format of the glass would not have fitted between the existing
mullions of the window; the clear religious content of the glass was
probably considered unsuitable for what was essentially a dining
hall; and the heraldry being supplied by Willement was certainly a
safer bet – the fact that Willement was providing the “fifteenth
century” stained glass for free was clearly also a consideration.
John Curling continued to try to sell the stained glass through the
advertisement pages of the Gentleman’s Magazine between 1835
and 1837, while it was stored in the warehouse of Messrs. Nichols,
the proprietors of the Gentleman’s Magazine.

Case Study 3. Betton & Evans and Three Reverend
Gentlemen: a Study in the Acquisition and Installation of
Stained Glass

In the first half of the nineteenth century, a group of clergy
from the diocese of Lichfield, together with the glass-painters
Betton & Evans of Shrewsbury, imported and installed Continental
stained glass in Lichfield Cathedral. This is discussed in chapter II
and detailed in the Appendix I. In 1802, the triumvirate of
Archdeacon Woodhouse, the Rev. Hugh Owen and the Rev. William
Gorsuch Rowland, the latter two both from Shrewsbury, organised

\[450\] Ibid.
\[451\] J.G.N., Letter: 'Ancient Stained Glass from Cologne (2nd S. x. 266) N&Q (17
November 1860): 395 and 266.
\[452\] See Appendix I, entry for Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (p.239).
the Herkenrode installation, with Rowland designing the installation scheme, and John Betton of Shrewsbury being contracted to repair and install the glass. Owen, Rowland and Betton (Evans after 1815) were responsible for numerous installations of stained glass in Shrewsbury, particularly the church of St Mary, mainly after 1825 (Fig. III.33).

In the period following the London exhibitions and subsequent storage of the Altenberg stained glass, E.S. Curling appears to have maintained an interest in the glass he had imported. He noted again in his diary “after remaining for several years in the packages it came in, the glass was sold only for what it cost to a dealer at Shrewsbury or Leicester... there is no question it would now be worth at least £1000.” Curling here appears to be alluding to the square foot rates achieved by William Stevenson for “perfect glass” thirty years earlier; Stevenson’s perfect glass is presumably that which he was selling following Yarrington’s restoration work. In all likelihood, Curling’s buyer for the Altenberg stained glass was the firm of Betton & Evans of Shrewsbury, a firm with an established reputation for the painting, installation and “restoration” of stained glass. Betton & Evans’s contract for work

---

454 Ibid.
455 In another part of the diary, Curling gives the dealer’s location as Lichfield. This entry belongs to Curling’s additions to his diary probably from 1848 inserted between his entries dated Heidelberg Tuesday 11 August 1829 and Constance Monday 17 August 1829.
456 See chapter II, p.81.
457 The best examples of Betton & Evans’s restoration work are glass at Winchester College (1821) and the east window of Ludlow Church (1850). See Le Couteur, 1922. On the Winchester work it was noted that the firm was “contracted to retouch the colours, and to restore the glass to its original condition ... So pleased were the authorities at the manner in which the work had been carried out that a few years later they decided to have the side windows restored by the same firm. In 1825 the four South windows were taken in hand, and in 1827-28 the four North windows underwent a similar process; in
at Winchester College Chapel between 1822 and 1828 was significant in the history of the installation of the Altenberg stained glass in Shrewsbury: through the agency of Betton & Evans, the Rev. Rowland had acquired the original figures of St John the Divine, St James the Less, and a prophet from the chapel at Winchester. Rowland initially installed these figures in the three north lights of St Mary’s choir after 1829. This glass was later demounted only to be replaced by the St Bernard glass. Rowland died before he could find another home for the Winchester stained glass in the church. These figures are now exhibited in the Victoria & Albert Museum (See Fig. I.9).

There has been much debate as to how much the Rev. Rowland, the Rector of Shrewsbury, paid for the stained glass now in St Mary’s, and how he obtained it. Jarman considered that the glass was bought by the Rev. Rowland from a London auction-mart in 1845 for £425. Writing in 1860, Leighton was of the opinion that “it was placed by the late Rev. W.G. Rowland, the incumbent, who purchased it at, as I have heard, the cost of about £700”. In 1886, Westlake stated that the Rev. Rowland had the glass installed, after acquiring it from London antiquaries. In 2007, it was reported in *Vidimus* that Rowland had seen the Cologne panels in a London dealer’s shop in 1824 (the year of the Hirn/Schiefer auction) when the asking price was £900; twenty years later, the

---

458 See Appendix I, entry for Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (p.264).
459 In the medieval galleries of the Victoria & Albert Museum (Fig. I.9).
461 Leighton, 1860.
panels still had not been sold, and Rowland bought them for £425.\(^{463}\)

A more comprehensive story can be told through analysis of the Curling diary. The Altenberg and St Apern glass was sold at cost for £162 to Betton & Evans. Taking the rates for restoring and installing ancient glass calculated by Eginton for the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield for the Herkenrode glass in 1803,\(^{464}\) a factor of at least four should be calculated between acquired cost and installed cost, giving a total of about £650. With profit, the £700 quoted by Leighton in 1860 would seem a reasonable price for the Rev. W.G. Rowland to have paid.\(^{465}\)

The interests of the Rev. Rowland and his predecessor, the Rev. Owen, concerning the collection and sale of stained glass have been documented in chapter II and above.\(^{466}\) In his History of Shrewsbury of 1825 Owen documented that Rowland made his first stained-glass installation in 1820, when he had presented heraldic stained glass by Betton & Evans for the west window of Shrewsbury Abbey; he also praised the firm’s work on their “exact facsimile” of the east window of Winchester College Chapel.\(^{467}\) The book also contains an illustration by John Buckler of the window in St Mary’s Shrewsbury that would hold the St Bernard glass, which at that date was empty (Fig. III.34).\(^{468}\) In 1826, Rowland became


\(^{464}\) LRO, D30/6/3/3.

\(^{465}\) A direct comparison between prices at the beginning of the nineteenth century and 1840 is legitimate. The price index in 1802, when Eginton calculated his prices, was 11.4; in 1840 it was 10.9. In 1998 the index was 592.3. See Twigger, 1999: 11–17.

\(^{466}\) See Appendix I, entry for Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (p.264).

\(^{467}\) Owen, 1825: II, 81–82.

\(^{468}\) Ibid., 316.
Rector of St Mary’s Shrewsbury, a post he retained until his death in 1851. It is significant that Rowland’s first installation of ‘original’ stained glass at Shrewsbury was English, reflecting the situation that high-quality Continental stained glass was a rarity in the mid-1820s, a situation that would only change with the evolving economic situation in Europe.

The exact date of the acquisition of the Altenberg stained glass and its installation in Shrewsbury is unknown. The last advertisement for the glass appeared in the Gentleman’s Magazine in 1837, and Poyntz has speculated on 1845.469 Curling’s diary runs from 1827 and 1837 and the disposal of the glass was noted. The final text of his diary is marked “Deal 1848”, two years prior to Curling’s death. In 1848 Curling edited his diary, sometimes with corrections in red, and, in the case of the Altenberg stained glass purchase with additional data pasted into the text. The Altenberg purchase was clearly a significant event in Curling’s long tenure as a Trade Consul and stained glass importer. In Pigeon’s Memorials of Shrewsbury of 1837 no Continental glass is referred to, only the Jesse window, glass by David Evans in the south transept, and the three figures from the 1390s formerly in Winchester College Chapel.470 In 1881, Archdeacon Lloyd recalled the period when Rowland was installing and arranging stained glass in St Mary’s: "when I first remember the church, in 1829, these three windows, vis, the east window of the chancel and the north and south windows of the transept were the only coloured windows in the

---

469 Poyntz, 1920: 75–79.
470 Pidgeon, 1837: 45–53; Appendix I, entry for Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (p.264).
building”. This confirms Pidgeon’s observation that “from that time during the next ten years he [W.G. Rowland] was continually adding to or exchanging the glass in the church”. From the available evidence it may be concluded that W.G. Rowland acquired and installed the Altenberg and St Apern glass around 1840 but maybe as late as 1845. Why Rowland replaced English medieval glass with Continental Renaissance glass requires some explanation. Rowland aimed to fill the windows of St Mary’s completely: the Winchester figures would not have achieved this aim alone, so they were replaced. Another factor that may have led to the replacement of these figures is if their condition at this period was poor, and Betton & Evans had not been able to optimise their restoration.

The first full description of the Altenberg and St Apern stained glass in St Mary’s was published in 1851, in the enlarged second edition of Pidgeon’s *Memorials of Shrewsbury*. He started his description with the window illustrated by Owen a quarter of a century before: “On the north side of the altar is a beautiful triple lancet window, with arches remarkably acute, and resting on isolated columns, whose capitals are adorned with elegant foliage, &c. The window is filled with fourteen subjects of stained glass, comprising a series of events, or miracles in the life of ST. BERNARD.” Pidgeon reiterates the fact that the glass “was brought from the vaults of the church of St Severin at Cologne”, and proceeds to describe the content and location of the stained

---

471 Lloyd, 1900: 61.
472 Pidgeon, 1851: 77.
glass, beginning at the top of the left-hand light (CVMA n1). All
descriptions are quoting Pidgeon from 1851.

Bernard Reaping.

Bernard healing a diseased woman, ... she appears resting on a
pallet borne by two men.
The benefit of Clergy extended to a Criminal, ... The figures of the
executioner and the bound malefactor are apparent...

In the centre light, at the top:

Bernard visiting his friend Guigo.- Prior of the Great Chartreuse.
The next subject represents the admission of Bernard’s Sister
Humbeline, as a nun, or the conversion of Aloide, duchess of
Lorraine, sister of the Emperor Lothaire.

Bernard on horseback, before whom a husbandman is kneeling.
The celebration of the mass, and the chastisement of an offender,
Bernard healing the blind, ... at the right, he is crossing a river in a
boat; on the opposite shore a crowd of persons expect his arrival.

Bernard Reading with five Monks in their stalls, in front of the
latter, angels are kneeling, as listening to the service. (See Fig.
III.35)

Right-hand light:
The Emperor in the act of obeisance to Bernard, ... He appears in
this subject as distributing books in the presence of the Pope, and
Emperor, a Cardinal, a Bishop and others.

Bernard afflicted with sickness, on the right he is returning thanks
for his recovery, when he went to Clairvaux, and reconciled some
contending parties. Bernard giving audience to an Abbot, attended
by Monks, at the side workmen re-building, or repairing a church.\textsuperscript{473}

On page 91 Pidgeon continues with the glass now in the south aisle (CVMA s VII).

The centre window is in part a continuation of acts in the life of St Bernard.

The monk from illness, is reclining on a couch, among his attendants is a minstrel, who is in the act of beating from him, and then recovered.

On one subject, representing a side chamber with a man lying on a bed in agony, an angel appears holding a shield, which bears a merchants mark resembling an arrow-head rising from two conjoining xx. (see Fig. III.30).\textsuperscript{474}

St Peter and a family at prayer. (see Fig. III.36; St Apern glass.)

The circumcision of Jesus, Beside those which relate to St Bernard, there is a crucifixion, and the circumcision of the Infant Jesus,\textsuperscript{475}

The excommunication of flies. The Abbey of Foigui being exceedingly haunted by swarms of flies ... This panel is now in the window on the north side of the choir; (see Fig. III.36).

Bernard and a Monk in a snow storm.

Bernard preaching from a pulpit before the Pope and Bishops, probably in favour of the second crusade, the clergy standing on either side, and the laity in front.

\textsuperscript{473} Ibid., 78–79.
\textsuperscript{474} E.I.C., 1832: 517–18.
\textsuperscript{475} Ibid.
A Sovereign and his Queen seated on a throne absorbed in grief. Bernard’s Vision During Christmas Eve is from St Apern; (see Fig. III.31). The Crucifixion,476 (see Fig. III.29).

The following panels are missing from Pidgeon’s description: “Bernard Advised by Abbot Stephen Harding” and “Bernard as Mediator and Advisor”. Pidgeon concluded his description by commenting on who was responsible for the restoration and installation of the stained glass: “the restoration of the old and the execution of the latter work are fine specimens of Mr. Evans’s skill in this art”.477 The work of Archdeacon Lloyd in the mid-1860s probably explains the difference in the location or the omission of some of the Altenberg glass recorded by Pidgeon in 1851. Between 1864 and 1866, Lloyd oversaw a significant renovation of St Mary’s and observed in 1881: “... I found the south windows much shorter than those in the north aisle, and the change of aspect was impractical without sacrificing some of the glass.”478 A similar process of rearrangement has also been observed by Ivo Rauch relating to the Trier glass in St Mary’s,479 which was also described by Pidgeon.

Conclusion

This chapter has documented the process of acquisition, collection and redistribution of Rhenish stained glass, focusing on Cologne after 1815. That the more highly valued glass remained in Cologne collections, usually until the 1820s, reflects the cultural

476 Ibid.
477 Pidgeon, 1851: 90.
478 Lloyd, 1881: 73.
479 Rauch, 1999: 10.
engagement of the city’s cultural elite in the period of secularisation. The change of economic conditions after the lifting of the Continental blockade in 1815, and the decreasing interest in the collections established by an older Cologne generation resulted in a significant transfer of stained glass from the city’s collections to those in the United Kingdom. This transfer of cultural goods confirms the hypothesis by Seyfarth\textsuperscript{480} that art works often transfer from areas of instability to more stable environments, in this case a more stable economic environment.

The case study of the acquisition of the Altenberg and St Apern stained glass represents an exception to the conventions of the stained glass trade in the period between 1815 and 1835. The discovery of Curling’s diary however gives us an insight into the trade of the period, linking many of the principal protagonists in Cologne on personal and business levels. The conditions prevailing in England regarding acceptance and rejection of stained glass and the exhibition and sales methodology of the period have been noted. The stained-glass trade at this time was principally organised through a long-established network of traders and architects providing “goods” for their clients. E.S. Curling appears to have been an individual trader with an interest in stained glass, as reflected in his gift in 1829 of two stained-glass windows to the Free Library of Canterbury. If Curling imported stained glass prior to 1827 is unclear; he was a trade consul from 1815 till 1835, but the diary of his activities unfortunately only covers the period between 1827 and 1837.

\textsuperscript{480} Seyfarth, 1995: 33.
III.1. Detail of the Diary of Edward Spencer Curling (1829).

III.2. St Apern Cloister stained glass. Cologne Cathedral.
III.3. Christian Geerling (1797-1848), (Kölnisches Stadtmuseum, G 7253a).
III.5. SS Peter & Paul, Stained glass with additions by C. Geerling. London (Kensington and Chelsea), Victoria & Albert Museum.

III.6. Stained glass from Altenberg; ‘Bernard Heals a Woman Ailing for Eight Years in Metz’. Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire). CVMA. nI.3c.

III.9. Rhenish Stained Glass; Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg.

III.12. Jeffry Wyatville plan for Chapel Window, Ashridge. (1815, RIBA/LDAC Box No. SB13,122)


The drawing is not correct as to the shape of the figure, but nearly depicts the general effect of the environment, in which is a part of the frame.
III.16. Mariawald stained glass installed in Ashridge Park chapel installed by 1830, (Todd). The numbers are from the catalogue by Täube. The only significant panels missing are Täube’s No.85 “Massacre of the Sons of Ahazial”, and No.99 “Massacre of the Innocents”. All the stained glass panels are now in London, Victoria and Albert Museum.
III.17. The South Front of Ashridge Park (Todd, 1824: edited by the author).
III.20. Stained glass from Altenberg, 'Bernard on His Deathbed at Clairvaux', Sacristy, Altenberg Abbey Church, Germany.
III.21. Interior, Church of St Severin Cologne.
III.22. Section of the Crypt, Church of St Severin Cologne.

III.23. Stained Glass; West window of the south aisle, Church of St Severin Cologne.
III.25. Stained Glass Altenberg, ‘Bernard Receives a Visit From His Sister Humbeline’ (Lower panel), Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire). CVMA. n1.5b (and 6b).
III.26. The Sales List of the Altenberg and St Apern Stained Glass. The Diary of Edward Spencer Curling (1829).
III.27. East windows of St George’s the Martyr church Ramsgate, (Kent).

III.29. Crucifixion Stained Glass, Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire). CVMA. S7.1c.
III.31. Stained glass from St Apern, Cologne, ‘Bernard’s Vision During the Christmas Eve’, Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire). CVMA. s7.2c.

III.33. St Mary’s Shrewsbury, perspective 1810.
III.34. The Triple Lancet Window in St Mary’s Shrewsbury without stained glass (Buckler, J. c.1825).
III.36. Stained glass from St Apern, Cologne, ‘St. Peter with Eight Donors’, Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire). CVMA. s7.2a.
III.37. Stained glass from Altenberg, 'Bernard Rids Foigny From a Plague of Flies', Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire). CVMA. s7.3c.
The European Trade in Stained glass, with special Reference to the Trade between the Rhineland and the United Kingdom, 1794-1835

Conclusion

This study has offered a critical reassessment of the significant developments in the stained glass trade during the opening decades of the nineteenth century. Through this investigation a pattern of a previously unknown, or partly known, network of salesmen, collectors and dealers has been established. The importance of figures such as Wilhelm Laurenz Düssel, Canon Linden of the church of St Severin, and Christian Geerling in Cologne and in the United Kingdom, Edward Spenser Curling and the extended network established around the Society of United Friars, with their lodges in Norwich and London has emerged. The discovery of new information regarding the stained glass trade shows the complex nature of the evolution of the trade in the period, and the close connections to the evolution of taste and an appreciation of the Gothic style and medieval and Renaissance antiquities in the Late Georgian period.

One starting point of this study was the thesis by Brigitte Wolff-Wintrich from 1995 that there had been three distinct periods of acquisition and distribution of Rhenish Stained glass. This study confirms and extends her proposal. Wolff-Wintrich’s first period was from 1750–1802, that was defined by the antiquarian collector. Her second from 1802–1824 by the formation of primary collections in the Rhineland and the first exports of stained glass, and the third, a period of redistribution
starting in 1807. This study expands the knowledge of all three periods. This study shows that in the second period the stained glass that was more highly valued by local collectors remained mostly in Cologne collections, and probably only the secondary works, or those in poorer condition were exported. However, the author’s principal contribution is to the understanding of the third period of redistribution, particularly in the 1820’s, the peak period of stained glass exports from the Rhineland to the United Kingdom. In this period, many significant Rhenish stained glass collections, now principally in the United Kingdom and the United States were exported, some have ended up in parish churches such as Hingham in Norfolk others now form the centrepieces of museum collections such as the Metropolitan Museum in New York, and the Victoria & Albert Museum in London.

The study has also emphasised that as with other branches of the antiquities trade in this period, the role of the dealer grew in importance in step with his increasing expertise. The dealer became an arbiter of taste and more significantly, he defined the price of the glass on the basis of quality of glass painting, its condition and its relationship to a homogenous group of panels. This study examines the previously undocumented activities of William Stevenson, who in the early years of the century, was the defining person in analysing the market not only for his own ends, but also with implications for the wider value placed on imported stained glass, as in the case of the Herkenrode glass at Lichfield.

The study also shows that Stevenson was a pioneer in the development of methods of exhibition of stained glass suitable for the Late Regency period, the period under study. New methods of display were developing, and in the opening decade of the nineteenth century,
Stevenson had already regularly introduced back-lighting in his exhibitions, possibly using gas lighting, a method only to be improved upon by Pugin at the Great Exhibition of 1851.

To date, most studies of imported stained glass have focussed on the iconography and history of the glass alone, seeking to reconstruct dispersed historic schemes. They have tended to ignore the method of its acquisition and installation. This study highlights the importance of the functions and activities of the Regency contractor-architect, particularly William Wilkins and Jeffry Wyatt, who were responsible for the integration of the majority of Rhenish stained glass in their clients’ projects in the 1820’s. The architect of the period not only supplied designs, he also defined and employed contractors (often his own) and acquired fittings for his clients’ projects, including much of the Rhenish stained glass, which forms the focus of this study. Wilkins and Wyatt can be directly connected to the Rhenish stained glass from Mariawald and Steinfeld now in the Victoria & Albert Museum in London, and glass in Corpus Christi Chapel and King’s College Chapel in Cambridge, in Dalmeny House, Edinburgh and indirectly to that in St Stephen’s church, Norwich.

The study reinforces and details the degree to which the supply of imported stained glass was dependent on a network of like-minded individuals. The author has uncovered a significant network based around the Society of United Friars with their lodges in Norwich and London. The Stevenson’s were members, as were the Wilkins, father and son also, and their friends embraced the gamut of architects, landscape designers, critics and intellectuals. Over two generations this network, starting with those imports by Hampp and Stevenson, played a significant role in the import, sale and installation of Continental stained glass, principally French.
at the beginning of the period, and tending towards German imports after 1815.

A major contribution to the knowledge of the stained glass trade of the period has been the author’s re-discovery of the diary of Edward Spenser Curling (1827-1836). Through the eyes of Curling the very nature of the stained glass trade in Cologne in the late 1820’s is documented, and the relationships between the principal characters involved is vividly portrayed. Curling documented the existing network of interests and relationships prevailing in Cologne, providing a coherent account of the human network on which to hang what was previously little more than loosely related data. Curling’s diary is a unique document that confirms that it was he who was responsible for the importation of the Altenberg and St Apern stained glass, today in St Mary’s, Shrewsbury, together with many other panels, some of which the author has identified. Stained glass was an interest of Curling, but it was also for him a commercial enterprise; he always paid about two-thirds of the asking price. Curling’s diary also gives the researcher insight into the practical aspects of buying, exporting and selling stained glass, its framing, packing, transport by steam-ship and the problems of sale on the London market.

There is however one speculative thought that has plagued the author since his discovery of Curling’s diary: the diary is dated between 1827-1836. Curling became the Trade Consul for Deal in 1817. Where is his diary from 1817-1826, if it still exists? If Curling had conducted business in the first decade of his tenure as Trade Consul, as he did in his second, the detailed history of the importation of major Rhenish stained glass collections, such as those from Mariawald and Steinfeld may require further revision.
Finally a speculation, and a subject for further research: The possibility of a business relationship between two gentlemen of similar character, and contacts, Jeffry Wyatt (1766-1840) and Edward Spenser Curling (1771-1850). The former was planning an installation of Rhenish stained glass from Mariawald in Ashridge Park Chapel between 1815-1816; the latter became a Trade Consul in 1817. That the import of the Altenberg stained glass took Curling three years, (between 1828-1831) and the Ashridge Park Chapel installation was only recorded in 1823, means that there could have been time for Curling to act as Jeffry Wyatt’s agent.

That a business relationship existed between Wyatt and Curling remains in detail unclear and requires further research. The author has evidence that such a constellation existed between Wyatt, Curling and other previously documented protagonists in the trade in the period after 1815. A new area of research is a detailed analysis of the stained glass trade between 1815-1820.
APPENDIX I

A selected study of Relevant Installations of Continental Stained glass in the United Kingdom, 1800-1845

Unless otherwise specified, all locations are in England.
Blickling and Erpingham (Norfolk)

Introduction to the buildings:

Blickling Hall, the church of St Andrew (Blickling), and the church of St Mary (Erpingham) all house or have housed imported stained glass. The stained glass, principally of Steinfeld provenance, has been repeatedly moved, repaired and copied.

The Stained Glass:

A timeline best illustrates this history.

1804. First acquisition of five Steinfeld panels through Hampp and Stevenson; installation at Blickling Hall or Blickling Church.

1823–25. John Adey Repton (1775–1860) is involved in renovation work at Blickling Church.\textsuperscript{481}

1829. Chambers noted that the window over the communion table is about to be filled with stained glass.\textsuperscript{482}

1841 and later: When the 8th Marquess of Lothian inherited Blickling in 1841, he arranged that William Butterfield (1814–1900) design a grand east window in Blickling Church as a memorial to Lady Suffield, the previous life tenant of Blickling,\textsuperscript{483} a handsome five-light window of Rayonnant design was filled with glass by John Hardman executed in 1854–55 and installed in 1856.\textsuperscript{484} The old stained glass formally in the east window was installed in Lady Lothian’s sitting room at Blickling Hall in 1860; this glass is now to be seen in the east window of Erpingham Church.\textsuperscript{485}

\textsuperscript{481} Maddison, 1991: 82.
\textsuperscript{482} Chambers, 1829: 183.
\textsuperscript{483} The Marquess records a meeting with Butterfield at Blickling in his diary for 15 November 1851.
\textsuperscript{484} Chambers, 1829: 83.
\textsuperscript{485} NRO, MC3/159 466X7.
1955. Pevsner writes on Erpingham Church: “Many good painted panels of the 15-16 C. fill the east window; they come from Blickling Hall.”

1995. The Steinfeld glass returns to Blickling, and copies are installed in Erpingham church.\(^{486}\)

c.1970. The stained glass was restored in Norwich.

**Import History:**

Glass was imported at two periods. Five Steinfeld panels were imported by J.C. Hampp, probably in 1803; these are listed in the Pall Mall Catalogue of 1804 and by Täube.\(^{487}\) The remaining glass was probably acquired through John Repton, possibly from the remains of the Ashridge Park collection. See further Case Study 1 in chapter III (p. 128), and the gazetteer entry for Disley, St Mary’s (p. 221).

\(^{486}\) Pevsner, 1962: 126.
Burton Constable Hall (East Riding of Yorkshire)

Introduction to the building:

Burton Constable is an Elizabethan country house 14km northeast of Hull, in the former East Riding of Yorkshire. The property was inherited by Sir Thomas Hugh Clifford (1762–1823) in 1821; and the stained glass acquired by him was installed by one of his descendants in the two lower registers of the bay window of the long gallery. The date of installation is unknown, but probably fell in the period 1833-54, when the long gallery was restored. The glass was first illustrated in its present location in 1845, in a picture that still is presented in the house.

The Stained Glass:

Twelve panels of stained glass of Flemish and German provenance. Eleven of the panels have white-glass additions to the sides and have been cut vertically (Fig. App. I.2). This format may reflect the manner in which they were installed in their previous location, the Catholic chapel of Tixall Hall (Staffordshire), where the panels were housed prior to 1815 (Fig. App. I.1). After Burton Constable had been inherited by Sir Thomas Aston Clifford-Constable (1806-1870) in 1823, and Sir Thomas had succeeded to the baronetcy in 1829, the Catholic memorabilia, including the stained glass, appear to have been removed from the chapel to Burton Constable. In a letter to her sister in 1822 regarding the renting of Tixhall Hall, Sir Thomas’s daughter had however noted: “Papa would

only let it to a Catholic on account of the Chapel being in the house
as a protestant would object to it.”

Import History:

The first reference to the glass comes from the account book of J.C. Hampp: “1803 feb’ 28: Annunciatio, Mr Clifford, £21.” In 1807, William Stevenson noted that “Mr. Clifford has filled the windows of his chapel at Tixhall, with whole length figures, &c. coeval with the building”. Whether it was Hampp or Stevenson who supplied Clifford with the stained glass is unclear, but this glass certainly belongs to the earliest group of importations after 1802.

---

489 ERYALSS, DDCC/144/31.
491 Stevenson, 1807.
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Chapel (Cambridgeshire)

Introduction to the building:

The chapel was designed, built and furnished by the architect William Wilkins (1778-1839) between 1824 and 1827. The chapel was extended by two bays to the east in 1870, to the design of Arthur Blomfield (1829-99), and stained glass designed and executed by Heaton, Butler & Bayne was installed in the new east window in 1881. The Master of Corpus Christi, the Rev. John Lamb, recorded in 1831 that stained glass had been installed in the 1820s by the Yarrington workshop of Norwich, the work being supervised and the glass repainted as required by James George Zobel. Stained glass appears to have been installed in at least three periods.

The Stained Glass:

The extent of the first installation of Rhenish glass in the chapel of 1827 cannot be identified with certainty, but Lamb’s description is probably accurate. In an undated print of the interior of the chapel only the east window has stained glass (Fig. App.I.3). Parallels to the Ashridge chapel installation are apparent, a programme of installation depending on availability. Lamb noted that the “Ecce Homo” in “third north window” (CVMA. n III), and the Death of the Virgin in the “third south window” had been given by the architect William Wilkins, and that the tracery lights above and the half figures below the “Ecce Homo” were given by the Rev. T. Shelford. Both these windows carry the arms of Wilkins, confirming

---

493 Pevsner, 1970: 64.
494 Haward, 1884: 222-226.
495 Lamb, J. 1831.
496 Ibid.
his donation. (Fig. App.I.4). The exact date of this second installation is not recorded, but can be assigned to the period 1827–31, thanks to Lamb’s description. The first and primary installation in the east window, again according to Lamb, was made in 1831, and included the Adoration of the shepherds and the three Marys that are now located in CVMA n IV and s IV.\textsuperscript{497} Wilkins appears to have made further gifts or legacies of stained glass to the college; these were installed in King’s College Chapel, Cambridge, in the twentieth century.

\textit{Import History:}

Passavant’s description of 1833,\textsuperscript{498} repeated in 1836,\textsuperscript{499} credits “a Dutch merchant of the name of Hampp” as the supplier; as Hampp had died in 1825, this seems improbable. A slightly different version of events was noted in 1837, when it was stated that “the great window over the altar is glazed with some ancient stained glass of brilliant colours, which was purchased by the College, at great expense, of the late Mr. Hampp”.\textsuperscript{500} This statement provides evidence of Hampp’s great reputation in the commercial field. The period of installation matches well those of other installations of Rhenish stained glass made by William Wilkins and Sir Jeffry Wyattville (1766-1840), and there are parallels to the glass in Hingham Church (Norfolk), both in style and installation date. There remains the possibility that Hampp imported the stained glass at an earlier date and stored it, and that it was only sold on after his death. The more likely scenario, as with earlier imports, is that the agents were the

\textsuperscript{497} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{498} Passavant, 1833: 202.
\textsuperscript{499} Passavant, 1836, II: 55-56.
\textsuperscript{500} \textit{Cambridge Guide}, 1837: 93–94.
Stevenson’s (father and son), acting with Christoph Friedrich Häussermann (1772-1842) on contract from the architect, William Wilkins.
Cambridge, Kings College Chapel (Cambridgeshire)

Introduction to the building:

The complex architectural history of the Kings College Chapel is summarised in The Commission on Historical Monuments (England). The Discussion here will focus on the installation of Rhenish stained glass in the side chapels in the early 1920s. The general location of these chapels being well illustrated in David Loggan’s engraving of 1690 (Fig. App.I.5).

The Stained Glass:

The glass falls into two groups: the Holy Hunt, and the two donor panels with Sts Christopher and Martin, all originating from the abbey church of Mariawald. The Holy Hunt was originally installed in William Wilkins’s house Lensfield, in Lensfield Road, Cambridge (Fig. III.13). Lensfield was remodelled by Wilkins after his marriage in 1811, and the Greek Doric portico-in-antis was dated to c.1815 by Colvin. The house was demolished in 1955. After Wilkins’s death in 1839, the Holy Hunt became the property of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where Wilkins had been both architect and donor. Wayment quotes Eric Milner-White (1884-1963), Dean of King’s College, as saying that Mrs Laurence Humphry, daughter of a Master of Pembroke, purchased the Holy Hunt from Corpus Christi in 1920, and gave it to King’s College in memory of her husband. Wolff-Wintrich has written a comprehensive analysis of this window in its present location (Fig. App. I.6), (CVMA. Chapel J. 37a-d).

The two donor panels with Sts Christopher and Martin were first recorded in

---

the early 1920s as being installed in the staircase of the Master’s Lodge of St Catherine’s College, Cambridge. Wayment quotes Dean Milner-White from the summer of 1921.\textsuperscript{505} “A workman in shirtsleeves came over to my rooms from the neighbour College of St Catherine’s. He and his fellows were working at the important conversion of the old Master’s Lodge into sets of rooms. He asked me to come across and look at two panels of glass upon the staircase which ‘seems to me good stuff, but my mates will have their poles through it tomorrow’.\textsuperscript{506} This glass was installed in King’s College Chapel in 1921. Milner-White apparently thought the glass was “like the \textit{Holy Hunt} forming part of the collection that Wilkins made for his new Corpus Christi Chapel”,\textsuperscript{507} see also the biography of Wilkins by Liscombe.\textsuperscript{508}

\textit{Import History:}

Both installations of stained glass in King’s College Chapel were acquired in the 1920s and came originally from the private collection of William Wilkins, which was redistributed after his death. For the origins of this glass, see further the entries for Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Chapel (p.185); Edinburgh, Dalmeny House (p.196); and particularly Norwich, Parish Church of St Stephen (p.226).

\textsuperscript{505} Ibid., 261–64.
\textsuperscript{506} Ibid. Wayment.
\textsuperscript{507} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{508} Liscombe, 1980: 127.
Cholmondeley Castle, Chapel of St Nicholas (Cheshire)

Introduction to the building:

Cholmondeley Castle Chapel was a thirteenth-century foundation; it was repaired in 1652, encased by Vanbrugh in 1716, and acquired its present form in 1829, when the transepts were added. The stained glass was removed from the chapel after it was damaged during the Second World War in 1941.

The Stained Glass:

The glass at Cholmondeley Castle comes principally from the charterhouse of St Barbara in Cologne. This foundation was one of the first to be secularized during the French occupation and was converted to be used for storage in 1794. The buildings had various uses subsequently, including as a Protestant church. The charterhouse was bombed on 19 August 1945, and only the church was reconstructed after the war. The exact date at which the stained glass was installed is unknown, but the best description of it, including the St Barbara panels, is by Hebgin-Barnes. Wayment described seven panels from a “St. Barbara Cycle” from the charterhouse at Cologne in the east window of Cholmondeley Castle Chapel; five of the panels are still there, and two were acquired by King & Son in 1941 after being damaged during the war. The latter were subsequently purchased at auction by King’s College, Cambridge, in 1970, and installed in the chapel there. Additional stained glass of similar provenance can found in the transepts and
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509 Dunn, 1978.
510 Hebgin-Barnes, 2010: 70–89.
the Cholmondeley Chapel in Malpas Church (Cheshire),\textsuperscript{512} donated by
the 2nd Marquess of Cholmondeley in 1840, and the 5th Marquess in
1856 (Fig. App. I.7).\textsuperscript{513}

Import History:

This stained glass was sold by William Stevenson from his
emporium at 97 Pall Mall, London. He noted in 1807: “The Gothic
Windows of Cholmondeley Castle are enriched with passages from St.
Barbara’s Life.”\textsuperscript{514} Import from Cologne was almost certainly effected
by J.C. Hampp in 1803, through the agency of Peter Bemberg.

\textsuperscript{512} Hebgin-Barnes, 2010: 149–60.
\textsuperscript{513} Ibid., 150.
\textsuperscript{514} Stevenson, 1807.
Costessey Hall, Chapel (Norfolk)

Introduction to the building:

The chapel was completed in 1809, prior to the death of Sir William Jerningham, 6th Baronet (b.1736) that year, and was consecrated in time for his funeral service. The chapel was designed by Jerningham’s son Edward (1774–1822), to answer the Roman Catholic needs of the family and locals of the same confession. The chapel was demolished some time after 1918.\footnote{Pevsner, Norfolk 2: North-West and South, 1999: 271.}

The Stained Glass:

The stained glass was probably installed in the twenty-two windows after the death of Sir William,\footnote{Raguin, 1990: 311.} and some of it may have been redistributed in 1885.\footnote{Spelman, 1885.} One of the spiritual guides for the planning of the chapel and the stained-glass installation was probably the Rt Rev. John Milner (1752–1826), Roman Catholic architectural polemicist, builder of a new Catholic church in Winchester (1792) in the Strawberry Hill Gothic style, and a friend of the Jerninghams. The chapel conformed to his design principles.\footnote{Milner, 1808: 252–65.} Costessey Hall was dismantled in 1918, and the site is now a golf course (Fig. App. I.8). All the stained glass was sold to Grosvenor Thomas, who sold it on (Fig. App. I.9). The first description of the stained glass, dated 1819, describes the “noble windows filled with very fine old stained glass, collected from various monasteries on the Continent”.\footnote{Cromwell, 1819: 45.} According to Shepard, the stained glass had been “purposefully arranged, with
particular emphasis on sacramental themes”.\textsuperscript{520} This is in stark contrast to the next great chapel installation, at Ashridge Park (started in 1815 and finished in 1831), where the decorative effect of the imported glass was paramount.\textsuperscript{521} That Joseph Hale Miller (1777-1842) was the stained-glass artist commissioned for both projects is significant. Firstly, he was himself a Roman Catholic, which would have informed his understanding of the requirements at Costessey. Secondly, his connections to stained-glass traders were excellent: Kerney has documented that Miller restored the Stevenson glass at the churches of Tottenham, London and Strelley, Nottinghamshire and at Abbots Bromley, for the Baggot’s. He installed roundels at Longleat when Sir Jeffry Wyattville was renovating the house.\textsuperscript{522} Eighty-four subjects from French and Rhineland locations were installed, including six stained-glass panels from the abbey church of Mariawald. The collection was disbanded in 1918, when seventy-six panels were sold.\textsuperscript{523} Today the glass is found in a number of American collections, the Burrell Collection (Glasgow), and Exeter Cathedral (three panels). Research into the sale activities of Grosvenor Thomas in the early twentieth century in the United Kingdom and the United States of America falls outside the remit of this study.

\textit{Import History:}

The standard account is that of 1815 by D.J. Powell, who made William Stevenson responsible for the import and supply of the

\textsuperscript{520} Shepard, 1995: 186.  
\textsuperscript{522} Kerney, 2009.  
\textsuperscript{523} Drake, 1920.
stained glass.\textsuperscript{524} The exact date of the importation is not known, but for glass of similar installation date (the first decade of the nineteenth century), and Mariawald glass acquired at the same time by William Wilkins for Dalmeny House and his personal use, see also the gazetteer entries for Cambridge, King’s College Chapel; (p.214); Edinburgh, Dalmeny House (p.224); and Norwich, parish church of St Stephen (p.261). The traders appear to have been William Stevenson assisted by J.C. Hampp, with the source most likely having been the Bemberg collection from Cologne, which was auctioned in 1807.

\textsuperscript{524} BL, Additional MS. 17462, 331–32.
Disley, Parish Church of St Mary (Cheshire)

Introduction to the building:

According to the last two editions of the church guide,\textsuperscript{525} a chapel was built on land belonging to Sir Piers Legh of Lyme in 1524. This was rebuilt in 1828, 1837 and 1891, to create the present parish church. The early sixteenth-century roof has been retained, and the nave pillars and the sixteenth-century arches are original. The Continental stained glass was probably installed in 1837 and rearranged in 1891.\textsuperscript{526}

The Stained Glass:

Ten panels originating from the cloister of Steinfeld Abbey (Eifel, Germany) installed in the east window of the chancel, these were listed by Täube as follows.

Cat. no. 137, window VII (1b) St Bartholomew with Premonstratensian monks.\textsuperscript{527}
Cat. no. 143, window XIII (1a) St Augustine with donor.\textsuperscript{528}
Cat. no. 144, window XIV (2b) Christ before the high priest Annas (trimmed).\textsuperscript{529}
Cat. no. 145, window XI (2b) Christ before Pilate (trimmed; Steinfeld?).\textsuperscript{530}
Cat. no. 146, window XVI (2a) Ecce Homo.\textsuperscript{531}
Cat. no. 146, window XVI (2c) The Flagellation.\textsuperscript{532}
Cat. no. 147, window XVIII (1a) St Nicholas with donor.\textsuperscript{533}
Cat. no. 147, window XVII (2b) The Carrying of the Cross (trimmed).\textsuperscript{534}
Cat. no. 147, window XVII (1c) St Elizabeth of Thuringia with donor.\textsuperscript{535}
Cat. no. 149, window XIX (2b) The Mourning of Christ (trimmed).\textsuperscript{536}

\textsuperscript{525} Marshall, 1958 and 1987.
\textsuperscript{526} See further Hebgin-Barnes, 2010: 92-102.
\textsuperscript{527} Täube, 2007: II, 319-20.
\textsuperscript{528} Ibid.: II, 346-48.
\textsuperscript{529} Ibid.: II, 356-358.
\textsuperscript{530} Ibid.: II, 362-63.
\textsuperscript{531} Ibid.: II, 368.
\textsuperscript{532} Ibid.: II, 371.
\textsuperscript{533} Ibid.: II, 373-75.
\textsuperscript{534} Ibid.: II, 379-80.
\textsuperscript{535} Ibid.: II, 380.
\textsuperscript{536} Ibid.: II, 392.
Installation History:

In 1790, John Byng wrote: “Disley, June 14: Entering the church, I was delighted at its fitting up; with 3 large windows glaz’d with old armorial bearings, as well as two smaller ones of modern stained glass, all guarded by wiring”.

In 1831, the church’s patron Thomas Legh (1792–1857) employed the sculptor Richard James Wyatt (1795–1850) to carve a memorial to his late wife. In 1835, the heraldic glass was removed by Legh to Lyme Park Hall, and installed in rooms designed by Lewis William Wyatt (1777–1853). In about 1817, L.W. Wyatt had supplied stained glass to Legh at this time, some of which had come from Disley church. L.W. Wyatt may have contacted Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyattville) regarding the acquisition of stained glass about this time, as glass was available within the Wyatt family circle after the completion of the Ashridge Park chapel installation. Exact dates are not known for the installation of the Steinfeld stained glass at Disley, Pigot’s directory noted in 1835: “In the chancel window are some beautiful specimens of heraldic stained glass”, and further noted in 1842, “The windows of the chancel have modern stained glass”, concluding that the windows had poor Perpendicular tracery.

In July 1891, Canon Charles James Satterwaite (vicar 1859–1910) noted: “The stained glass has recently been re-arranged, re-leaded, and placed in a window specially designed for it.” About 3cm was trimmed from the sides of some
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540 Pigot & Co, 1835.
541 Ibid., 111.
542 Richards, 1947, 144.
panels, presumably during the post-1835 installation. In his Notes on the Churches of Cheshire, Sir Stephen Glynne wrote: “The stained glass is very interesting of German design and manufacture, date 1535.”543 (Fig. App. I.12).

Import History:

Stained glass from the Casper Bemberg collection in Cologne was imported after Bemberg’s death by S.W. Stevenson, C.F. Häussermann and Jeffry Wyatt to complete the Ashridge Park Chapel installation, which was finished in 1831. The remaining Steinfeld glass that was not acquired for Ashridge was sold on to form other collections, including that at Disley (installed after 1835), and was probably sold (and installed) by the glass-painter Joseph Hale Miller, from his “stained-glass warehouse” at 158 Regent Street, London.

543 Glynne, 1894, 112.
Edinburgh, Dalmeny House (Scotland)

Introduction to the building:

In 1814, the 4th Earl of Dalmeny commissioned Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyattville) to prepare drawings for Dalmeny House; the house was to be in a Tudor style based on East Barsham Manor (Norfolk). In the same year, William Wilkins designed a house in the Greek Revival style for the earl (Fig. App. I.11). The Classical design was rejected, but Wilkins was awarded the contract, on the condition that he designed a Gothic house, probably because of his personal contact with the earl through the Society of Dilettanti. Wilkins always had a desire to satisfy his clients, regardless of his personal preferences, and produced a design remarkably similar to Wyatt’s. Wilkins noted that “we are all plagiarists more or less; there is nothing new under the sun”; he did however believe that “A system founded on the pure basis of Grecian excellence must, and will finally prevail.” It should be noted further that Wyatt is listed as a family friend in the housekeeping books of Wilkins’s wife Alicia for the period 1822–28, Wilkins and Wyatt also had a professional relationship, with the former giving the latter access to designs for Dalmeny, completed in 1817, the connecting corridor on the south side between the two ranges was designed in such a way that stained glass could be installed in three bays, two with a two-light window and one with a four-light window, all the lights being 2.44m high (Fig. App. I.12).

The Stained Glass:

544 Robinson, 1984: 413.
545 Liscombe, 1980: 8.
546 Letter to the editor of The Athaeum (2 March 1833).
547 Liscombe, 1974: 398.
The eight panels in the south corridor are from the abbey church of Mariawald and represent the largest group of panels from Mariawald remaining together with the five in the east window of St Stephen’s Norwich. Wolff-Wintrich described the panels as follows.  

1. St John the Baptist with Johann von Salm-Reifferscheidt, facing right; new head to St John, the donor’s head probably repainted.
2. Bishop (St Erasmus?) with female donor, Anna von Salm (née Hoya), figures facing left; the donor’s head new.
3. St Hubert, facing right; head original, lower vestments early nineteenth century.
4. St Paul with female donor, facing left; donor figure a copy of Anna von Salm.
5. St Clare with donor, facing right; original, possibly some facial repainting of the donors face.
6. St Catherine, with female donor.
7. St John the Evangelist, facing right; head probably new.
8. St Ursula(?) and female donor, facing left.

Import History:  

Wolff-Wintrich maintains that the eight panels of Mariawald glass at Dalmeny had been in the possession of the Earl since 1809; this scenario would imply an acquisition from William Stevenson from his Pall Mall outlet. It may be a coincidence, but Wilkins was probably designing window mullions for the Mariawald glass at Dalmeny House in about 1815, the year in which his friend Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyatville) was designing the mullions for the chapel at Ashridge Park, which was to hold glass with the same provenance. As Wilkins was probably the original owner of the Mariawald glass now in St Stephen’s Norwich, the observations
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549 Ibid., 243.
550 RIBA/LDAC, ‘Chapel Window, Ashridge’, pencil, 320 x 525mm SA42/WYJAS [1](122) (1815).
concerning the stained glass in the gazetteer entry for St Stephen’s entry may also apply to Dalmeny (p.261).
Ely, Ely Cathedral (Cambridgeshire)

*Introduction to the building:*

The glass is located in the Perpendicular west window of the nave of the cathedral. The architect J.T. Groves (1761–1811) signed a receipt on the 2 February 1808 for £290 6s. received from the bishop “for materials, workmanship, and every other charge in completing and putting up at the West End of Ely Cathedral a painted glass window with stone mullions”.

*Stained Glass:*

A first group of panels was installed in 1807–1808. Barnard noted the acquisition and installation of the stained glass in 1949. The Chapter Order of June 14 1808, which you mention, I have confirmed by reference to the Order Book. – The west window is of Dutch [sic] glass of the late 16th Century. Where it came from I do not know, and there is no record I can find after prolonged search. Bishop Yorke gave most of it. The following entries are taken from this Order Book.

1806. November: The Bishop gives £150 towards the cost of the new West Window and is thanked.

1807. June 14: West window given by the Bishop.

Bishop Yorke’s installations in Ely Cathedral were detailed in William Stevenson’s 1817 supplement to Bentham’s 1771 *History and Antiquities of the Conventual and Cathedral Church of Ely*. What also appears in other parts of the cathedral, particularly in the
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551 Millers, 1834: 55.
552 Barnard, 1949: 206.
553 Stevenson, W., 1817; Bentham, 1771.
painted glass that he placed in the western window. Moore documents however that there was not enough glass to fill the windows, and on 6 July 1853 the Dean and Chapter expressed their “grateful thanks to John Waddington Esq. of Twyford near Winchester for making such additions by Mr Clutterbuck to the ancient painted glass in the West Window of the Cathedral given by his father and grandfather (the bishop) as to fill the whole in a uniform style.” (Fig. App. I.13).

Import History:

The glass was acquired by William Stevenson with his son Seth William, and import was arranged by J.C. Hampp in 1802. Glass is documented as having been sold by William Stevenson from his exhibition at 97 Pall Mall: “Christ before Herod, and Pilate washing his hands, by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ely Minster”. The glass part of a group of panels from Rouen, described by Wayment in French as “les belles vitres de St. Jean”, that are now also found in Wells and Ely cathedrals and the Burrell Collection; see further the gazetteer entry for Glasgow, Burrell Collection (p.229). The manner in which the stained glass was acquired was documented in detail in 1815 by Seth William Stevenson in his book Journal of a Tour through Part of France, Flanders, and Holland. The origin and import of the stained glass donated by John Waddington are not documented, but the glass must have come from William Stevenson originally.

554 Bentham, 1771: Addenda, 12.
555 Moore, 1973: 3.
556 Stevenson, 1807.
558 Stevenson, S.W., 1817: 32.
**Glasgow, Burrell Collection (Glasgow, Scotland)**

*Introduction to the building:*

The stained glass is now in the Burrell Collection in Glasgow and was acquired from Blithfield Hall in Abbots Bromley (Staffordshire) a medieval house built by the Bagot family. It was greatly extended in the Elizabethan period, and cased in Tudor Gothic style in the 1820s by John Buckler. In *British Listed Building Online* the cloister is described as “on north side of range; rib vaulting springs from colonettes, blind panelling between each window bay, windows of 3 cinquefoil headed lights beneath a 4-centred arch”. In the first decade of the nineteenth century, Buckler illustrated the remodelled cloister, but did not include the stained glass (Fig. App. I.14).

*The Stained Glass:*

In the *Gentleman’s Magazine* for 1807 William Stevenson noted that “Lord Bagot has filled his fine cloister at Blithfield with some brilliant lights of *St. John’s Life*”. Bagot acquired eight sixteenth-century panels from Rouen scenes from the life of St John the Evangelist. Other stained glass from the same cycle was later installed in Wells Cathedral and Ely Cathedral (see entry, p.227). The restoration work on the stained glass at Blithfield can be attributed to Joseph Hale Miller and was probably executed around 1807.

---


560 Stevenson, 1807.

561 Ayers, 2004: II, 594–608. The St John glass probably came from the church of Saint-Jean, Rouen, which was closed in 1793 and later demolished. See further Christie 1808, and the gazetteer entry for York, York Minster: the Crucifixion Window (p. 269). The St John the Evangelist glass now in Wells Cathedral and the Burrell Collection, the glass at Ely Cathedral, and the Crucifixion Window in York Minster are all of the same style and have all been attributed to the same provenance.
1807 when he was executing similar work at Tottenham.\textsuperscript{562} The stained glass acquired from Stevenson remained at Blithfield until 1946, when it was bought by William Burrell, through the agency of Wilfred Drake (Fig. App. I.15). Burrell’s starting offer for the stained glass (including four English armorial roundels) was £1500, to include removal and reglazing of the cloister. Eventually the glass cost Burrell £850, but when commission and removal expenses were added the total was £1,395 8s. 9d.\textsuperscript{563} Today, the stained glass forms part of the collection donated by Sir William Burrell to the City of Glasgow, and is exhibited in the museum carrying its donors name, designed by Barry Gasson that was opened in 1983.

\textit{Import History:}

La Quérière notes that the beautiful painted windows of St. John were all taken away in 1802, during the peace of Amiens, at the cost only of glazing the empty spaces.\textsuperscript{564} This refers to the acquisition of glass from the church of Saint-Jean, Rouen, by William Stevenson with his son Seth William, the importation of which was arranged by J.C. Hampp.\textsuperscript{565} See the report of 1826 made by the merchant John Roger Teschmacher regarding import and exhibition of stained glass.\textsuperscript{566}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{562} Kerney, 2009: 62-79.
\item \textsuperscript{563} Marks, 1983: 179.
\item \textsuperscript{564} La Quérière, 1841: I, 213; Fletcher, 1924.
\item \textsuperscript{565} Stevenson, S.W., 1817: 32.
\item \textsuperscript{566} Ibid., La Quérière, 1841: I. Beerbühl, 2007: 432.
\end{itemize}
Hafod House (Caernarvonshire, Wales)

Introduction to the building:

Thomas Johnes (1748–1816) was a Regency gentleman in every sense of the word: almost everything was done to excess, and he bought antiquities without a thought of the cost. Walpole referred to him as “the Knight of the Brazen Milk pot”. The foundation stone of Hafod was laid in 1786, and the house was built to the designs of Thomas Baldwin (c.1750 -1820) of Bath. It was described in 1797 as being in the “modern Gothic style”, Barber, “saw through its gothic vesture,” and Hafod was rendered in an idealised manner by W.M. Turner in 1799 (Fig. App. I.16). Thomas has made a detailed study of Hafod that needs no repetition here. In 1807, B. H. Malkin (1769-1842) described Hafod in a nutshell as a small Classical house in Gothic dress with “pointed windows and pinnacles” (Fig. App. I.17). Johnes built a library in the form of a chapel, where he installed stained glass including, as Rees wrote in 1815, “some fine specimens of painted glass. The large window contained a most finished portrait of a Cardinal kneeling.” The end of Haford House came on Friday 13 March 1807, when it was burnt to the ground. The Gentleman’s Magazine wrote passionately of the servants’ heroic efforts to save the building, but all was nevertheless lost. Johnes’s losses in the fire were valued at £70,000, but the sum received from
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the Imperial and British Insurance Company was only £26,000.\textsuperscript{574}

Johnes, ever an optimist, wrote in 1807, “Hafod will be rebuilt, and though perhaps not so large, it will be more compact and handsome”. The stained glass he had installed however was lost forever.\textsuperscript{575}

\textit{The Stained Glass:}

Owen documented the arrival of the stained glass in Shrewsbury in his book of 1808: “Mr Johnes, of Hafod, procured a very considerable quantity from Flanders, in which are some admirable specimens, particularly the figure of a Cardinal large as life, in robes of most brilliant scarlet, kneeling before an altar.”\textsuperscript{576}

Owen was recalling events that had taken place in 1802, as in his letter to Archdeacon Woodhouse that year he wrote: “...it is singular enough that the most splendid collection of painted glass from an Abbey Church at Antwerp should have found its way to Shrewsbury”.\textsuperscript{577} Apart from the Cardinal, Owen noted, “About a dozen pieces are so clearly in the manner of the Lichfield glass they must have been the production of the same artist”.\textsuperscript{578}

\textit{Import History:}

The Rev Hugh Owen stated that the glass was most likely acquired as a single purchase. “Wm. Johnes of Haffoed near Abergavenny has purchased the whole spoil of the Abbey it is now in the hands of a very good glazier here for repair [John Betton of Shrewsbury]. The quantity is great, perhaps more than half as much

\textsuperscript{574} Ibid.: 420.
\textsuperscript{575} Thomas, 1973: 152.
\textsuperscript{576} Owen, 1808: 246.
\textsuperscript{577} Letter from H. Owen to Archdeacon Woodhouse; LRO: D30/6/3/3.
\textsuperscript{578} LRO: D30/6/3/3.
as that at Lichfield.\textsuperscript{579} The parallels to Brook Boothby’s purchase of the Herkenrode glass for Lichfield Lady Chapel are striking, as both appear to have been purchased in 1802; see the entry for Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (p.239). That William Stevenson was not involved in the transaction is confirmed by Owen; “Mr Stevenson the Proprietor of the exhibition of ancient stained glass in London called on me a few days ago. I delighted him with a sight of this glass especially the Cardinal.”\textsuperscript{580} If Owen was correct in saying “whole spoil”, the Hafod installation could have been as large as two hundred panels.

\textsuperscript{579} LRO: D30/6/3/3.\textsuperscript{580} LRO: D30/6/3/3.
Hingham, Parish Church of St Andrew (Norfolk)

Introduction to the building:

St Andrew’s is a large Decorated church with some Perpendicular features. The stylistic consistency of its architecture reflects the short period over which it was built, between c.1340 and c.1360. One feature of the building now inconsistent with the harmonious whole is the east window of the chancel, which dates from the middle of the 1820s (Fig. App. I.18). A sketch by the author suggests the design of the original five-light window, in the style of the fourteenth century Decorated church (Fig. App. I.19); there are parallels with a window of slightly later date at Claypole (Lincolnshire, Fig. App. I.20).

The nineteenth-century window has been raised, probably for liturgical reasons, about 1.5m above the string-course, which would have marked the original foot of the window. Although the width of the window has remained the same, the height was increased, as was the number of lights (from five to seven), probably to accommodate stained glass that had been purchased.

The Stained Glass:

There were clearly two periods during which Rhenish glass was installed at Hingham. The first, well-documented donation, made by John, 1st Lord Wodehouse (1739-1834), in 1813, was in all probability installed in the original east window of the church. The author’s sketch of the original window illustrated in green an eventual location of this stained glass, of the three central figures of the present window, the two donor figures and two angels at the top of

\[581\] Stewart, 1961: 57.
\[582\] Lewis, 1848: 514–18.
the present window (Fig. App. I.21), the remaining four lights would have been either empty, or glazed with old glass from the church. The second installation, which we see now, would have been made in the late 1820s or early 1830s by Samuel Yarrington, probably assisted by James George Zobel, who at this period was responsible for Yarrington’s site work, repainting and repairing of stained glass.\textsuperscript{583} The parallels to the glass in Corpus Christi College Chapel, Cambridge, are clear: both installations have the same Rhenish provenance, and were probably made by the same workshop at around the same time. Lord Wodehouse was probably the donor on this occasion too, and his may well be related to his donations to the glazing of his local village church at Kimberley in 1835; see further the entry for Kimberley (p.237). The nature of the tracery lights is consistent with the second period of installation: the robustness of the detailing belongs to a period later than 1813, when a “skinny Gothic”, exemplified by the 1815 work of Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyattville) at Ashridge Park chapel, would have been the norm.\textsuperscript{584}

\textit{Import History:}

The stained glass of the first installation was probably imported by William Stevenson with J.C. Hampp; similar figures of angels were installed in Kimberley Church (Norfolk),\textsuperscript{585} and the figures resemble those imported by Hampp and Stevenson and installed by Stevenson in other Norfolk locations, such as Warham\textsuperscript{586}

\textsuperscript{583} King, 1974: 28–29. On Yarrington and Zobel, see further Lamb, 1831.
\textsuperscript{584} See further the gazetteer entry for London, Victoria & Albert Museum London, Cloister Glass from Mariawald (Eifel), p.246.
\textsuperscript{586} Ibid.: 249.
The glass of the second installation can be connected to that at Corpus Christi Chapel, Cambridge, implying that its import was commissioned by William Wilkins and Sir Jeffry Wyattville, their agents being the Stevensons (father and son) with C.F. Häussermann. An alternative scenario, implying importation at an earlier date, is that this glass was acquired from Yarrington, who had taken over much of Hampp’s remaining glass after his death in 1825. Whichever scenario is correct, the present Hingham installation cannot be earlier than the late 1820s.

---

587 BL, Additional MS 17462, 331.
Kimberley, Parish Church of St Peter (Norfolk)

Introduction to the building:

St Peter’s is a run-down village church in Norfolk, west of Norwich (Fig. App. I.22), the church’s fate is typical of many other English village churches: although it has a long history and bears witness to many nineteenth-century architectural interventions and improvements, it is now unloved. The stained glass is installed in the east window of the chancel and the windows of south side of the chancel. The critical period for “improvement” of this church was in the 1830s. In 1845, White wrote: “The whole church was repaired and beautified by Lord Wodehouse in 1835; and a few years earlier, two of its windows were filled with stained glass, at the cost of the late Lord Wodehouse.”^588

The Stained Glass:

There are two groups of Rhenish glass at Kimberley. The first group consists of two angels from the abbey church of Mariawald in the east window of the chancel. This glass has been documented in detail by Wolff-Wintrich,^589 whose positing of some form of connection between the first Wodehouse gift to Hingham in 1813 and that at Kimberley is probably correct; see further the entry for Hingham, Parish Church of St Andrew (p.234). The second group, consisting of two panels from the Steinfeld cloister, is now installed in the south windows of the chancel. Täube has proposed that these two panels were a gift of the 1st Lord Wodehouse, installed by Yarrington in the 1820s;^590 the installation date is more likely to be the early 1830s.

^588 White, 1845: 514-18.
(see above). Täube also noted that the Rev. W.H. Langton installed six Steinfeld panels at Warham in 1836. Täube also noted that the Rev. W.H. Langton installed six Steinfeld panels at Warham in 1836.591 Other minor installations of Steinfeld cloister glass (in the parish church of St Botolph at Hevingham, Norfolk, a gift of the Rev. Henry Philip Marsham in 1881) and Stisted (a gift from Onley Savill-Onley in 1844) probably resulted from a familial tie: the Rev. Marsham married Caroline Savill-Onley of Sisted at Braintree (Essex) in 1843.592 The circumstantial evidence indicates that the Steinfeld cloister glass in these installations belonged to the group acquired for Ashridge Park chapel.

**Import History:**

The Steinfeld cloister glass at Kimberley belongs to the group of panels not installed in Ashridge Park chapel by Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyattville) on account of their poor condition. This Steinfeld glass would have been distributed by Joseph Hale Miller after his completion of the Ashridge glazing in 1831. The acquisition of this glass is documented in Chapter III, Case Study 1 (p.128), and in the entry for Disley, Parish Church of St Mary (p.221).

---

592 Rye: I, 1911: 524.
Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (Staffordshire)

Introduction to the building:

The early sixteenth-century glass from the Cistercian abbey of Herkenrode is installed in the thirteenth-century Lady Chapel of Lichfield Cathedral (Fig. App. I.23). White noted in 1831; “The beauty and magnificence of the edifice has been greatly enhanced, by the addition of some painted windows, from the dissolved Abbey of Herckenrode, in Germany: this valuable purchase was obtained by the Dean and Chapter, through the liberality of the late Sir Brooke Boothby, who made the acquisition when travelling on the Continent, for the small sum of £200, and [Sir Brooke Boothby] generously transferred to them his bargain, estimated at £10,000.” 593

The Herkenrode stained glass is currently removed for conservation and is the focus of interest for academics, the press, and restorers of stained glass. The current author can but clarify the timeline of the glass’s installation and comment on the trade mechanisms operating at the turn of the nineteenth century.

The Stained Glass:

The 1986 study of Vanden Bemden and Kerr still remains the starting point of research into the Herkenrode stained glass, its iconography, history, and installation; 594 further research was undertaken by Marie Groll in 2011. 595 The Rev. W.G. Rowland of Shrewsbury (1770–1851) is credited as being responsible for the actual arrangement of the glass, and John Betton (1765–1849) of

593 White, 1831: 79.
595 Groll, 2011.
Shrewsbury had the work of installing it. The 1787 glazing scheme of the cathedral architect James Wyatt (1746-1813), which assembled old glass from the cathedral with new, was destroyed when the Herkenrode glass was installed. How much of Wyatt’s scheme that was to cost £150 was executed is not known. How much influence Wyatt had on the installation of the Herkenrode glass is also not known, although his 1804 offer of “advice” on its technical aspects was accepted by the Dean and Chapter. Further research at a technical level on the effect of this consultancy is needed; Wyatt may have acted as a consultant because of the partly new mullion profiles he had probably created in the late 1770s, which may not have been suitable for the Herkenrode glass.

The Birmingham glass painter Francis Eginton (1736–1805) was the first to examine the Herkenrode stained glass, probably on the recommendation of his patron James Wyatt, with whom he had worked since 1786, when he was commissioned to produce three heraldic windows for St George’s Chapel, Windsor. Eginton noted that “the stained glass from Liège appears to contain 332 squares besides a quantity of tracery and fragments. The Squares 22.5 x 22.5, the whole superficial measure about 1300 feet”. Then Eginton became embroiled in cost comparisons, as detailed in chapter II, that in the long run probably cost him the leading role in the restoration and installation contract; his age may also have been a factor. Francis Eginton made the following cost analysis, but his son William Raphael

---

596 WSL, ‘A short account of Lichfield Cathedral; More particularly on the Painted Glass with which its Windows are Adorned’, 13.
597 LRO, MS 036 (7 March 1787).
598 Ibid.
599 LRO, D30/6/3/3 (not dated).
Eginton (1778–1834), his long-term assistant, certainly executed some of the restoration work (see below). Francis Eginton’s text reads: “Total original cost was 200£ has been purchased for about 3 shillings per foot, and about 11 shillings each square. An historical piece of 12 Squares cost originally about £6.12.0 and the pieces now put up £19.16.0 add Tracery £3.4.0 total £23.0.0 at the price such glass now sells in this country there can be little doubt that each square of these window would sell for £20 [Eginton struck through this price twice] consequently the 36 squares could amount to £720 [ditto] This was the first window put up... We give 3/6 per foot for the plain ground glass. The whole 350 squares, at the price Mr Stevenson sells in Pall Mall, (see Mr [Rev. Hugh] Owens letter)\(^{600}\) taking it only at 20£ per square, to £7000, at 30£ to £10500, at 40 to £14000”. Eginton may have been getting old, but his analysis was correct. His rate of £23 per group of twelve panels would result in a total restoration cost of about £650, and as the “short account of Lichfield Cathedral” of 1811 (Fig. App 1.24), three years after the completion of the contract, stated: “A total of 340 panels each about 22 inches square. The total expense of purchasing, importing, arranging, and repairing this glass, and for fitting the windows to receive it, may have cost about One Thousand Pounds.”\(^{601}\) It can be assumed this is close to the actual price, since John Betton’s and the Rev. Rowland’s costs can reasonably be assessed at about £350.

The Dean and Chapter of Lichfield were interested in the total cost of the stained-glass installation. In 1807, William Stevenson

---

\(^{600}\) Ibid.
\(^{601}\) WSL, bs 753/3, 11–12.
noted that “The venerable Cathedral at Lichfield now boasts of having seven fine appropriate windows, purchased abroad for the Chapter, to whom Government liberally relinquished the duty on their importation.” An application was submitted by Archdeacon Robert Nares on 19 May 1803, and the remission of excise duties for £23.2.0 was accepted by Mr William Mott of Lichfield Cathedral from Treasury Chambers on the 9 September 1803. Work began on the restoration of the stained glass in 1803, with the contract being divided between Worthington (1803–1804), Jager (1804), and William Raphael Eginton (1804–1805); the glass was finally installed by Betton between 1806 and 1808.

Import History:

The import of the Herkenrode stained glass was documented in the correspondence between Sir Brooke Boothby (1744–1824) and Mr William Mott, chapter clerk at Lichfield Cathedral, conducted between 1802 and 1803. Some extracts. Boothby to Mott: 24 September 1802: price not to exceed £160; conditions of payment: £80 deposit on embarkation of the glass at Liege, the rest to be paid half at six months the rest at twelve.

Boothby to Mott: Spa, 5 October 1802: “I had no time to contact the Chapter of Lichfield ... wonderfully cheap ... being 370 squares of about 19.5 inches square each at 15 shillings a square.’

Boothby to Mott: Liège, 8 January 1803: “This morning the cases of painted glass have sailed past my windows for Rotterdam.
They consist of ten large and one smaller. The former contains twelve smaller windows, and five large ones, besides the remains of another that may be useful to repair.’

From all appearances the acquisition if the stained glass was a co-ordinated operation. In 1802, Boothby was credited £112,607 and on 30 March 1803 the Herkenrode stained glass arrived at Hull.608 It was transported to Lichfield and laid out on the floor of the chapter house for inspection. Thus began the conservation, restoration and installation process that is being repeated at the present time.

---

607 Ibid.
608 Ibid.
London (Islington), Parish Church of St Andrew, Whitehall Park

Introduction to the building:

St Andrew’s was built between 1894 and 1895 by Frederic Hammond (1845–1919) as a mission church to serve the area between Highgate Hill and the Holloway Road. The building, in Early English Gothic Revival style, in red brick with stone dressings on a sloping triangular site, was Hammond’s only church project.609

The Stained Glass:

Two sixteenth-century figures of St James and St Simon (French or German?) were installed in 1935 “to replace the plain glass in the central lights of the north and south transepts by stained glass also removed from Ram’s [Chapel, Homerton]”.610 Ram’s chapel had been built in the garden of Stephen Ram (d.1746), on the north side of Homerton High Street, and was a proprietary chapel. It was left to Ram’s son-in-law the Rev. Reeve Ballard, who employed a preacher before leasing it to the vicar of Hackney in 1765. Ballard’s son sold it 1775, and the chapel was vested in twelve trustees in 1791. It continued as a preaching chapel until 1930.611 The chapel was closed in a state of disrepair in 1933, although services continued at Urswick Road Sunday school until 1934. The Trust was dissolved in 1936, and the plate, font and stained glass were redistributed. The chapel was demolished, and the site was taken for road widening.612 In 1807, William Stevenson documented the origin

610 LMA, P83/AND2/52 (1935).
612 HAD, D/F/BAG/14a (not dated).
of the two apostolic figures installed in the two west windows of
Ram’s Chapel in the Gentleman’s Magazine: “The inhabitants of
Rickmansworth have also enriched their chancel by subscription, as
well as those at Homerton; the former with a fine window of the
Crucifixion; the latter with whole lengths of the Apostles.” The Pall
Mall exhibition ran between 1802 and 1803, and then sporadically
until 1807. The point-of-sale may well have been Wighley’s Rooms in
Spring Gardens, where stained glass was exhibited by the
Stevensons until 1815.

Import History:

The import was probably effected either by W. Stevenson with
J.C. Hampp, or S.W. Stevenson with C.F. Häussermann. The glass is
of similar provenance to that installed at All Hallows’ Tottenham,
which was probably imported by Häussermann with the help of
Alexandre Lenoir’s glazier Jean-François Tailleur; see further the
entry for London (Haringey), Parish Church of All Hallows (p.256).

613 Stevenson, 1807. On St Mary’s, Rickmansworth, see Lewis, 1848: 666.
614 Owen, 1808: 246.
615 Warrington, 1848: 69.
London (Kensington and Chelsea), Victoria & Albert Museum

Glass from the Ägidius-Kapelle, Cologne (via the Geerling Collection): The Apostles Peter and Paul

Introduction to the building:

These panels are today installed in a light-box on the south wall of the Medieval and Renaissance Galleries of the Victoria & Albert Museum, which were opened in 2010 (Fig. App. I.25).

Original provenance of the Stained Glass:

They come originally from the Ägidius-Kapelle “an der Hohenschmiede” in Cologne;\(^{616}\) both the street and the chapel (if it was still standing then) were finally eradicated during the Second World War. The location lay south of Blaubach, on the southern perimeter of the then city, and the approximate location of the chapel is recorded on the gable wall of a small block of flats on the Pantaleonstraße. The first post-medieval owner of this window was Christian Geerling, who in the 1820s ran the wine and vinegar trade established by his father “am Blaubach”,\(^{617}\) about 200m north of the chapel.

The Stained Glass:

The window portraying the apostles Peter and Paul was first illustrated in Christian Geerling’s *Sammlung von Ansichten alter enkaustischer Glasmalerei*,\(^{618}\) of 1827. His illustration corresponds in the main to the glass now in the Victoria & Albert Museum. The

---

\(^{616}\) Oidtmann, 1912: 439.
\(^{617}\) Greven, 1828: 159.
\(^{618}\) Geerling, 1827: part II, 5 and fig. 4.
museum glass includes original main lights,\(^{619}\) from about 1510 assembled with tracery lights from the early nineteenth century, (Fig. App. I.26), presumably from Geerling’s stained glass atelier.

**Import History:**

There are two possible scenarios. The first is that it was imported by Edward Spenser Curling in 1828. Curling noted in his diary: “Cologne Saturday 27 September 1828: Mons. C. Geerling.—Ancient Glass. No.3.- about 10 feet high by about 2 feet wide.- 2 of these 700 Fr.”\(^{620}\) The dimensions cited by Curling correspond to the principal lights of the present window, and the Victoria & Albert Museum has confirmed that from the dimensions given by Curling and those documented during renovations and re-leadings it is highly likely that its window is that noted by Curling.\(^{621}\) If Curling did acquire the glass however, its history between 1828 and 1858, when the museum bought it, is unknown. Support for this scenario may perhaps be found in the price at which the glass was acquired from Geerling, which was very reasonable (compared with other glass bought by Curling, particularly that from Altenberg), and the price paid by the Victoria & Albert Museum in 1858, which was likewise not excessive. The story of the second scenario would have begun on the 27 June 1848, when the body of Christian Geerling was found on the west bank of the Rhine; “There was speculation that the dilettante loner had committed suicide, however no grounds were known.”\(^{622}\)

---

\(^{619}\) The V&A inventory numbers list: St Paul- 5941:1-1858 to 5941:4-1858. St Peter- 5941:5-1858 to 5941:8-1858. Tracery- (by Christian Geerling) – 5941:9-1858 to 5941:17-1858.


\(^{621}\) Personal communication from Eatman, S. 1 March 2010.

\(^{622}\) Schaden, 2002: 205.
of Geerling’s belongings were auctioned by court order; most of the artworks were sold through the Heberle auction house on the 22 August 1853. In 1998, Cillessen noted that after Geerling’s death the apostles Peter and Paul were considered for the collection of the Berlin Kunstgewerbemuseum, stating that the Cologne Dombaumeister Ernst Friedrich Zwirner (1802-1861) advised against its acquisition, as the price was too high. Chillessen provides no source however for this evidence, and does not record who acquired the glass. The records of the Victoria & Albert Museum state that the glass was acquired in 1858 from an unconfirmed source for £125. The museum has noted that panels 5941:9 to 5941:17-1858 are tracery lights and may well not belong to the original window.

**Cloister Glass from Mariawald Abbey**

*Introduction to the building:*

Some of the stained glass from the cloister of the Cistercian abbey of Mariawald is exhibited on the north wall of the Medieval and Renaissance Galleries at the Victoria & Albert Museum, which opened in 2010 (Fig. App. I.27). The installation compromises twenty-two panels of the forty-five panels in the museum’s collection and follows, in part, Täube’s reconstruction of a window published in 2007. Some panels may have later headpieces, and one panel is a 95% copy by Joseph Hale Miller.

---

623 Heberle, 1853.
624 Cillessen, 1998: 104.
625 Eatman, S. (Head Stained Glass Conservator, V&A, London) re. 5941:1-17-1858): ‘they were recorded between 2007-2009 when they were conserved and mounted for the new Medieval & Renaissance galleries’.
627 Ibid.: II, 221 (cat. no. 111, ‘St. Cornelius seated’).
The Stained Glass:

Mariawald Abbey was dissolved in 1795 and sold on 2 September 1802. The date of the sale of the stained glass from the church and the cloister is not recorded, but Conrad considered that the abbey church glass could have been auctioned as early as 1797 or 1798. The cloister glazing was probably sold in 1802, and its sale may be connected to that of the cloister glazing from the nearby monastery of Steinfeld in June 1802 (see further below). This may have dictated the pattern of ownership of the cloister stained glass in contrast to that of the abbey church glass: the later appears to have been sold piecemeal over an extended period of time, finding its way into numerous collections and locations, but the contrast to the cloister glass could not be clearer, presenting as it does today in the Victoria & Albert Museum a homogeneous group. This suggests that the cloister glass was part of a collection, and a likely candidate is that belonging to Peter Bemberg from Cologne, who was J.C. Hampp’s trade partner. Bemberg died in 1814, a relatively wealthy, but broken man, his financial situation reflecting the new international trade conditions after the lifting of the Continental blockade. After Bemberg’s death his property, including presumably his stained-glass collection, was auctioned off to fulfil family commitments to his descendants.

632 See P. Benberg’s letter of 1808 to his wife, to be opened after his death, relating that he can still write honestly about his financial condition that later he would have difficulty doing... ‘da ich noch die Feder führen kann, was vielleicht später nicht mehr möglich sein möchte’ http://www.bemberg.net/ buch koelner.htm (accessed April 2012).
In 1815, Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyatville) took over the design and supervision of the project at Ashridge Park formerly in the hands of his uncle James Wyatt (1746–1813).\footnote{James Wyatt died in a carriage accident near Marlborough on 4 September 1813, travelling back to London with a client, Christopher Codrington.} After securing the Ashridge contract,\footnote{In his diary for 18 September 1813 Joseph Faringdon wrote: ‘[Jeffrey Wyatt] wrote 15 letters to different persons soliciting their interest to get something that His uncle enjoyed’; Linstrum, 1974: 15. Quotes Farringdon, p.6397, 18 September 1813.} he was in a position to design purpose-made tracery lights for the chapel windows to accommodate the Mariawald cloister stained glass, which has certainly been acquired by him.\footnote{The drawings came from the collection of W.J. Donthorne (Jeffry’s pupil from 1817 to 1820) and are presumably part of the Wyatt office record. See RIBA/LDAC SA42/WYJAS[1] 122 ‘Dimensions of the Chapel Windows, Ashridge’, pencil (320 x 535mm).}

This installation was to survive until Ashridge Park was sold by Lord Brownlow in 1928. The stained glass was auctioned at Sotheby’s on the 12 July 1928 and realised £27,000.\footnote{Sotheby & Co., 1828. The copy in the Stained Glass Museum, Ely has (on p.7) the following annotation in pencil; ‘Sold for £27,000 a total of 53 lots’.} It was purchased anonymously by E.E. Cook, and subsequently bequeathed by him to the Victoria & Albert Museum.

Täube has established that the Steinfeld and Mariawald cloister glass formed part of the Casper Heinrich and Peter Bemberg collections, and that it was probably acquired by them in 1802.\footnote{Täube, 2007: II, 161–62.} Twenty-seven panels of Mariawald glass can be identified from the Todd engraving of Ashridge Park published in 1823 (Fig. App. 1.28).\footnote{Todd, 1823: Page numbers vary between copies.} The restoration of the glass at Ashridge Park Chapel was undertaken by Joseph Hale Miller presumably from his premises at 107 Swallow Street, London. In 1846, Warrington wrote that Miller’s work at Ashridge represented a major improvement in glass-painting and restoration skills unknown in the period of the first importations:
“From this circumstance may be dated the revival of the art.”
Todd’s engraving has a carefully chosen perspective, illustrating a “First Installation” showing only Mariawald glass; engravings of the exterior of the chapel from the same book tell a different story however: only the three apse windows were glazed (see p.183). The windows of the chapel were designed by Jeffry Wyatt to house the Mariawald stained glass, as is testified by drawings held by the RIBA; the same cannot be said of the “Second Installation”, predominantly of Steinfeld glass, installed in the late 1820’s.

Import History:

Of the forty-nine extant panels of stained glass from the Mariawald cloister, forty-five were installed at Ashridge Park and subsequently acquired by the Victoria & Albert Museum in 1928. The forty-five were acquired by Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyattville) for Lord Brownlow at Ashridge Park in 1815–16 through the agency of S.W. Stevenson and C.F. Häussermann. It remains unclear from which collection the panels came, but they most likely came from that of Peter Bemberg, who died in 1814. There is an alternative scenario, outlined in chapter II, that the glass was acquired earlier, at the Bemberg auction in Cologne in 1807, then stored and subsequently purchased by Wyatt; if this was the case, J.C. Hampp was probably the initial purchaser.

\[\text{639 Warrington, 1848: 69. See also Williamson, 2007: 118.}\]
\[\text{640 The first of three sketches gives the general concept of the window. The second gives the dimensions of stained-glass panels to be inserted; dimensions are given for two panels at the foot of the left-hand light (2/3 by 2/2, and 2/3 by 2/6), as well as for a frieze at the base 4” deep and a frieze at intermediate level 5” deep. The third sketch gives the final dimensions of the windows. RIBA/LDAC, SB13/WYJE[1](121-123).}\]
\[\text{641 Rackham, 1945–47: 2.}\]
**Cloister Glass from Steinfeld Abbey (Eifel)**

*Introduction to the building:*

Some panels of the cloister glazing from the Premonstratensian abbey of Steinfeld in the Eifel region are displayed in the Stained Glass Gallery (84) of the Victoria & Albert Museum. The majority of the glass, totalling forty panels, is in storage. One panel has returned to Steinfeld (Fig. App. I.29).

*The Stained Glass:*

The glass was acquired in 1928 from Ashridge.\(^{642}\) A total seventy-four panels from the Steinfeld cloister are extant in England. The history of the dispersal and presumed sale of the cloister stained glass has been documented extensively, particularly by Neuss, King and Joester.\(^{643}\) There is however a major discrepancy, as Täube has noted: "A large number of other panels [other than those from Ashridge] also arrived in England, the majority being distributed in the Norwich region... the majority of these are in a far worse condition than those in the Ashridge/V&A collection."\(^{644}\) The abbey was cleared on the 26 July 1802 on the order of the Prefect of the Saar region.\(^{645}\) The panels from the cloister had been taken down in 1785, partly because they were broken, and partly because the cloisters were damp, and it was hoped that sun and air could dry out the structure.\(^{646}\) The glass was pre-packed for sale before the French Revolution. There is no definitive documentation of the sale of the

---

\(^{642}\) Rackham, 1945–47: 2. 'In 1928 Ashridge was sold by Lord Brownlow, and the glass of the chapel windows was put up for sale at Messrs. Sotheby's rooms; it was bought by an anonymous donor [Cook] and given by him to the Victoria and Albert Museum, with the exception of three panels which he retained in his possession'; V&A acquisitions register for the year 1928, 25. In 1946, the three remaining panels were given to the museum.


\(^{644}\) Täube, 2007: II, 257.


\(^{646}\) Neuss, 1955: 71.
glass, the earliest records in relation to this being the sale of some glass by Peter Bemberg to J.C. Hampp in 1803.

The construction of the cloister began in 1499 under Abbot Johann IV of Düren and was completed by Abbot Godfrey II of Kessel (1509–1517) and his successor Abbot Johann VI. The latter began the installation of the windows in 1526, the last being installed in 1557.\textsuperscript{647} Documentation relating to the stained glass is extensive, and does not need to be rehearsed here; where necessary, the author has used Täube’s 2007 catalogue as his source of reference.\textsuperscript{648} The Steinfeld stained glass was installed in Ashridge Park chapel in Hertfordshire between 1824 and 1831.\textsuperscript{649} The majority of the Steinfeld panels were trimmed to fit the Ashridge windows by Joseph Hale Miller (1777–1842), as the mullions designed by Jeffry Wyatt in 1815 to accommodate the Mariawald stained glass were not of the right dimensions to accommodate the newly imported Steinfeld glass. Miller’s original framing of the glass has now been removed by the Victoria & Albert Museum, but it should be noted that his 1820s workmanship and over-painting is more professional than his earlier work of about 1815 for the chapel on the Mariawald glass.\textsuperscript{650} This difference confirms the two periods of installation at the chapel, and underlines Warrington’s thesis that Miller’s experience with this contract contributed to the revival of the art.\textsuperscript{651} Miller had from the beginning been an important figure in the development of stained-

---

\textsuperscript{647} Grant, 2002.
\textsuperscript{648} Täube, 2007: II, 253–419.
\textsuperscript{649} ‘An humble individual of the same name as the Prophet Amos, the Top Figure in the Head of this Window, first commenced fixing these windows in the year 1811 & finished the Windows in 1831.’; Rackham, 1945–47: 1.
\textsuperscript{650} Täube, 2007: II, 257.
\textsuperscript{651} Warrington, 1848: 69.
glass painting and restoration in the United Kingdom. Born a Roman Catholic, he had been the ideal craftsman, ideologically speaking, for the Costessey Chapel installation of 1807–1809, and he certainly profited from the contact with William Stevenson, the stained-glass supplier. The Ashridge Park chapel contract, a product of the same Catholic network, now in its second generation, improved Miller’s status; his “glass warehouse” of 1821 became the “stained-glass warehouse” at 158 Regent Street, London in 1827. The fact that not all the imported Steinfeld stained glass was installed at Ashridge leaves one question open: was the other Steinfeld glass in England (such as that at Disley, Cheshire) restored and later sold by Miller through his Regent Street outlet?

*Import History:*

There were two distinct periods of importation for the Steinfeld stained glass. The first involved glass from Peter Bemberg, who was selling on panels in poor condition that were of minor interest to him, consisting of donors from lower registers and damaged pieces. These were sold to J.C. Hampp in the period 1802–1804, principally in March 1803, for a cost of £267. How much Steinfeld stained glass was included in this first trade is not documented, but it most likely included items 161–75 in Hampp and Stevenson’s catalogue, comprising a series of “Saints and Founders”, principally from the lower registers of the Steinfeld cloister glazing. Lot 165 (St Quirinus) and lot 169 (St Virinus) are both now in Blickling Hall (Norfolk). Hampp sold most of the panels in Norfolk, but he also sold them

---

652 BL, Additional MS 17462, 331.
through William Stevenson from his gallery in Pall Mall. The glass acquired by the Baghotts of Lypiatt Park in 1802 was sold in 1820 for use in the Lord Mayor’s Chapel, Bristol, and is now in the east window of the Poyntz Chapel there. Of the total of seventy-four Steinfeld panels in England, fifty-two have a demonstrable connection to some part of the extended Wyatt family, the remaining twenty-two appear to have some form of Hampp provenance.

---

655 Rushforth, 1927: 313. (31 August 1820, £136 6s.).
London (Haringey), Parish Church of All Hallows, Tottenham

Introduction to the building:

The church was previously called All Saints. The stained glass was originally installed in the three-light east window of the chancel, but between 1875 and 1877, when the church was restored and extended to the plans of William Butterfield, it was moved to the north aisle. The additions to the fabric on this occasion consist of one new bay at the east end of the nave and aisles (or rather the old chancel and its aisles), with a new chancel and a five light east window.

The Stained Glass:

In the Gentleman’s Magazine in 1807 William Stevenson noted that there had been a donation to Tottenham church which he recorded as follows: “The Evangelists and Prophets; by John Wilmot, Esq. to Tottenham church”. Walford described the glass as “French glass of c. 1600 including Mark, Matthew, and Luke seated, over small figures of David, Isaiah, and Jeremiah presented in 1807 by John Eardley [Wilmot (1749–1815)].” The original chancel window installation (Fig. App. I.30) was illustrated in 1818 by William Robinson. This window was given to the parish in 1807 by the late John Eardley Wilmot Esq. at the time he resided at Bruce Castle; who also defrayed the whole expense of fitting it up as it now is. On putting up this window the then vicar (the Rev. T. Roberts) preached an appropriate sermon, from Eph. iv. 11. He gave some, prophets
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658 Stevenson, 1807.
659 Ibid. Walford, 1879–85.
and some apostles.\textsuperscript{660} The illustration from Robinson’s book is an engraving by L. Mills from a drawing by the “Rev.\textsuperscript{d} LS.” and gives an impression of the prevailing style of such installations in this period, which combined glass of different periods with contemporary late Georgian glass-painting. The glass, as reinstalled in the Victorian period, is illustrated in the \textit{Royal Commission on Historical Monuments} inventory for Middlesex of 1993.

\textit{Import History:}

On account of the French provenance of the glass, we can say that was probably imported either by W. Stevenson with J.C. Hampp, or by S.W. Stevenson with his nephew C.F. Häussermann in Paris; the latter seems more likely.\textsuperscript{661} The glass was exhibited by William Stevenson around 1806 at 97 Pall Mall and acquired by Wilmot and possibly the Rev. T. Roberts.\textsuperscript{662}

\textsuperscript{660} Robinson, 1818: 11.
\textsuperscript{661} Shepard has noted that Jean-François Tailleur, Alexandre Lenoir’s glazier, sold stained glass to England; Shepard, 2009: 498. This is confirmed in J.C. Hampp’s account book: ‘June 1 1802 Borders of Tailleur 3 10 6’ and ‘1803 April 17 Glass Account, rec’d from Hausermann CH 16. 17.18.19 4 Cases sent from Paris cont’d a collection of 25 Subjects bought for £104’; FM, ‘Account book of John Hampp, 1802–1804’.
\textsuperscript{662} Stevenson, 1807.
Marston Bigot, Parish Church of St Leonard (Somerset)

Introduction to the building:

Edmund Boyle (1742-98), the 7th Earl of Cork and Orrery, financed a new church at Maston Bigot for personal reasons: the old church had stood in front of Marston House, and the new church’s location on Coward’s Mead improved the earl’s view and afforded him more privacy. A private act of Parliament passed in 1786 allowed the earl to demolish the old church on the grounds that it was “in a ruinous condition” and that “No service can be performed in the old church, and, if the erecting of a new one is deferred another year, the inhabitants of the said parish ... will have no place of public worship.” The new church, consisting only of a nave, was consecrated in 1789. The plan for it bears the inscription “This plan belongs to me, Cork.” The family extended the church in 1809, when a tower was added, and in 1844-45 by one of the earl’s sons, the Hon. Rev. R.C. Boyle, Rector of Marston, who donated the chancel to a design by the Bath architect Edward Davies. When the stained glass, mostly of Rhenish provenance, was installed is not recorded, but this probably took place at the time of the chancel extension: the original church was apparently a very mean building, and such glazing would have been an inappropriate luxury.

The Stained Glass:

In 1946, Woodforde described six stained-glass panels in the east window of the chancel, one of which originated from the cloister of the Cistercian monastery of St Apern in Cologne, identified by

---

Täube as “A Lady Hosts Bernard with His Friends” (Fig. App. I.31). This panel from St Apern is one of three in the United Kingdom, the other two being in St Mary’s Shrewsbury. Woodforde described the panel in detail, including the Latin text. The five other panels include an Annunciation, the Fountain of Life, and Jacob preparing to appear before Esau. This last panel is of particular interest, as two womens’ heads in it are clearly repainted; after analysis, they could provide a link to the glass-painter and restorer responsible, who was probably David Evans of Shrewsbury. Woodforde defined the glass as Flemish and Rhenish and made some observations on their possible origins. The Annunciation he linked to the Steinfeld glass in the Lord Mayor’s Chapel, Bristol, and the St. Apern glass to the series from Altenberg in St. Mary’s, Shrewsbury, which following Poyntz, he believed was acquired in 1845.

Import History:

The exact date of the installation of glass from Altenberg and St Apern in St Mary’s, Shrewsbury, undertaken by David Evans (1793–1861) is not known, but it was certainly the early to middle 1840s, a period that would correspond with the installation date at Marston Bigot. Evans was the only glass-painter to have had contact with St Apern panels, so it is probable that he was the supplier and installer of the glass. If that was the case, the list of owners of the St Apern glass at Marston Bigot would read: Wilhelm Düssel, John
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666 Täube, 2007: II, 140–42 (cat. no. 69).
667 Ibid.: II, 139–40 (‘Bernhard’s Vision during the Christmas Eve’, cat. no. 68) and 155 (‘St. Peter with Eight Donors, cat. no. 80).
668 Rushforth, 1927: 312.
669 Poyntz, 1920: 75–79.
Curling, David Evans and the Boyle family. See further chapter III, Case Study 2 (p.141).
Norwich, Parish Church of St Stephen (Norfolk)

Introduction to the building:

St Stephen’s is a late Gothic church built in the early sixteenth century in what was then the new French borough. The original glazing was mostly destroyed in the “Great Blow” of 1648; fragments of this glass may remain at the base of the east window.

The Stained Glass:

The east window houses glass from the abbey of Mariawald (Fig. App. I.34). It has been considered opinion for the last half century that William Stevenson made the first donation of Mariawald glass to St Stephen’s in 1799. In 1904, Harford quoted an extract from the churchwarden’s book dated 3 November 1799: “a present of the elegant painted work on glass, representing the figure of St Stephen … which is fixed in the centre of the east window of the Church of the said Parish of St Stephen’s”. King thinks however that it was “certainly a panel of local glass”, not from Mariawald, and considering the date of the churchwarden’s book entry, King is probably correct, as in 1799 there was no significant access to Rhenish stained glass in English. The present central figure of the window is the representation of St Phillip from Mariawald installed in the early 1840s (Fig. App. I.32-33): see further below. That Stevenson contributed to the glazing scheme can be confirmed by the inclusion of a Cologne panel “Barbara says farewell to Origen’s Colleague”, and it is documented that he was selling similar glass
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670 Blomefield, 1806: 238–47.
671 Harford, 1904: 339.
672 King, 2010: 13.
from his outlet in Pall Mall, London. Wolff-Winrich has identified five panels of Mariawald stained glass in St Stephen’s as follows.

1. Saint with female donor; inscription “zo katzellebogen anno 1513”; 1.60 x 0.48m. The donor is Maria, daughter of Wilhelm IV, Herzog von Jülich, who married Johann III von Jülich-Kleve-Berg in 1511. This panel probably comes from the west window of the church, as the average width of the main lights of most windows is 0.53m, while that of the west window is only 0.48m.

2. John the Baptist with Judgement Angel; 1.60 x 0.53m.

3. St Stephen or St Philip; 1.60m x 0.53m. The donor was Phillip von Waldeck in 1505.

4. St Christopher with the Manderscheid-Blankenheim coat of arms; 1.60 x 0.53m.

5. Male saint with female donor; 1.60 x 0.53m. The donor was probably Sibilla, Herzogin von Jülich und Berg, who gave glass to Mariawald in 1505.

The date of installation cannot be established with certainty, but it was probably 1842. The entry in the churchwarden’s book for 30 September 1841 reads: “It was resolved that the painted glass placed in the east window of the church by Mr. Starland be immediately removed, and the place filled up in such a way as to be satisfactory to the churchwardens.” On the 17 February 1842, Mr. Bentley, the churchwarden, confirmed that he had received stained glass from “Mr. Norgate” (John Norgate, of St Stephen’s Street, wine-trader and owner of public houses in the parishes of St Stephen and
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674 ‘The Gothic Windows of Cholmondeley Castle are enriched with passages from St. Barbara’s Life’; Stevenson, 1807.
St Giles), and “it was resolved that the same be placed in the space in the east window, and that the thanks of the meeting be given to Mr. Norgate for his handsome gift.”

Import History:

There are two possible scenarios. The glass may have been imported by William Stevenson, who was providing glass for Costessey chapel between 1807 and 1808, such an import could be related to the installation of similar glass by the architect William Wilkins at Dalmeny House near Edinburgh after 1815, and Wilkins’s various installations of similar glass in Cambridge in his home and Corpus Christi College Chapel in the mid-1820s. A scenario more likely to be consistent with the later installation date is that the St Stephen’s glass is part of a post-1815 importation arranged by William Wilkins and Sir Jeffry Wyattville to satisfy the requirements of their numerous Gothic Revival architectural projects. The agents, as with earlier imports, would have been the Stevenson’s (father and son), acting with C.F. Häussermann. The import hub was, as previously, Norwich. This may explain the availability of the stained glass to Norgate, but the explanation of the late installation date for the stained glass may lie in the fact that William Wilkins died in 1839. Wilkins can be linked to almost all of the Mariawald Abbey glass, and these panels may well be part of his disbanded art collection that had been documented in part by Waagen in 1838.
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Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire)

Introduction to the building:

St. Mary’s Shrewsbury was a collegiate church since the thirteenth century. It was built and altered over a period of five hundred years, and is now in the care of the Churches Conservation Trust. The church contains the most comprehensive, installation of Continental stained glass in the United Kingdom (Fig. App. I.34-35). Williams’s study of 2000 provides a history of the building that should be read together with that by Newman. The installations of imported Continental stained glass were the work of one man, the Rev. William Gorsuch Rowland (1770–1851), who took over the church from his friend the Rev. Hugh Owen (1761–1827) in 1829. Rowland was at St. Mary’s from 1829 until his death in 1851, and his first recorded stained glass installations were English from Winchester College Chapel or commissioned by him from the Shrewsbury stained-glass artist David Evans (1793–1861) and is dated 1829. The acquisition of the Altenberg and St. Apern stained glass installed in two windows of the church is the subject of Case Study 2 in chapter III; this entry gives an overview of the other stained glass in the church. Rowland’s influence on the fabric of St Mary’s was dramatic. The church had last been restored in 1818 under the Rev. John Brickdale Blakeway (1765–1826), incumbent between 1784 and 1826 Rowland inherited a church with practically no stained glass; this was to change, particularly in the 1840s.

---

The Stained Glass:

Pidgeon described the stained glass in St. Mary’s in his *Memorials of Shrewsbury* of 1837.\(^{682}\) He noted three figures from Winchester College Chapel installed in the three lancet window on the north side of the choir.\(^{683}\) In the east window of the choir he recorded the Genealogy of Christ (from Old St. Chad’s, Shrewsbury), that a rearrangement was in progress, and that “to complete the genealogical line additional figures will be added, and the lower tier of arches in the window, formally filled with brickwork, have been opened to their base”.\(^{684}\) Pidgeon noted that the triple windows of the north and south transepts are filled with small full-length figures, the glass dated 1829, that the south transept being a gift from W.G. Rowland. “The windows of this and the north transept were executed by Mr. D. Evans, of Shrewsbury, and may be considered as some of the finest specimens of the art in the kingdom.”\(^{685}\)

In 1851, Pidgeon republished his *Memorials of Shrewsbury*. The east window is described again, but with the additional remarks on the rearrangement of 1837, other figures had been added, and that the work, done “by the able hands of Mr. D. Evans”, financed by W.G. Rowland. The triple-lancet window on the north side of the choir is now “filled with fourteen subjects of the life of S. Bernard”, and the Winchester College Chapel glass is no longer mentioned. The David Evans glass in the transepts is described, but in addition Pidgeon notes that the lancet window westwards “contains a fine figure of the titular Saint of the Church, crowned, and bearing the infant Jesus,

\(^{682}\) Pidgeon, 1837: 45.  
\(^{683}\) Ibid.: 45–46.  
\(^{684}\) Ibid.: 48.  
\(^{685}\) Ibid.: 53.
with her symbol the lily; it is of the richest Munich glass.\textsuperscript{686} Pidgeon describes all the stained glass now installed in the church, firstly the Flemish Horn glass with its David Evans’s additions; then the glass in the south aisle, including the two Altenberg and St Apern windows; then the north aisle installations, including the Trier glass that has been studied by Rauch.\textsuperscript{687} The locations of some panels have changed over time, the rearrangement probably being the work of Archdeacon Lloyd.\textsuperscript{688} Pidgeon also noted that one window had been the gift of Rowland’s brother Daniel Rowland (1778–1859).

\textit{Import History:}

The import and installation of this Continental stained glass deserves a study in itself, the author will not speculate on details here. What can be said is that the Rev. W.G. Rowland was the instigator of the glazing scheme, which he realised in the years between 1837 and 1851. The importance of David Evans cannot be underestimated, as Pidgeon states: “the restoration of the old and the execution of the latter work are fine specimens of Mr. Evans’s skill in this art”.\textsuperscript{689} Evans had acquired the Altenberg glass for Rowland, but whether he was the source of the other glass can currently only be a matter of speculation. The order in which the panels were acquired and installed also requires study, and if archival material from Evans’s studio in Shrewsbury still exist this would be a primary source.

\textsuperscript{686} Pidgeon, 1851: 74–89.  
\textsuperscript{687} Rauch, 1999.  
\textsuperscript{688} Lloyd, 1881: 73. “But I found the south windows much shorter than those in the north aisle, and the change of aspect was impractical without sacrificing some of the glass.”  
\textsuperscript{689} Pidgeon, 1851: 90.
Weeford, Parish Church of St Mary (Staffordshire)

*Introduction to the building:*

In 1804, the *Gentleman’s Magazine* reported that "Weeford church is very soon to be pulled down and rebuilt; and it remains for the *Gentleman’s Magazine* to preserve the recollection of the old edifice" (Fig. App. I.36). William White described Weeford Church in 1851: ("St Mary, is a small neat Gothic edifice, which was rebuilt in 1802, when the east window was embellished with beautiful painted glass, bought from Orleans by Sir Robert Lawley [1768–1834]."

The church was built by Benjamin Wyatt (1755–1813) of Sutton Coldfield, to a design made by his cousin James Wyatt (1746-1813) between 1800 and 1805. The correspondence concerning the building works is now in the William Salt Library, Stafford. The stained glass is now in the south transept window of this much altered and decrepit church. (Fig. App. I.37)

*The Stained Glass:*

In 1807, William Stevenson noted that the stained glass represented Pilate washing his hands, purchased by Sir Robert Lawley, Bart. And donated to his parish church. Pevsner observed that the glass was brought in 1803 from the chapel of the Duke of Orleans near Paris. In the articles of agreement regarding Weeford Church of 1800 it was planned that “the windows to be glazed with green and white Glass in diamonds”. In 1803, in the correspondence between Benjamin and Lewis William Wyatt (1777-
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1853) the need for a window to hold painted glass was recorded: “Pilate washing his hands from the Duke of Orleans’s chapel (Sketch Fig. App. I.38), and, I have not seen the glass but the shape is roughly 7 feet 9 high & and 4 feet 2 wide outside of frame) the dim x of wood frame is 1.75 wide & 1.5 thick”. Benjamin Wyatt concluded that perhaps Mr Eginton had better see it. In November 1803, Benjamin Wyatt from Sutton Coldfield, wrote to Lewis Wyatt, Queen Ann St, London; he wrote; “you did not send me any design for Sir Rob. Lawley’s East end Weeford Church & I have now narrow’d the Openings to 4 ft 9 his window being 4 ft 1 wide and 7 ft 4 ins high ...”, In July 1804, the office Wyatt correspondence states that “Mr Eginton is at labour on the window that Sir Rbt is sent to him & the design agreed upon to complete it’. In the last letter, of 1805, it was stated that Sir Robert Lawley has contributed £463 to the building of Weeford Church, of which £100 was for the east window (Fig. App. I.39).

Import History:

The glass was probably acquired by William Stevenson through J.C. Hampp and his nephew and agent in Paris C.F. Häussermann. Hampp’s account for 17 April 1803 notes: “rec’d CH 16.17.18.19 4 Cases sent from Paris cont’d a collection of 25 Subjects bought for £104”. The stained glass was exhibited by William Stevenson at 97 Pall Mall and acquired by Sir Robert Lawley.
York, York Minster (North Yorkshire) The Crucifixion Window (CVMA sVI)

Introduction to the building:

The glass was part of an extensive gift of stained glass by Dean Eric Milner-White. The was installed between 1952 and 1953 in the south aisle window sVI, of York Minster where it now forms a memorial to Bishop Philip Lloyd (1884-1952) of St Albans and his brother.

The Stained Glass:

The window contains three lights 3.65m high and 0.6m wide "taken from the Choir of the church of St Jean of Rouen where it was presented by Mons. Pierre St. Lament".\(^{701}\) The glass was previously installed in the church of St Mary the Virgin, Rickmansworth. In the early nineteenth century, Clutterbuck described St Mary’s as a “normal English parish church needing some embellishment”.\(^{702}\) Redecoration may have been necessary as a result of arson in the sixteenth century: “Possibly in the first half of 1522 the church of St Mary’s, Rickmansworth was severely damaged by arsonists, and the iconoclasts setting fire to images in the church.”\(^{703}\) The purchase of the stained glass was organised by the then vicar, the Rev. E. Hodgson (vicar 1805–53). The glass was installed in 1806. In 1807, William Stevenson stated that “The inhabitants of Rickmansworth have also enriched their chancel by subscription.”\(^{704}\) In 1815, Clutterbuck noted in his History of the Antiquities of the County of Hertford that the window had been “purchased by the Rev. Edward
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\(^{701}\) Westlake, 1879-94: IV, 65.
\(^{702}\) Clutterbuck, 1815: I, 203.
\(^{703}\) Aston, 1993: 231.
\(^{704}\) Stevenson, 1807.
Hodgson, the present Vicar, and his parishioners”.  

The glass was actually illustrated reversed, but with the leading and the format of the original Rickmansworth installation accurately rendered. The glass was reinstalled after building work in the church in 1825: “Above the altar was reinstalled the three-light stained glass window which had been put into the old church in 1806 by Rev Edward Hodgson” (Fig. App. I.40). In 1848, Lewis erroneously stated that the glass was “originally from St Peter’s at Rome, and purchased in Paris, in 1800, for £200”. Westlake concluded that the glass was “placed there in 1806 by the Rev. Edward Hodgson, who purchased it for 150 guineas”. The 1851 *Post Office Directory for Hertfordshire* noted that the glass was “purchased for 100 guineas, and was a monument of the Monmouth family”. The window was removed when St Mary’s was rebuilt in 1889–90, and went into storage until it was sold in 1952 to the Dean and Chapter of York Minster, through the agency of the dean, Eric Milner-White (Fig. App. I.41).

*Import History:*

The glass was acquired by William Stevenson with his son Seth William, and import was arranged by J.C. Hampp. S.W. Stevenson wrote in 1815: “The two churches of St Jean and St Nicholas were magazines for wool, when, on my former visit, we inspected their fine stained glass windows and, for myself, I am not ashamed of avowing a participation in the employment of taking many of these tasteful donations of Catholic bounty from their mouldering frames, and
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705 Clutterbuck, 1815: I, 203.
packing them up (1802) for a voyage to England, where the chief part now serve to enrich the windows of our Protestant Churches.709

**The Visitation Window (CVMA sIII)**

Introduction to the building:

The glass was installed in sIII, the east window of south aisle, of York Minster as a gift to the Dean and Chapter of York by Frederick Howard, 5th Earl of Carlisle in 1806 (Figs App. I.44).

The Stained Glass:

William Stevenson wrote an account of this window in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* for 1806 (Fig. App. I.42): "This fine Picture (for so it may be called), was bought at Rouen in Normandy, and originally adorned the East window of the church of St. Nicholas in that place."710 Stevenson’s eulogy continued: "It is now placed in the East window of the South aisle in York Cathedral, opposite Archbishop Bowet’s monument, through the opening of which, when it is seen, confined as it were within a magnificent Gothic frame, the effect is enchanting; nor are its beauties in the least eclipsed by the other brilliant windows with which that matchless pile abounds. From the roundness and bold relief of the figures, which are as large as life, and the richness of the colouring, it is esteemed by those who are conversant with the works of that master, to be the design of Sebastian del Piombo, the inventor of painting on walls in oil, who lived in the most utmost esteem with Pope Clement VIII. Was the great favourite of Michael Angelo Buonaroti, and whose martyrdom of
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709 Stevenson, 1817: 32.
710 Stevenson, 1806.
St. Agatha is pronounced equal to the best works of Raphael, Titian, or any of the great masters. William Stevenson later confirmed the purchase, in the Gentleman’s Magazine for 1807, stating: “I send you an account of some purchases made at the Warehouse, 97, Pall Mall. The following were presented, The Visitation, by the Earl of Carlisle to the Dean and Chapter of York”. The glass was sold in 1802 from 97 Pall Mall and an illustration of the glass formed the cover to the first Pall Mall stained glass catalogue, of December 1804, which was it was “respectfully dedicated by the Proprietors” to the Earl of Carlisle.

Import History:

The glass originated from the church of Saint-Nicolas in Rouen, and was bought at Rouen in 1802. The glass was acquired by William Stevenson with his son Seth William; import was arranged by J.C. Hampp and is documented in detail by Seth William Stevenson in his book Journal of a Tour through Part of France, Flanders, and Holland, including a Visit to Paris. Saint-Nicolas was demolished in 1840.
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App.I.3 Interior Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Chapel, (Cambridgeshire) (1820’s).
CVMA. Chapel J. 37a-d.
App.I.7. Stained Glass in Malpas Parish Church. Cheshire. CVMA. nII.1c.
App.I.8. The silhouette of Costessey Hall and Chapel (Norfolk); today. Costessey Golf Course (Google Earth 2012).

App.I.12. Stained Glass from Mariawald Cloister (Eifel), Stockport, Parish Church of St Mary, Disley (Cheshire). CVMA. I.
App.I.15. Stained Glass from Rouen, 'St John the Evangelist', Glasgow, Burrell Collection (Glasgow).

App.I.18. The East Front, Hingham, Parish Church of St Andrew (Norfolk).
App.I.19. Sketch by the author: Probable Five Light Window prior to 1820, Hingham, Parish Church of St Andrew (Norfolk).

App.I.21. East Window of the Chancel, Hingham, Parish Church of St Andrew (Norfolk). CVMA. I.
App.I.22. Exterior, Kimberley, Parish Church of St Peter (Norfolk).
App.I.24. Stained glass from Herkenrode (Belgium), Plan of the original installation (1811).
App.I.27. Stained glass from Mariawald Cloister (Eifel), London (Kensington and Chelsea), Victoria & Albert Museum.

App.I.31. Stained Glass from St Apern, Cologne, Marston Bigot, Parish Church of St Leonard (Somerset), (Taübe, 2007, Cat.No. 69). CVMA. I.
App.I.32. Stained Glass from Mariawald Abbey (Eifel), East Window, Norwich, Parish Church of St Stephen (Norfolk). CVMA. I.
App.I.33. Stained Glass from Mariawald Abbey (Eifel), Detail East Window, Norwich, Parish Church of St Stephen (Norfolk). CVMA. I.
App.I.34. Shrewsbury, Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire).

App.I.35. The St. Bernard Triple Lancet Window; Shrewsbury Parish Church of St Mary (Shropshire).
App.I.36. Old St Mary, Weeford, Parish Church of St Mary (Staffordshire), (GM, 1804, p.113).


App.I.39. Weeford Church on completion, Weeford, Parish Church of St Mary (Staffordshire), (WSL.SV XII.13a).
App. I.40. Stained glass from Rouen; the Crucifixion, St Mary’s, Rickmansworth, (Clutterbuck, 1815, p.203).
App.I.42. The Visitation Window. York, York Minster (York). CVMA. sIII,
APPENDIX II

Four Portraits:
William Stevenson and Seth William Stevenson,
Johann Christoph Hampp,
and Christoph Friedrich Häussermann

WILLIAM STEVENSON (1750–1821)\textsuperscript{716}

William Stevenson was a printer, bookseller and banker in
Norwich, the eldest son of the Rev. Seth Ellis Stevenson, of East
Retford (Nottinghamshire), Rector of Treswell in the same county.
He trained as a drawing master and studied under Sir Joshua
Reynolds. A professional painter of miniatures in Bury St Edmunds
from 1774 to 1782, he exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1777
and 1778 and had a drawing academy at 100 Pottergate Street,
Norwich, in 1782. He was a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries and
the proprietor of The Norfolk Chronicle for thirty-five years, from
1786 until his death.\textsuperscript{717} Stevenson became a freeman as a stationer
on 24 February 1786, by purchase, and advertised as a bookseller
in the Market Place, Norwich, at the “Medicinal Warehouse” and at
the “Norfolk Arms”.\textsuperscript{718} He became a sheriff in 1799 and in the
same year made his first gift of stained glass, to the church of St
Stephen.\textsuperscript{719} The engagement of the Stevensons (father and son)

\textsuperscript{716} Allthorpe-Guyton, 1984: 40
\textsuperscript{717} Chamber, 1829: 1292.
\textsuperscript{718} Stoker, 1981.
\textsuperscript{719} See Appendix I, entry for Norwich, Parish Church of St Stephen (p.261), and
Harford, 1904: 339.
in press and cultural matters was significant, and has been documented by Allthorpe-Guyton;\textsuperscript{720} of particular note was their involvement in the politics of the period, where they stood for rigorous Protestant and high Tory interests.

As far as this study is concerned, the significance of William Stevenson’s career lay in his substantial contribution to the development of the trade in Continental stained glass and the marketing and sales of its products. The relationship between Stevenson and J.C. Hampp, a businessman and buyer in Europe, has been studied extensively, but it was certainly Stevenson who developed the aesthetics of the market, the distribution network, and the marketing of the European product, this being a logical extension of his earlier activities in the buying and selling of English stained glass.\textsuperscript{721} In 1808, Owen noted the result of Stevenson’s strategy: “A splendid assortment of stained glass, collected chiefly from Rouen, by Mr. Stevenson, of Norwich, was exhibited in Pall Mall, in the years 1802 and 1803.\textsuperscript{722} In 1909, Lefrançois confirmed this,\textsuperscript{723} and in 1924 Fletcher quoted La Quérière, written in 1841, who identified Stevenson and Hampp as the importers of the glass exhibited at Pall Mall.\textsuperscript{724} The nature of the business relationship between Stevenson and Hampp is unclear, although it appears it was a relationship of equals. Confirmation of this may be seen in a note in Hampp’s account book for May 1804 for a joint account for £1,732. 18. 0; Hampp notes: “Mr Stevenson

\textsuperscript{720} “but indispensable support and publicity to the literary, musical and artistic interests which they wished to promote”; Allthorpe-Guyton, 1984: 39.
\textsuperscript{721} King, 2010: 13.
\textsuperscript{722} Owen, 1808: 246.
\textsuperscript{723} Lefrançois, 1909.
\textsuperscript{724} Fletcher, 1924: 243–44; La Quérière, 1841: II, 249.
mostly in cash this day £876. 9. 0”. An example of Stevenson selling one of Hampp’s panels is also noted in Hampp’s account book: “Mr. Stevenson sold in London The Virgin & Child in Ruby M’ Long, £63. 28 February 1803”.  

Powell was critical of Stevenson in relation to his English and Continental activities, and particularly with regard to the chapel at Costessey Hall (Norfolk). Powell described Stevenson as “a tradesman and alderman of Norwich and lately a great dealer in painted glass, the plunderer of all the painted glass particularly in the Norfolk churches he could legally lay his hands on no matter how, fitted up the windows of this chapel”. Powell also commented upon Stevenson’s exhibition techniques in London (see p. 82) but despite his reservations, privately acquired stained glass from him: “I myself laid out some money with him and possess about six very fine subjects amongst which a crucifixion.” Stevenson’s exhibition and sales outlet at 97 Pall Mall London attracted widespread attention, as was noted by Owen. Stevenson was active both as a salesman and an antiquary, but clearly not patient, as is witnessed by his correspondence with the Rev. John Brand, Resident Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries in 1802. His gift for self-promotion is reflected in his articles for the Gentleman’s Magazine, particularly that regarding the Visitation window in York Minster; see Appendix I: York, York Minster, p.235.

---

726 BL, Additional MS. 17462: 331, 332, 334.
727 King, 2004: 121.
728 See chapter II, and Stevenson 1806.
729 See Appendix I, entry for Lichfield, Lichfield Cathedral (p.239).
730 Evans, 1956: 221.
Stevenson’s significance in the development of the stained-glass trade during the opening decades of the nineteenth century lies primarily in the network he established, particularly through his membership and lifelong involvement with the Society of United Friars in Norwich and its lodge in London.\textsuperscript{731} His introduction to the society was probably facilitated through his professional interest in painting and friendship with the London portrait painter Sir William Beechey (1753-1839), a founder member of the society, who lived in Norwich 1782–87.\textsuperscript{732} Beechey was to be influential in obtaining the Corpus Christi College Chapel contract for William Wilkins (1778-1839), whose father (also William) was like Beechey a founding member of the Society of United Friars, being its abbot in 1791.\textsuperscript{733} Humphrey Repton (1752-1818) was also a member, from 1788,\textsuperscript{734} as was from 1892 his son John Adey Repton (1775-1860),\textsuperscript{735} who was instrumental in having Continental stained glass installed in Blickling Church.\textsuperscript{736}

William Stevenson was a member of the society from 1785 until his death in 1821, and its abbot between 1802 and 1803. He died on 13 May 1821 at Norwich, and was lauded in an obituary in the \textit{Gentleman’s Magazine} in the same year.\textsuperscript{737}

\textsuperscript{731} It is described on the National Archives website as "a society for the promotion of intellectual culture and social fellowship"; http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/records.aspx?cat=153-col&cid=10#10 (accessed April 2012). Its ceremonies were mock medieval, with each member assuming the habit of a monastic order.
\textsuperscript{732} Allthorpe-Guyton, 1984: 40.
\textsuperscript{733} NRO, COL/9/5.
\textsuperscript{734} NRO, COL 9/43.
\textsuperscript{735} NRO, COL/9/193/1.
\textsuperscript{736} See Appendix I, entry for Blickling and Erpingham, (p.207).
\textsuperscript{737} “The circle of his friends and correspondents was large and respectable; by whom he will be much missed and sincerely regretted... Mr Stevenson was an able and industrious Antiquary”; Anon.,1821: 472-73.
SETH WILLIAM STEVENSON (1784–1853)\textsuperscript{738}

Stevenson Jr probably did not inherit his father’s artistic tendencies. He was clearly priggish, but was also eloquent in his defences of what he believed in. His high Tory credentials were clear after the enactment of the Reform Act of 1832,\textsuperscript{739} as were his Protestant ones in relation to the import of stained glass from Rouen in 1802.\textsuperscript{740} His cultural attitudes can perhaps be encapsulated from his \textit{Norfolk Chronicle} article of 29 July 1820: "We have a most dedicated preference for the chaste and sober style over everything, however elegant and captivating, which partakes in the slightest degree of gaudiness and flutter."\textsuperscript{741} As far as the stained glass trade is concerned, to all intents and purposes he maintained and extended the network established by his father, moving the activities into a second generation. He was a member of the Society of United Friars 1813–28, becoming prior in 1815 and abbot in 1818. Stevenson began to read his “Journal of a Tour on the Continent made in the summer of 1816’, starting on 17 September 1816 and concluding on 25 March 1817,\textsuperscript{742} where he related his involvement in the acquisition of Rouen stained glass with his father and J.C. Hampp. Stevenson was the prior when the United Friars were disbanded in 1828.\textsuperscript{743}

The significance of the Society of United Friars was the extensive network it supported, as illustrated in chapter II. William

\textsuperscript{738} Allthorpe-Guyton, 1984: 40.
\textsuperscript{739} “If England may be saved at all, she will be saved by the conservatives. Now is their day–now is their hour”; \textit{Norfolk Chronicle}, 17 November 1832.
\textsuperscript{740} Stevenson, 1817: 32.
\textsuperscript{741} \textit{Norfolk Chronicle}, 29 July 1820.
\textsuperscript{742} NRO, COL 9/2.
\textsuperscript{743} NRO, COL/9/5.
Wilkins, who around 1818 installed the Mariawald stained glass at Dalmeny House, Edinburgh, was prior of the United Friars in 1822, two years before starting work on Corpus Christi Chapel, Cambridge, where he installed further Rhenish stained glass. Wilkins was on intimate terms with Jeffry Wyatt (later Sir Jeffry Wyattville). J.A. Repton was likewise a member of the society of United Friars. Stevenson was on intimate terms with Christoph Friedrich Häussermann, the nephew and heir of J.C. Hampp, who like him represented a second generation of stained-glass importers. Stevenson made a trip through Europe with Häussermann in 1825, after Hampp’s death. Stevenson Jr, Wilkins, Wyatt and Repton were all closely involved in the installation of Rhenish stained glass after 1815.

Stevenson was elected city sheriff of Norwich in 1828 and mayor in 1832. Apart from his activity in the field of stained glass, he made a significant contribution to the study of numismatics. In 1836, he became a member of the Numismatic Society, and his life’s work, A Dictionary of Roman Coins Republican and Imperial, was published posthumously in 1889. Stevenson died at Cambridge on 22 December 1853.

---

744 Liscombe, 1974: 398.  
745 Stevenson, 1827.  
746 Anon., 1854.
History has treated John Christopher Hampp shabbily. He was a conscientious and successful businessman, religious, and active in parish poor support. But one entry in his account book for 1802–1804 has dammed him; for 4 March 1803 we see: “of Cologne, By 6 Boxes of Glass £267 1 3, ditto Hams [£]5 11, ditto, and 30 March 1803, Donation to their Church [£]25”. Hampp has been accused of bribery, as £25 was a considerable sum. The reality is that he that was probably paying out of conscience for plain glass, as he had done in Rouen a year earlier, to weather proof a church after stained glass had been removed.\footnote{747}

Wandel’s 1995 study documents Hampp’s early years carefully, and confirms the close extended-family network that existed in Marbach am Neckar.\footnote{748} Significant for this investigation is that in 1762 Hampp’s father (1716–1781) made a marriage dowry contract for his daughter for 50% of the property at Markstrasse 7 in Marbach, which was a butcher’s shop. In 1766, his daughter Euphrosina Dorothea (1741–1808) bought the remaining 50%. Euphrosina’s husband was Georg Adam Häussermann, who was father of Christoph Friedrich Häussermann, the future contact partner on the continent for J.C. Hampp in his textile and stained glass businesses.

\footnote{747} “...were all taken away in 1802, during the peace of Amiens, at the cost only of glazing the empty spaces, by an Englishman named Hampp”; Woodforde, 1939: 80, following La Quérière 1821: I, 213.

About 1775, Hampp went to train as a merchant, under the supervision of Casper Johann Fredrich Thode, to Hamburg, where he probably learnt English. (Thode was married to Elizabeth Thode neé Webster from Pledwick near Wakefield, Yorkshire.) Hampp’s father died in 1781, and in his will it was stated that Hampp was “gegenwärtig in Norwich, in Engeland liegend, als Handlungsbedienter” (‘resident in Norwich in England, as a businessman’). Hampp’s mother died in 1783, and listed in the inventory of her possessions was a portrait “Von Sohn in Engelland” (‘of (my) son in England’).

Kent has documented Hampp’s success on arriving in Norwich: “for in 1782 we find him described as of No. 2 Red Well Street in the Parish of St. Michael at Plea, Norwich. He was admitted to the freedom of the City on 9 November 1793, as a worsted-weaver ‘not apprenticed’; this means that he was admitted ‘by purchase’ on payment of a fee.” In 1784, Hampp moved to the parish of St Giles, to 41 St Giles Street (at the corner of Fisher Lane), from which address he ran his textile and stained-glass businesses. Hampp was active in the French Walloon church in Norwich (disbanded in 1832), and in 1809 was registered as a deacon of the church, together with Philip Medows Martineau. In 1802, he had been elected as one of the “guardians of the poor” for Mancroft ward, and he attended their weekly committees.

---

750 Wandel. The will of Hampp’s mother: Stadt A M Inventuren und Teilungen No. 1517 (ex Fasz. 68 No.10).
752 Kent, 1937b: 193.
753 Moens, 1888: 149.
754 Ibid., Kent.
had made his will and testament on 2 November 1824. He continued to live at the St Giles Street address until his death in 1824 and was buried in St Giles’s church. The executors of his will were William Lewis Lohr and Hampp’s nephew Christoph Fredrich Häussermann (see below), who had first lived in Paris and later lived in Ebley near Stroud (Gloucestershire).

Hampp’s character is recorded by Sir James Edward Smith in 1786. In the parliamentary election of 15 September that year, Hampp was actively involved in supporting Sir Thomas Beevor (1726-1814), who lost however by 67 votes to Henry Hobart. Smith recorded his impressions of Hampp in verse, and Hampp was, in his words, “a cordial friend ... [who was] a German by birth, and who’s broken English is happily imitated”. Smith’s verses paint a sympathetic portrait of Hampp in the election campaign, and defined his status in Norwich. “Freemen and freemen’s wives and friends repair, And pay due reverence to the leathern chair; For there presides, with face of Belgic stamp, That son of Liberty–Bavarian Hampp”. Smith continued to describe Hampp’s political and business acumen with verses such as “He knows each wise contrivance to a hair” to “and therefore as a manager right able, He claims attention at the council table”. The verses however sank slowly into caricature.

755 “Died at his house in St. Giles, Norwich, aged 75, Mr. John Christopher Hampp, a native of Germany, many years an eminent merchant in the city, and a liberal benefactor of the poor”; Kent 1937a: 196.
757 Smith, 1832: 168–72.
758 From line 12.
759 Line 18.
760 Lines 22–23.
761 Lines 30–31: “Till hearing something said about the Diet, They thought the supper coming, and were quiet”.
Hampp’s almost legendary status in the stained-glass trade at the turn of the nineteenth century is based not only on his account book of 1802–1804, but also on the auction catalogues of sales at 97 Pall Mall, London, a showroom run by his business partner William Stevenson. Hampp recorded his stained-glass sources in Paris; Lenoir and Tailleur (through Häussermann) in Rouen; Romberg, in Aachen, Oelmecher and in Cologne from Peter Bemberg. In 1804, Hampp bought glass from Bemberg for a total of £482 1s. 6d.. As outlined in chapter II, Hampp and Bemberg were involved in the same professions – the acquisition and trade in textiles and stained glass, and theirs was to prove a long standing relationship. Indeed, the business was to be carried over to the next generation, resulting in further imports of Rhenish stained glass after the lifting of the Continental Blockade in 1815.

Hampp appears to have been proactive as a businessman not only on his own behalf, but also in relation to William Stevenson, acquiring as he did stained glass for Stevenson through his Continental trade network. As stated above, Hampp and Stevenson divided the importation costs 50:50, with Stevenson selling his glass in London, and Hampp supplying the local market from his warehouse in Fisher Lane, Norwich. Like Stevenson and his son Seth William Stevenson, Hampp’s interest in the stained-glass import business was taken over by his nephew Christoph Friedrich Häussermann (see below).

---

CHRISTOPH FRIEDRICH HÄUSSERMANN (1772–1842)

Häussermann was the son of J.C. Hampp’s sister Euphrosina Dorothea (1741–1808) and Georg Adam Häussermann (d.1822), a butcher from Marbach am Necker. The earliest record of stained-glass-related business between uncle and nephew was recorded by Hampp in 1802: “June 1 1802, Boɪ at Amiens & Hausermann of Lenoir, £3 and 17 April 1803, Glass Account, recd from Hausermann CH 16.17.18.19 4 Cases sent from Paris cont’ a collection of 25 Subjects bought for £104”.

According to his mother’s will, Häussermann was living in Paris in 1802, and he was still in the city in 1808. According to his father’s will, in 1822 Häussermann was in in Ebley near Stroud (Gloucestershire). His reasons for being in Ebley are clear: the early 1820s were peak years in the Gloucestershire woollen industry, with more than 140 manufacturers in the county. Trade competition between the manufacturers in Germany, Flanders, France and England was fierce, and uncle and nephew were certainly involved, until the market broke and the larger manufacturers cut out the middlemen after 1824.

The importance of the relationship with Hampp is reflected in the fact that as executor of Hampp’s estate after the latter’s death in 1824, Häussermann received £300 for his services; when all funeral costs had been deducted, Hampp’s remaining capital was turned into cash and invested, and the annual interest thereon was

---
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764 Wandel (StadtA M Inventuren und Teilungen No. 2288).
765 Wandel (StadtA M Inventuren und Teilungen No. 2686).
766 Tann, 1967: 54
767 Gell and Bradshaw, 1820.
given to Häussermann for the rest of his life. On Häussermann’s
death in 1842 the remaining capital was distributed among some of
Hampp’s relations.768

The relationship between Häussermann and Seth William
Stevenson is obscure, but one year after Hampp’s death they toured
Europe together. Stevenson wrote: “On the 12 of July [1825],
accompanied by my friend, Mr Häussermann, I set out from Paris on
a journey to Milan. We travelled extra poste, in an English built
calèche, taking the high road from Fontainebleau.”769 They later
corresponded, exchanging data for Stevenson’s book about their
tour.770 Stevenson and Häussermann were involved in the import of
Continental stained glass from 1802 onwards, continuing and
supporting the network established by the previous generation, with
Haüssermann as buyer and Stevenson as distributor through London
and the Society of United Friars network.

Wandel has documented Häussermann’s apparently itinerant
life, from Paris to Ebley, Norwich, Stuttgart (in 1827) and his home
town of Marbach am Neckar. In 1832, he applied to the authorities
in Marbach for a six-year permit to reside in Frankfurt am Main. He
had moved there by 1837, when he was registered at Lange Strasse
A, 100,771 but in 1841 he was no longer registered. In 1842, he was
recorded in the Marbach family register as “missing”, being

769 Stevenson, 1827: 1.
770 Letters from Häussermann to Stevenson dated 20 December 1825 and 9 June
1827, BL, Additional MS. 74734 T, partly quoted or paraphrased in Stevenson
1827.
771 Frankfurt am Main, Stadtsarchiv, address books for 1837/38.
apparently 70 years old and assumed dead; his death was confirmed by the Marbach court in 1844.\textsuperscript{772}

\textsuperscript{772} Ludwigsburg, Stadtarchiv, F 282 I Bü 302.
App.II.1. Diagram of relationships between the involved parties.
### List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>British Library, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>British Museum, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Canterbury Library, Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVMA</td>
<td>Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERYALSS</td>
<td>East Riding of Yorkshire Archives and Local Studies Service, Beverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum, Department of Manuscripts and Printed Books, Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Gentleman’s Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAD</td>
<td>Hackney Archives Department, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMA</td>
<td>London Metropolitan Archives, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRO</td>
<td>Lichfield Record Office, Lichfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAL</td>
<td>National Art Library (Victoria &amp; Albert Museum), London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLW</td>
<td>National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPG</td>
<td>National Portrait Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQ</td>
<td>Notes and Queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRO</td>
<td>Norfolk Record Office, Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Public Record Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCHME</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Historical Monuments England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIBA/LDAC</td>
<td>Royal Institute of British Architects/Library, Drawings and Archives Collections, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLUB</td>
<td>Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Dresden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRO</td>
<td>Staffordshire Record Office, Stafford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLL</td>
<td>University College London, Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYA</td>
<td>West Yorkshire Archive, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSL</td>
<td>William Salt Library, Stafford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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