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This research explores the world of Thomas and Drake, a transatlantic art dealership formed by landscape painter George Grosvenor Thomas (1856-1923), his son Roy Thomas (1886-1952), and glass-painter and glazier Wilfred Drake (1879-1948). Together, they were the only art dealers to have specialised solely in the selling and adaptation of Medieval and Renaissance stained glass during the first half of the twentieth century, and did so on an unprecedented scale. Handling thousands of panels, their stock now underpins many collections worldwide, underlining their status as exceptionally important and prolific vendors.

This thesis provides an in-depth and sustained study of the activities of Thomas and Drake, and its predecessor, the Grosvenor Thomas collection. Unravelling their rich stock, often sourced from English country houses (often from those that were the receptacles for high-quality displaced continental stained glass, collected by British aristocrats during the early nineteenth century), this work provides part of the next chapter in the story of the trade and dispersal of European glazing schemes. Stained glass is situated as an important interior design element, especially popular in the revival style mansions of the extremely wealthy, where other original architectonic salvages from once great country estates were also accommodated. The ways in which their stock was physically transformed, both before and after sale, is revealed, as well as the firm’s origins, operations, collaborators, and customers.

Sustained analysis of the different phases of collecting undertaken by Glasgow-born William Burrell (1861-1958), the firm’s most longstanding customer (and founder of the internationally significant Burrell Collection museum) illustrates Thomas and Drake’s work in context. This is enhanced by new reconstructions of the layout and glazing of Burrell’s final home, Hutton Castle (Scottish Borders), and transcriptions of the extensive correspondence between Wilfred Drake and William Burrell have been reproduced in full for the first time.
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## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. **Unknown, *images of the Thomas family while in Australia and China*, c. 1855-65, photographs, dimensions unknown, all private collection, David Ockleshaw.**

2. **Unknown, *paintings of Grosvenor Thomas and his family*, c.1860-1865, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown, all private collection, David Ockleshaw.**

3. **John Beattie, *portrait of John George Thomas taken in Bristol*, 1868, photograph, dimensions unknown, private collection, David Ockleshaw.**

4. **Unknown, *interior views of the Lady’s (above) and the men’s (below) cooling rooms at the Earls Court Turkish Baths after the business had been taken over by Archibald James*, 1927, dimensions unknown, images originally published in *The Hydro*, and shared by Malcolm Shifrin.**

5. **Thomas Annan and Sons, (descending) *Grosvenor Thomas in Glasgow*, photograph, c.1886, dimensions unknown; *Roy Grosvenor Thomas in Glasgow*, photograph, c.1895, dimensions unknown, both private collection, David Ockleshaw.**

6. **Grosvenor Thomas, (descending) *The Mill*, 1917, oil on canvas, 71 x 94.5 cm, now at GMRC, Glasgow, image courtesy of GMRC; *Gathering Bait, Kintyre*, unknown date, oil on board, 22 x 31 cm, now at the Royal Edinburgh College of Physicians, image courtesy of artuk.org.**

7. **Unknown, *Grosvenor Thomas at work in his studio*, c.1890s, photograph, unknown dimensions, private collection, David Ockleshaw.**

8. **Grosvenor Thomas, *Cluden Mill*, c. 1907, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of Getty Images print collection.**


10. **Unknown, (left to right) *Grosvenor’s daughter Dorothy Grosvenor Thomas*; and, *his wife Matilda Jane Thomas in London*, c.1910, photographs, unknown dimensions; (below) Phillip Burne Jones, *sketch of Matilda Jane Thomas*, c.1910, pencil and charcoal, dimensions unknown, both private collection, David Ockleshaw.**

12. Unknown, (left to right) *Scenes from the lives of Saint Nicasius and Saint Eutropia*, French thirteenth century, stained glass, each panel 68 x 78 cm, now on display at the Gardner Museum, Boston (C28s2), image courtesy of The Gardner Museum; *panels from the same source*, French thirteenth century, stained glass, dimensions unknown, now at the Louvre (Paris), images courtesy of Getty Images.

13. Unknown, *Saints Quirinius and George*, Ochre Court (RI), German sixteenth-century, stained glass, dimensions unknown, remaining *in situ* in the staircase window at Ochre Court, images courtesy of Marie Stumpff.

14. Unknown, *Grosvenor Thomas’s ‘Maximilian series’, originally from the Chapel of the Holy Blood, Bruges*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 180 x 89.7 cm each panel, now at the V&A (c.441-1918), image courtesy of the V&A.

15. Unknown, *examples of some of Grosvenor’s fifteenth-century English alabaster and stone carvings*, (left to right, descending) *part of a figure group depicting the Apostles, St John’s Head, Adoration of the Virgin, St John’s Head*, dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 47.

16. Unknown, (left to right, descending) *the First Miracle of St. Nicholas, Geldulph de Nausnydere with Saint Geldulph, Catherine Boelen with Saint Catherine*, Dutch sixteenth century, stained glass, 70 x 47 cm each, now at the V&A (c.211-213-1908), images courtesy of the V&A.

17. Unknown, *St Peter*, French thirteenth-century, stained glass, 121 x 54 cm, now at the V&A (c.727-1909), image courtesy of the V&A.

18. Unknown, *composite grisaille*, English thirteenth-century, stained glass, 107 x 32 cm, now at the V&A (c.278-1911), image courtesy of the V&A.

19. Unknown, *Entry into Jerusalem*, German fourteenth-century, stained glass, 71 x 52 cm, now at the V&A (c.200-1912), image courtesy of the V&A.


21. Unknown, *Return of the Prodigal Son*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 21 cm diameter, now at the V&A (c.386-1912), image courtesy of the V&A.
22. Unknown, *composite window depicting Apostles and Saints*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 355.6 x 203.8 cm overall, now at the MMA, New York (12.210.1a-bb), image courtesy of the MMA.

23. Unknown, *Disciples in the Upper Room*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 105.4 x 167.6 cm, now at the MMA (52/75), image courtesy of the MMA.


26. Unknown, *Virgin and Child*, German fifteenth century, stained glass, 152.4 x 60.3 cm overall, now at the MMA (41.170.93), image courtesy of the MMA.

27. Unknown, (left to right, descending) *the Deposition, the Entombment, the Visitation, the Nativity*, German fifteenth century, stained glass, each scene approximately 110x 74 cm overall, now at the MMA (13.64.1-4, a-b), image courtesy of the MMA.

28. Unknown, *Mordecai Overhears the Conspiracy*, Dutch sixteenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 19.2 cm, note the number 51, its exhibition number, still on the surface of the glass in the bottom right corner, now at the Chicago Institute of Art (1937.863), image courtesy of Chicago Institute.

29. Unknown, ‘*bearded head* from Wilton Church, Wiltshire’, English or French twelfth century, stained glass, 46 x 27 cm, now at the Burrell Collection, Glasgow (45/1), image courtesy of GMRC.

30. Wilfred Drake, (left to right) *composite window with St Protasius and with St George*, colour drawings, dimensions unknown, images from a surviving Thomas and Drake album, SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 52.

31. Unknown, *Beatrice Von Falkenburg*, English thirteenth century, stained glass, 60x 26 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/2), image courtesy of GMRC.

32. Unknown, *Tree of Jesse*, French sixteenth century, 180 x 65 cm each light, now at the Burrell Collection (45/393-94), image courtesy of GMRC.
33. Unknown, *St John the Evangelist*, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 180 x 65 cm each light, now at the Burrell Collection (45/390-92), image courtesy of GMRC.

34. Unknown, *St Cecilia and the Angels*, German fifteenth-century, stained glass, 77 x 58 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/377), image courtesy of GMRC.

35. Unknown, *voyage to New York, showing Grosvenor, Roy and Winifred Thomas*, 1921, photographs, dimensions unknown, private collection, George Bartlett.

36. Unknown, *return voyage from New York to London, Adam Paff (far right) is shown seated next to Winifred Thomas*, June 1922, photograph, dimensions unknown, private collection, George Bartlett.


38. Unknown, (descending) *Drake and Sons’ workshop, Exeter*, c.1920, photograph, dimensions unknown, private collection, Frances Page; *Drake and Sons workshop today (central building), with salvaged window surrounds still in situ*, 2015, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of British Listed Buildings.

39. Wilfred Drake, *unknown female figure, formerly known as Katherine of Aragon*, watercolour, 28.6 x 14.6 cm, now at the National Portrait Gallery, London (2421), image courtesy of the National Portrait Gallery.

40. Thomas and Drake, *interior views of Wilfred Drake’s Holland Park workshop*, note, some of the roundels pictured here on display were later purchased by the Metropolitan Museum, c.1922, photographs, dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 45. The Drake family still own one of a pair of oriental cabinets shown in these images, which were likely leftovers from Grosvenor’s oriental art business, image of the cabinet by the author, with thanks to Frances Page.

41. Unknown, *the Hanging of Judas*, German sixteenth century, stained glass, 57.2 x 44.6 cm, now at the Chicago Institute (1949.494), image courtesy of the Chicago Institute.

42. Unknown, *Saint [probably Thomas or Matthias]*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, unknown dimensions, now at the St Louis Museum of Art (22.29), image from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50.
43. Unknown, (descending) St Clement, French fourteenth century, stained glass, 72.5 x 58 cm, and, St Nicasius, French fourteenth century, stained glass, 71.5 x 58 cm, both now in the Burrell Collection (45/373-74), images courtesy of GMRC.

44. Unknown, the Apostles Creed, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 563 x 263 cm overall, now at the BMFA (25.213.1-21), image courtesy of the BMFA.

45. Unknown, (descending) Horse and Rider, Dutch sixteenth century, stained glass, 58 x 44 cm, now at the Cranbrook Institute (CEC-693); Arms of Compton, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 39.5 x 28 cm, now at the Cranbrook Institute (CEC-703), images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, stock nos. 13, 665.

46. Thomas and Drake, panels obtained by George Booth, no longer in situ at Cranbrook, stock cards, unknown dimensions, not known where the panels are now, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, nos. 70, 589, 630.

47. Unknown, pair of seventeenth-century Dutch armorials obtained by Booth through Roberson of London, stained glass, 28 x 22 cm each, now at the Cranbrook Academy of Art Museum (1927.100), image from Madeline Caviness et al., Stained Glass before 1700 in American Collections: Midwestern and Western States, Studies in the History of Art XXVIII (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1989), 153.


49. Unknown, composite quatrefoils, examples of some of Roberson of London’s 1927 purchases of stained glass from Thomas and Drake, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, nos. Cas[siobury].79, Cas[siobury].95, 1663.

50. Unknown, interior view of the gallery room at Gaukler House, Grosse Pointe (MI), showing stained glass in situ (gallery north window is pictured on the right, and the alcove window on the left), photograph, c.1945, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of the Michigan History Division.

51. Thomas and Drake, acquisitions of stained glass made by Walter Rosen of Caramoor (NY), stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, nos. 1230, 1331, 1333.


56. Thomas and Drake, *acquisitions of stained glass made by Paul Watkins of Winona (MN)*, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, nos. 582, 619, 664, 1324.

57. Thomas and Drake, *acquisitions of stained glass made by Paul Watkins of Winona (MN) from Thomas and Drake’s London branch*, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 56, 416, 867, 870, 1078, 1244, Cas[siobury].89-90, Cas[siobury].100, plus two not numbered.

58. Unknown, *exterior views of Coe Hall (now Planting Fields, NY), showing some stained glass in situ above and flanking the main doorways*, photographs, dimensions and dates unknown, images courtesy of the Planting Fields Foundation.

59. Charles of London, *rendering of the drawing room at Coe Hall (NY)*, 1920, colour drawing, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of the Planting Fields Foundation.

60. Unknown, *interior views of Coe Hall (NY), showing stained glass in situ*, photographs, dates and dimensions unknown, images courtesy of Planting Fields Foundation.


64. Unknown, *Scenes from the Life of St John the Baptist*, French fifteenth and sixteenth century composite window, stained glass, 401.3 x 351 cm overall, now at the Philadelphia Museum of Art (1929-131-1), image courtesy of the Philadelphia Museum.

65. Thomas and Drake, *panels now part of the tracery of the French composite window shown before they were altered by Wilfred Drake*, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, nos. 396, plus one not numbered.

66. Thomas and Drake, *Thomas and Drake’s surviving stock cards of the main lights of the French composite window (left), and the panels as they appear today (right)*, stock cards and photographs, dates and dimensions unknown, stock card images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, no numbers accorded, and photographs courtesy of the Philadelphia Museum of Art.


68. Thomas and Drake, *Thomas and Drake’s sketch showing the arrangement of the armorials from Hassop Hall at Aldus Higgins’s home in Worcester (MA), and either Roy’s or Wilfred’s watercolours of the medallions*, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, no numbers accorded.
69. Unknown, *Potiphar and his Wife*, stained glass, presumed to be a nineteenth-century forgery, dimensions unknown, now at Worcester Art Museum (MA), image courtesy of the Worcester Art Museum.

70. Unknown, *Christ Presenting the Keys to St Peter*, German fourteenth century, stained glass, 71.8 x 34.9 cm overall, now at the MMA (29.55.1-2), image courtesy of the MMA.

71. Unknown, (left to right, descending) *Saint Bartholomew, St John the Evangelist, St Martin Dividing his Cloak, St Martin on Horseback*, Austrian fifteenth-century, stained glass, each approximately 50 x 43 cm, all now at the MMA (30.113.1-4), images courtesy of the MMA.

72. The author, *two of the loggia windows at The Cloisters, New York*, July 2014, photograph, 8 x 6 cm, image by the author.

73. Thomas and Drake, *window nII, Riverside Church (New York) as it appears today, and stock cards showing that Wilfred Drake had added modern borders to the panels*, photograph and stock cards, photograph taken in July 2014 by the author, date and dimensions of the stock cards unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, nos. 15, 30.

74. Thomas and Drake, *composite quatrefoil panels purchased by Riverside Church (New York)*, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, location of panels now unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 1684-85, 1688, plus one not numbered.

75. The author, *Arms of the House of Hapsburg*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, each 86 x 53 cm, now at The Cloisters (37.147.1-5), images by the author.

76. Unknown, *St Benedict*, German sixteenth century, stained glass, diameter 33.4 cm, now at the Detroit Institute of Arts (40.126), image courtesy of the Detroit Institute.

77. Thomas and Drake, *acquisitions of stained glass made by Julius Haas of Detroit (MI)*, note the latter image, with Manhattan’s cityscape as its backdrop, was probably taken in Roy’s studio, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 5, plus one not numbered.
78. Unknown, (left to right) *St Lawrence, and St Stephen*, English fifteenth-century, stained glass, 111.8 x 45.7 cm, now at the V&A (c.237-1931), images courtesy of the V&A.

79. Thomas and Drake, *seven out of twelve scenes from the Life of Christ known to have been in Henry Goldman’s collection at Bull Point (NY)*, on the left are Thomas and Drake’s stock cards, and on the right the panels as they appear today, note the insertion of clear glass borders, stock cards and photographs, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 17, 20, 32, 36, 39, 40, 378a, and photographs courtesy of the MMA, New York (44.114.1-12).


81. Thomas and Drake, *pair of commemorative panels acquired by Phillip Hofer*, German eighteenth century, stock cards, unknown date and dimensions, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 1055-56.

82. Thomas and Drake, *acquisitions made by the Manvilles of Hi-Esmaro (NY)*, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, location of these panels now unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 53, nos. 1458, plus two not numbered.

83. Unknown, *the Gothic Room at the Smithsonian Museum composed of items from John Gellatly’s collection*, c.1933, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of the Smithsonian Museum, Washington DC.


86. Thomas and Drake, *acquisitions of stained glass made by Maud Seabury of New York*, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor...
Thomas Papers, box 53, nos. 74, 89, 284, 843, 1235-36, 1281, 1483, 1509-15, 1537, 1569-70, 1627.

87. Unknown, *exterior and interior views of Thomas and Drake’s New York studio (straight after it was vacated by Roy and occupied by the Terrace Garden Gallery) at 119 East 57th Street (the Todhunter Building)*, photographs, 1940s, dimensions unknown, images courtesy of the New York Public Library.

88. Unknown, *Grisaille lancet*, French thirteenth-century, stained glass, 248.5 x 58.7 cm overall, now at the Corning Museum of Glass (NY), (51.3.228), image courtesy of the Corning Museum.

89. Unknown, *Christ with Inscription*, German or English fifteenth-century, stained glass, 33.8 x 29.8 cm, now at the Corning Museum of Glass (NY), (51.2.185), image courtesy of the Corning Museum.

90. Unknown, *images of Wilfred Drake*, 1916, photographs, and the latter some time during the 1920s, unknown dimensions, private collection, Frances Page.

91. Unknown, (above) *Samson upbraiding his father-in-law*, English nineteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 20 cm, now at the V&A (c.102-1924), image courtesy of the V&A, and; (below) *Satyr with Baccante*, German eighteenth century, stained glass, 25 x 17 cm, now at the V&A (c.1361-1924), image courtesy of the V&A.

92. Unknown, *The Deposition*, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 86.3 x 51.7 cm overall, now at the V&A (c.62-1927), image courtesy of the V&A.

93. Unknown, *Prophet*, French thirteenth century, stained glass, 67.5 x 23 cm, now at the V&A (c.125-1929), image courtesy of the V&A.

94. Unknown, *Prophet*, French thirteenth century, stained glass, 47 x 14.6 cm, now at the V&A (c.3-1983), image courtesy of the V&A.

95. Unknown, *Mary Magdalene*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 127.9 x 50 cm, now at the V&A (c.881-1935), image courtesy of the V&A.

96. Unknown, *Triumph of Death over the Church*, French sixteenth century, stained glass, each 122.2 x 67.7 cm, now at the V&A (c.75-76-1955), images courtesy of the V&A.
97. Thomas and Drake, *acquisitions of stained glass made by Dr Aetena of the Fodor Museum, Amsterdam*, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, location of these panels now unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 116, 1193, 1418, 1430.

98. Thomas and Drake, *Madonna and Child*, acquired by Hans Lehmann of the Swiss National Museum, Zurich, probably German sixteenth-century, stock cards, dimensions unknown, location of this panel now unknown, image from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, no number.

99. Thomas and Drake, *acquisitions of stained glass made by Cecil Leitch and Kerin*, stock cards, unknown dates and dimensions, location of these panels now unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 45, 130, 465, 1240, 1247, 1373, 1566, 2055.

100. Thomas and Drake, *male saint, annotated ‘could be made square’ on the reverse*, stock card, unknown date and dimensions, location of this panel now unknown, image from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, no. 1781.

101. Thomas and Drake, *Flemish sixteenth-century panels purchased by Leitch and Kerin on behalf of Robert Lander*, stock cards, unknown dimensions, location of these panels now unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 1364, 1461.

102. Thomas and Drake, *acquisitions of stained glass made by Robert Lander of Glasgow*, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, location of these panels now unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 78, 88, 102, 158, 207, 238, 1080, 1171.

103. Thomas and Drake, *acquisitions of stained glass made by Cecil Leitch and Kerin in 1937*, stock cards, dimensions unknown, location of these panels now unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 31, 91, 174, 184, 812, 816, 1005, 1172, 1899, plus one not numbered.

104. Thomas and Drake, *acquisitions of stained glass made by ‘Crowther’ in 1943*, stock cards, dimensions unknown, location of these panels now unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 109, 259, 299, 869, 887, 1715, 1717, 1850, 1920.
105. Thomas and Drake, *Dutch roundel sold to Herbert Hendrie*, stock card, dimensions unknown, location now unknown, image from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, no. 944.

106. Thomas and Drake, *eighteenth-century panel depicting a female saint, possibly St Barbara, sold to Horace Wilkinson*, stock card, dimensions unknown, image from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, no. 1658.

107. Thomas and Drake, *examples of some of the seventeenth-century composite quatrefoils probably made by Wilfred Drake from fragments of stained glass in Thomas and Drake’s stock*, stock cards, unknown dimensions, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50.

108. Unknown, *Archbishop Saint, the blue glass backgrounds flanking the figure have been inserted by Wilfred Drake*, stained glass, 110 x 30 cm, now at the Burrell Collection, Glasgow (45/52), image courtesy of GMRC.

109. Unknown, *composite panel depicting angels holding scrolls, blue and red insertions made by Wilfred Drake*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 37 cm, now in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow (45/40), image courtesy of GMRC.

110. Unknown, *composite praying angels, insertions of red and blue glass, and sunburst motifs all Wilfred Drake’s hand*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 50 x 28.5 cm each panel, now in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow (45/55-56), image courtesy of GMRC.

111. Unknown, *(left) Princess Cecily*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 38.5 x 29.5 cm, now at the Burrell Collection (45/75), image courtesy of GMRC; *(right) the Crucifixion*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 41 x 30 cm, now at the Burrell Collection, Glasgow (45/23), image courtesy of GMRC. Note, the blue kite-shaped section behind the figure of Christ is composed of blue glass cut-away from the background of the Princess Cecily panel.

112. Unknown, *grisaille lancet, borders added by Wilfred Drake*, French thirteenth century, stained glass, 147 x 57.2 cm, now at The Cloisters (36.109), image courtesy of the MMA.

113. Unknown, *Angel Playing an Instrument, borders composed of medieval glass inserted by Wilfred Drake*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 43.5 x 28 cm, now in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow (45/67), image courtesy of GMRC.
114. Wilfred Drake, (above) *St Protasius with ‘modern’ red and gold borders and composite head panel attached*, colour drawing, dimensions unknown, image from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas papers, box 52; (below) *panels shown after the modern borders on the St Protasius panel had been removed by Wilfred Drake, and the head panel separated*, stained glass, 80 x 41.5 cm overall (for St Protasius), dimensions of the head panel unknown, both now in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow (45/28, 45/387), images courtesy of GMRC.


116. Wilfred Drake, (above) *design for the east window of St Mary’s Church, Melbury Sampford, Dorset*, March 1938, vidimus, dimensions unknown, private collection, Frances Page; (below) *interior view of the chancel, showing the window as executed*, photograph, 2015, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of Peter Walker, http://www.peterwalker.info/churches_text/sampford.

117. Unknown, *St John the Baptist Preaching*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 37.4 cm diameter, now at the V&A (c.5641-1859), image courtesy of the V&A.

118. Unknown, (descending) *The Execution of St John the Baptist, and The Crowning with Thorns*, Flemish sixteenth century, stock cards, dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas papers, box 43.

119. Unknown, *Christ in the House of Martha*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 36 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/470), image courtesy of GMRC.

120. Ernest Heasman, [one of] *The Four Seasons*, stained glass, dimensions unknown, *in situ* at the administrative building, St George’s School, Harpenden (Hertfordshire), image courtesy of Harpenden Library archives, cat.no. B 3.1.

121. Ernest Heasman, *Our Lady and Child*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, dimensions unknown, *in situ at St Mary’s Church, Swardeston (Norfolk)*, image courtesy of Wikimedia Commons.

122. Unknown, *heraldic panels in the great hall at Dutton Homestall (West Sussex)*, October 2009, photographs, dimensions unknown, images from “Dutton Homestall

123. Thomas and Drake, (left, descending) Dutch or Flemish biblical scenes in the ‘solar’ at Dutton Homestall (West Sussex), stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 28, 39, 43, 47, 149, 798, 1370, 1958; (right, descending) the panels as they appear today (still in situ), with the addition of foliate borders likely composed by Wilfred Drake, 1997, photographs, dimensions unknown, images from the Dutton Family Organisation, http://www.dunton.org/duttonhall.

124. Unknown, Jesus and the Samaritan Woman by Jacob’s Well, Flemish or Dutch sixteenth century, stained glass, dimensions unknown, sold to William Aiken Starrett of New York, but location now unknown, image from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, no. 1833.

125. Wilfred Drake, design for quarry glazing at Dutton Homestall (West Sussex), colour drawing, date and dimensions unknown, image from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 47.

126. Wilfred Drake, design for a window in the great hall at Saltwood Castle (Kent), colour drawing, date and dimensions unknown, image from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 40.


128. Thomas and Drake, acquisitions of stained glass made by James Arundel of Locksley Hall (Lincolnshire), stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 623, 1476, 1928, 1940.

129. Wilfred Drake, cold-painted insertions seen here on the upper left on a Dutch seventeenth-century medallion, stained glass, dimensions unknown, now in the Burrell Collection (45/577), image by the author.

130. Wilfred Drake, cold-painting with paint still visible on the surrounding leads, stained glass, dimensions unknown, now in the Burrell Collection (45/577-78), images by the author.
131. Wilfred Drake, *black cold-paint marking cracks in the glass*, stained glass, dimensions unknown, now in the Burrell Collection (45/28, 45/33, 45/244, 45/581), images by the author.

132. Wilfred Drake, *use of new lead that closely matches the original in profile*, stained glass, dimensions unknown, now in the Burrell Collection (45/570), image by the author.

133. Unknown, *Joachim and Anna Meeting at the Golden Gates*, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 150 x 66 cm overall, now at the Burrell Collection (45/389), image courtesy of GMRC.

134. Unknown, *Marriage at Cana*, French thirteenth century, stained glass, 162.5 x 60 cm overall, now at the Burrell Collection (45/366), image courtesy of GMRC.


136. A & R Annan, ‘*Gather Ye Rosebuds While Ye May*, showing the now lost lower register of the window’, 1893, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of the RIBA Archive, Photographic Collections, item no. RIBA81787, “4 Devonshire Gardens.”

137. Wilfred Drake, *western rose window at Pagham Church (Sussex)*, 1929, stained glass, dimensions unknown, private collection, Frances Page.

138. Unknown, (left to right, descending) *Virgin Mary*, Swiss seventeenth century, stained glass, 35 x 18.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow (45/506); *Heraldic shield*, Swiss seventeenth century, stained glass, dimensions unknown, now in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow (45/557); *St Notker*, Swiss seventeenth century, stained glass, 16 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/529); *Scene from the Life of St Francis*, Swiss seventeenth-century, stained glass, dimensions unknown, now in the Burrell Collection (45/530); all images courtesy of GMRC.
139. Unknown, *interior views of 8 Great Western Terrace, the dining room, sitting room, and vestibule at the top of the main staircase*, c.1905, photographs, dimensions unknown, images courtesy of GMRC.

140. Unknown, *panels known to have been installed at 8 Great Western Terrace, Glasgow*, (left to right, descending) *Arms of the Stringer*, English sixteenth-century, stained glass, 20.5 x 17.6 cm, now at the Burrell Collection (45/217); *Heraldic Panel with Bell Foundry*, Swiss sixteenth century, stained glass, dimensions unknown, now at the Burrell Collection (45/503); *Shield of Cornelis Abrams*, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, dimensions unknown, now at the Burrell Collection (45/537), *Cook and Small Boy*, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 20.5 x 17.7 cm, now at the Burrell Collection (45/551); *Seven Women Beating a Man’s Trousers*, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 20.3 x 17.5 cm, now at the Burrell Collection (45/613); *St Andrew*, German sixteenth century, stained glass, dimensions unknown, now at the Burrell Collection (45/627) picture not available, images courtesy of GMRC.

141. Unknown, *exterior views of Hutton Castle (Scottish Borders)*, photographs and pencil drawing, dates and dimensions unknown, images courtesy of RCAHMS.

142. Unknown, *Hutton Castle before the construction of the servants’ quarters*, c.1880, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of RCAHMS.


145. Unknown, (descending) *extract from Wilfred Drake’s ‘List of Ancient Stained Glass at Hutton Castle’*, document, 21 x 29.7 cm, image courtesy of GMRC; unknown, plan of Hutton Castle, 1984, architectural drawing, dimensions unknown (the vestibule’s ground floor location indicated by the author), image courtesy of RCAHMS; unknown, *the vestibule at Hutton Castle*, c.1935, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of GMRC; the author, *photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, St John the Divine*, stained glass,
60 x 23 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/36); and *St Mary Magdalene*, stained glass, 60 x 23 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/37), photographs provided by GMRC.

146. Unknown, *plan of Hutton Castle*, 1984, architectural drawing, dimensions unknown (location of the ground floor gentleman’s cloakroom indicated by the author), image courtesy of RCAHMS; the author, *photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame*, not to scale, *Marriage at Cana*, Flemish fifteenth century, stained glass, 92 x 59 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/426), photograph courtesy of GMRC.

147. Unknown, (descending)*plan of Hutton Castle*, 1984, architectural drawing, dimensions unknown (location of the ground floor gentleman’s lavatory indicated by the author), image courtesy of RCAHMS; the author, *photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame*, not to scale, *Angel*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 149.3 x 37.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/6), image courtesy of GMRC.

148. Unknown, (descending)*plan of Hutton Castle*, 1984, architectural drawing, dimensions unknown (location of the ground floor great hall indicated by the author), image courtesy of RCAHMS; unknown, *the great hall, Hutton Castle*, c.1935, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of GMRC.

149. The author, *southernmost window, great hall, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame*, not to scale, (left to right) *Red Rose of Lancaster*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 42.5 x 35 cm, now in the Burrell Collection, (45/180); *Red Rose of Lancaster*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 42.5 x 35 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/181), images courtesy of GMRC.

150. The author, *middle-south window, great hall, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame*, not to scale, (left to right) *Arms of the Prince of Wales (after King Edward VI)*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 42.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/182); *Arms of the Prince of Wales (after King Edward VI)*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 42.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/183), images courtesy of GMRC.

151. The author, *middle-north window, great hall, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame*, not to scale, (left to right) *Arms of Henry VIII*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 40 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection
(45/184); *Arms of the Prince of Wales (later Edward VI)*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 40 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/185), images courtesy of GMRC.

152. The author, *northernmost window, great hall, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, (left to right) Arms of Queen Elizabeth I*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 46.9 x 40 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/186); *Arms of Henry VIII*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 47 x 39.9 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/187), images courtesy of GMRC.

153. Unknown, (descending) *Hutton Castle great hall*, c.1935, photograph courtesy of GMRC; the author, *three light window, great hall, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, (left light, descending) Tree of Life*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 30 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/7); *St Cecilia*, French fifteenth century, stained glass, 75 x 59.8 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/377); *Arms of Beauchamp*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 27.6 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/130), (central light, descending) the *Meeting at the Golden Gate (Joachim and Anna)*, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 150 x 65 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/389); (right light, descending) *Ornamental Foliage*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 31 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/8); *the Adoration of the Magi*, Flemish fifteenth century, stained glass, 77.5 x 57.6 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/427); *Tudor Rose*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 27.4 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/97), images courtesy of GMRC.

154. Unknown, (descending) *first floor plan of Hutton Castle*, 1984, architectural drawing, dimensions unknown (location of the first floor drawing room indicated by the author), image courtesy of RCAHMS; unknown, *the drawing room*, c.1930s -1950s, photographs, dimensions unknown, images courtesy of GMRC.

155. The author, *south three light window, drawing room, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, (upper lights, left to right) Arms of Howard*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 65 x 57.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/131); *Three Female Donors*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 60 x 60 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/436); *Arms of De Vere*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 65 x 57.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/132); (main lights), *Scenes from the Life of St John the Divine* (from left to right)
Ordeal by Fire, St John at Patmos, Miraculous Raising to Life of Drusiana, stained glass, each 210 x 65 cm, all now in the Burrell Collection (45/390-92), images courtesy of GMRC.

156. The author, westernmost two light window, drawing room, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left light, descending) Shield of Handelowe, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 41 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/111); Sacred Heart, French fifteenth century, stained glass, 30 x 28.4 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/378); Angel holding shield of the Prince of Wales, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 137.5 x 40 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/38); Arms of Lisle, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 33.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/133); (right light, descending) Arms of Bereford, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 40 x 40 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/112); Arms of King Henry VII, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 30 x 26 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/188); Arms of Tierney, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 137.5 x 40 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/134); Arms of Lisle, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 33.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/135), images courtesy of GMRC.

157. The author, middle two light window, drawing room, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (upper lights, left to right) Female Donor, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 40 x 60 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/39); Angels with Scrolls, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 40 x 60 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/40); (main lights, left to right) Tree of Jesse, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 180 x 65 cm, (45/393); Tree of Jesse, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 180 x 65 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/394); (lower lights, left to right) Youth, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 17.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/90); Arms of Craddock, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 21 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/189); Virgin Saint, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 17.6 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/395); Head of a Man, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 15 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/396); Unidentified Shield, French fourteenth century, stained glass, 26 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/367); Young Man, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 15 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/397), images courtesy of GMRC.
158. The author, northernmost two light window, drawing room, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (right light, descending) The Madonna, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 50 x 35 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/41); Seraphim, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 37.5 x 37.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/43); Archbishop Saint, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 135 x 37.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/42); Male Figure, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 33.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/44); (left light, descending) Kneeling Donor, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 50 x 35 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/9); Seraphim, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 37.5 x 37.6 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/46); St Peter, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 135 x 37.8 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/45); Man and Woman, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 33.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/47); images courtesy of GMRC.

159. The author, east window, no. 1 bedroom, third floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, (left to right) Red Rose of Lancaster, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 37.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/191); Arms of Glastenbury, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 37.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/113), images courtesy of GMRC.

160. The author, south window, no. 1 bedroom, third floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right) Arms of Philpot, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 40 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/136); Arms of Holland, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 40 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/137), images courtesy of GMRC.

161. Unknown, (descending) no. 1 bedroom, third floor, Hutton Castle, c.1930s-1950s, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of GMRC; the author, west window, no. 1 bedroom, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, note that either the catalogue is wrong, or that the panels were at some stage switched in the window; (left to right) Arms of Upsale, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 40 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/138); Arms of Arundel, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 40 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/192), images courtesy of GMRC.
162. The author, *no. 1 dressing room, third floor, Hutton Castle*, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right) *Arms of Maltravers*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 52.5 x 37.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/193); *Arms of Talbot*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 52.5 x 37.6 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/194); *Arms of Guilford Dudley*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 53 x 37.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/195); *Arms of Stafford*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 52.6 x 37.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/196); William Burrell, *no. 1 dressing room window*, sketch, October 13, 1932, dimensions unknown, all images courtesy of GMRC.

163. Unknown, (descending) *no. 2 bedroom, third floor, Hutton Castle*, c.1930s-1950s, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of GMRC; the author, *west two light window, no. 2 bedroom, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame*, not to scale; (left to right) *Arms of Wentworth and Tyrell*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 36 x 31 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/197); *Arms of Wentworth and Bettenham*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 36 x 31 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/198), images courtesy of GMRC.

164. The author, *north two light window, no. 2 bedroom, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame*, not to scale; (left to right) *Arms of Ford*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 40 x 30 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/199); *Arms of Hampton*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 39.8 x 30 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/200), images courtesy of GMRC.

165. The author, *bathroom window, east wing, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame*, not to scale; (left to right) *Arms of Oldisworth*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 35 x 25 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/201); *Arms of Oldisworth*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 35 x 25 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/202), images courtesy of GMRC.

166. The author, *landing window, east wing, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame*, not to scale, (left to right) *Huntsman with a Bow*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 43.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/48), *Female Martyr Saint*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 32.6 x 43.4 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/49), images courtesy of GMRC.
167. The author, housemaids’ pantry window, east wing, photograph of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; St Peter, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 112.5 x 42.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/437), image courtesy of GMRC.

168. The author, landing window in passage to Marion Burrell’s bedroom, third floor, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale; St Jerome, French fifteenth century, stained glass, 120 x 57.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/368), image courtesy of GMRC.

169. Unknown, (descending) plans of the second, first and ground floors of Hutton Castle, 1984, architectural drawing, dimensions unknown (location of the western staircase indicated by the author, plans for the third floor have not been found), images courtesy of RCAHMS.

170. The author, second floor window western staircase window (first window at top of staircase), photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale; St Paul, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 110 x 65 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/438), image courtesy of GMRC.

171. The author, second window downwards, western staircase, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale; St Mary Magdalene, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 107.5 x 37.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/50), image courtesy of GMRC.

172. The author, third window downwards, western staircase, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; St Nicholas of Myra, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 110 x 43.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/439), image courtesy of GMRC.

173. The author, fourth window downwards, western staircase, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, (left, descending) Angel, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 25 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/53), Angel, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 50 x 29 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/54), (right, descending) Angel, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 25 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/55), Angel, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 50 x 29 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/56), images courtesy of GMRC.
174. The author, fifth window downwards, western staircase, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, (left, descending) Angel, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 25 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/57); Soul of the Righteous, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 80 x 32.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/398); (right, descending) Angel, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 25 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/58); Soul of the Righteous, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 80 x 32 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/56), images courtesy of GMRC.

175. The author, western staircase landing window, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (top lights, left to right) Angel Playing Pipes, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 18.5 x 8 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/10); Maiden, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/59); Angel Playing Pipes, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 18.5 x 8 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/11); (main light) Beatrice Von Falkenburg, English thirteenth century, stained glass, 60 x 26 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/2), images courtesy of GMRC.

176. The author, western staircase landing window, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (top lights, left to right) Arms of Lecheche, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 25 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/114); Arms of De Burgh, English fourteenth century, stained glass, now in the Burrell Collection (45/115), 25 x 22.5 cm; (main light) The Meeting in the Garden, French fifteenth century, stained glass, 77.5 x 65 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/379), images courtesy of GMRC.

177. The author, western staircase landing window, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (top lights, left to right) Arms of Netherville, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 23 x 20 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/116); Emblems of the Passion, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/62 or maybe 45/12); (main light) The Madonna, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 60 x 52.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/60), images courtesy of GMRC.

178. The author, second floor landing window leading to William Burrell’s bedroom, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale; St Augustine,
English fifteenth century, stained glass, 140 x 41 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/51), image courtesy of GMRC.

179. The author, *housemaids’ pantry window, second floor, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame*, not to scale, *Archbishop Saint*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 112.5 x 30 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/52), image courtesy of GMRC.

180. The author, *ground floor ladies cloak room window*, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (upper lights, left to right) *Arms of Bazley*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 21 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/117); *Arms of Massey*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 21 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/118); (lower lights, left to right) *Arms of Segny*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 12.5 x 12 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/203), *Arms of Vane*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 12.6 x 12 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/204), images courtesy of GMRC.

181. The author, *ground floor ladies lavatory window*, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale; *St Mary of Egypt*, French fourteenth century, stained glass, 90 x 25 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/369), image courtesy of GMRC.

182. The author, *ground floor corridor to business room, westernmost window*, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale; *Male Head and Grisaille*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 62.5 x 21 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/13), image courtesy of GMRC.

183. The author, *ground floor corridor to business room, second window from west*, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale; *Arms of Dudley*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 40 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/205), image courtesy of GMRC.

184. The author, *ground floor corridor to business room, third window from west*, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale; *Arms of Magdalen College, Oxford*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 51 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/139), image courtesy of GMRC.

185. The author, *ground floor corridor to business room, fourth window from west*, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (upper
lights, left to right) **Shield of Abbey of Bury St Edmunds**, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 21 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/119); **Arms of Cruwys**, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 21 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/140); (main light) **Arms of Battle Abbey**, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 35 x 26 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/120); (lower lights, left to right) **Eagle Emblem of St John the Divine**, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 21 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/61); **Eagle Emblem of St John the Divine**, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 21 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/62), images courtesy of GMRC.

186. The author, *ground floor corridor to business room, easternmost window, photograph of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; Angel*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 52.5 x 47.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/14), image courtesy of GMRC.

187. The author, *westernmost north window, first floor dining room, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right) Arms of Clare, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 25 x 18.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/121); Arms of Plantagenet, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 25 x 18.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/122), images courtesy of GMRC.

188. Unknown, *dining room, Hutton Castle, c.1930s-1950s*, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of GMRC; the author, *central north window, first floor dining room, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, (upper lights, left to right) Arms of Knolles, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 26 x 24 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/206); Arms of Knolles, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 26 x 24 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/207); (lower lights, left to right) St Servatius, German fourteenth century, stained glass, 15 x 10 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/475); St John the Baptist, German fourteenth century, stained glass, 15 x 10 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/476), images courtesy of GMRC.

189. The author, *easternmost north window, first floor dining room, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of Holy Trinity Priory, Canterbury, English sixteenth century, stained
glass, 22.5 x 18.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/208), Arms of Holy Trinity Priory, Canterbury, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 18.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/209); Arms of the Prince of Wales, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 18.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/141); Arms of King Henry VI, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 18.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/142), images courtesy of GMRC.

190. The author, easternmost south window, first floor dining room, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of the Diocese of Winchester, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 23.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/143); Arms of King Edward IV, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 27.4 x 23.6 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/144), images courtesy of GMRC.

191. The author, central south window, first floor dining room, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of Sulliard, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 23.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/145); Arms of Davies, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 27.8 x 23.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/146), images courtesy of GMRC.

192. The author, westernmost south window, first floor dining room, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of Copleston, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/147); Arms of Lucy, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/148), images courtesy of GMRC.

193. The author, westernmost south window, William Burrell’s bedroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (upper lights, left to right) Arms of Brooke, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/337); Arms of Peyton, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell
Collection (45/338); (main light) Arms of Donne, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 17 x 14 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/210), images courtesy of GMRC.

194. The author, easternmost south window, William Burrell’s bedroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (upper lights, left to right) Arms of Hales, English seventeenth century, stained glass, now in the Burrell Collection (45/339); Arms of Moning, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/341); (centre) Arms of Ardern, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/340), images courtesy of GMRC.

195. The author, north window, William Burrell’s bedroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Beggars, Swiss sixteenth century, stained glass, 15 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/494); Arms of Zug, Swiss seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/512), images courtesy of GMRC.

196. The author, easternmost window, William Burrell’s bathroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (upper lights, left to right) Arms of Peyton, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/342); Arms of Cleere, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/343); (main light) Arms of Trerice, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/149); images courtesy of GMRC.

197. The author, westernmost window, William Burrell’s bathroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (upper lights, left to right) Arms of Pigot, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/344); Arms of Peyton, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell
198. The author, window in passage between William and Constance Burrell’s bedrooms, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) St Catherine of Alexandria, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/440); St Barbara, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/441), images courtesy of GMRC.

199. Unknown, Constance Burrell’s bedroom, Hutton Castle, c.1930s-1950s, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of GMRC; the author, westernmost north window, Constance Burrell’s bedroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of Tench, English eighteenth century, stained glass, 20 x 13.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/362); Arms of Heath, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 18.5 x 13 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/150), images courtesy of GMRC.

200. Unknown, Constance Burrell’s bedroom, Hutton Castle, c.1930s-1950s, photograph, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of GMRC; the author, easternmost north window, Constance Burrell’s bedroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of De Spencer, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 20 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/151); St Thomas Touching the Sacred Heart, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 20 x 17.3 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/152), images courtesy of GMRC.

201. The author, easternmost south window, Constance Burrell’s bedroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of Peyton, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/346); Armorial Collection (45/345); (central) Shield Quarterly, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/533), images courtesy of GMRC.
202. The author, westernmost south window, Constance Burrell’s bedroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of Gernon, English seventeenth century, stained glass, now in the Burrell Collection (45/348); Two Shields, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/535); Arms of Francis, English seventeenth century, stained glass, 15 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/349), images courtesy of GMRC.

203. The author, westernmost window, Constance Burrell’s boudoir, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) The Annunciation, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/442); Ahasuerus and Esther, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/443), images courtesy of GMRC.

204. The author, easternmost window, Constance Burrell’s boudoir, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Adam and Eve, The Temptation, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/444); Adam and Eve, The Expulsion from Eden, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/445), images courtesy of GMRC.

205. The author, westernmost south window, Marion Burrell’s bedroom, third floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right) Armorial Achievement, Swiss seventeenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/513); Armorial, Swiss seventeenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/514), images courtesy of GMRC.
206. The author, *easternmost south window, Marion Burrell’s bedroom, third floor*, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right) *The Dream of Jacob*, Swiss seventeenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/515); *The Story of Jonah*, Swiss seventeenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/516), images courtesy of GMRC.

207. The author, *north window, Marion Burrell’s bedroom, third floor*, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right) *Standard Bearer and St Michael*, Swiss sixteenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/495); *St Clement of Rome*, Swiss sixteenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/496), images courtesy of GMRC.

208. The author, *Marion Burrell’s sitting room window, third floor*, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right) *A Countryman*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/63); *Reynard the Fox Dressed as a Priest*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/64), images courtesy of GMRC.

209. The author, *Marion Burrell’s bathroom window, third floor*, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right) *Arms of Huddesfield and Matford*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 20 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/153); *Arms of Erpingham*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 20 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/154), images courtesy of GMRC.

210. The author, *no. 4 passage window, third floor*, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right) *Quatrefoil Ornamental Medallion*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 23.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/15); *Quatrefoil Ornamental Medallion*, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 23.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/16), images courtesy of GMRC.

211. The author, *no. 4 bedroom window, third floor*, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right, upper lights) *Monogram of the Bishop of Exeter*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 32.5 cm,
now in the Burrell Collection (45/211); *Shield of the Diocese of Exeter*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 32.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/212); (lower lights, left to right) *Fetterlock Badge*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 12.5 x 7.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/213); *Arms of Ridley*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 12.5 x 7.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/214), images courtesy of GMRC.

212. The author, *no. 4 bedroom window above the door, third floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left to right) St Anne with the Blessed Virgin and Holy Infant*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 25 cm diameter, now at the Burrell Collection (45/447); *St Clara of Assisi*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 24.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/446); *St Dorothy*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 24.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/448), images courtesy of GMRC.

213. The author, *east window, billiard room, first floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Shield*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, now in the Burrell Collection (45/468); *Shield*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, now in the Burrell Collection (45/165), images courtesy of GMRC.

214. The author, *east window, billiard room, first floor, these panels were replaced in 1935 by those illustrated in fig. 213, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Male Head*, German fourteenth century, stained glass, 18 x 18 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/477); *Female Head*, German fourteenth century, stained glass, 18 x 18 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/478), images courtesy of GMRC.

215. The author, *billiard room south window, first floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of Stringer*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 21 x 19 cm, transferred to Hutton Castle from 8 Great Western Terrace, now in the Burrell Collection (45/217); *Shield*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 21 x 19 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/218), images courtesy of GMRC.
216. The author, east window, business room, ground floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of Payne, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 25.5 x 25 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/215); Arms of Servington, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 25.5 x 25 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/155), images courtesy of GMRC.

217. The author, south window, business room, ground floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location of the window indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Arms of Neville, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/156); Arms of Beaumont, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 25 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/157), images courtesy of GMRC.

218. The author, business room lavatory window, ground floor, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale, exact location unknown but presumably in close proximity to the business room, indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; Arms of Mowbray and Maltravers, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 36 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/216), image courtesy of GMRC.

219. The author, east window, tower bedroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Royal Badges, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 30 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/219); J.S. Monogram Quarries, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 30 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/158), images courtesy of GMRC.

220. The author, south window, tower bedroom, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Royal Badges, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 30 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/220); Royal Badges, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 30 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/221), images courtesy of GMRC.

221. The author, window, tower staircase, ground floor, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on the 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (left to right) Royal Badges, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 30 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/222); Royal Badges, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 30 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/223), images courtesy of GMRC.
1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; Male Figure, French fourteenth century, stained glass, 32.5 x 20 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/370), image courtesy of GMRC.

222. The author, window, ascending the tower staircase, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; Prophet Jeremiah, French thirteenth century, stained glass, 60 x 32.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/364), image courtesy of GMRC.

223. The author, window, ascending the tower staircase, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (descending) Arms of Blayney, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 52.5 x 40 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/222); Rebus of John Islip, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 30 x 23 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/223); Arms of Donne, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 15 x 18 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/224), images courtesy of GMRC.

224. The author, window, ascending the tower staircase, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; Arms of Argente, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 60 x 33.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/159), image courtesy of GMRC.

225. The author, window, ascending the tower staircase, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; Arms of Dudley, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 52.5 x 38 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/195), image courtesy of GMRC.

226. The author, window, ascending the tower staircase, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; Head of Moses, French twelfth century, stained glass, 60 x 26 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/1), image courtesy of GMRC.

227. The author, window, ascending the tower staircase, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on
1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; *Arms of Winterbourne*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 27.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/160), image courtesy of GMRC.

228. The author, *westernmost window, upper servants' hall, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame*, not to scale, location not known, but generally indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (upper lights, left to right) *Bearded Figure Holding a Book*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 8.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/449); *Bearded Figure Holding a Cross*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 8.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/450); (main light) *An Abbot’s Armorial Achievement*, Swiss sixteenth century, stained glass, 41 x 28 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/497), images courtesy of GMRC.

229. The author, *easternmost window, upper servants' hall, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame*, not to scale, location not known, but generally indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, courtesy of RCAHMS; (upper lights, left to right) *St Barbara*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 25.5 x 15 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/451); *St Catherine of Alexandria*, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 25.5 x 15 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/65); (main light) *St Nicholas of Myra and St Catherine of Alexandria*, Swiss seventeenth century, stained glass, 40 x 25 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/517), images courtesy of GMRC.

230. The author, *easternmost window, servants' hall, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame*, not to scale, location not known, but generally indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, as it was likely to have been close to the Butlers’ staircase (highlighted by the inner circle), image courtesy of RCAHMS; (upper lights, left to right), *St Roch*, Flemish, sixteenth century, stained glass, 21 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/452); *Susanna Bathing*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 21 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/453); (main light) *St Christopher*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 24 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/454); (lower lights, left to right) *Lion emblem of St Mark*, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/98); *The Virgin Mary and Holy Infant*, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/455), images courtesy of GMRC.
231. The author, westernmost window, servants’ hall, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location not known, but generally indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, as it was likely to have been close to the Butlers’ staircase (highlighted by the inner circle), image courtesy of RCAHMS; (upper lights, left to right) Labours of the Months, January, Flemish fifteenth century, stained glass, 21 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/428); Labours of the Months, Flemish fifteenth century, stained glass, 21 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/429); (main light) Shepherdess, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 23.5 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/456); (lower lights, left to right) The Nativity, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 21 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/457); St Michael the Archangel, Flemish sixteenth century, stained glass, 21 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/458), images courtesy of GMRC.

232. The author, window, butlers’ staircase, ground floor, photograph of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, image courtesy of RCAHMS; The Madonna, French fifteenth century, stained glass, 72.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/380), image courtesy of GMRC.

233. The author, east window, servants’ corridor, ground floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, image courtesy of RCAHMS; (upper lights, left to right) Armorial Achievement, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 20 cm, transferred to Hutton Castle from 8 Great Western Terrace, now in the Burrell Collection (45/536); Armorial Achievement, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 20 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/538); (lower panels, left to right) Armorial Achievement, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 61 x 75 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/537); Shield, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, now in the Burrell Collection (45/539), 60 x 74 cm, images courtesy of GMRC.

234. The author, window, servants’ staircase, second floor, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, image courtesy of RCAHMS; (left light, descending) Grotesque, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 15 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/17); Crowned Angel Playing a Lute, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 45 x 27.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/67); Arms of
Blundeville, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 20 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/123); (right light, descending) Woman’s Head, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 15.5 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/66); The Presentation in the Temple, German fifteenth century, stained glass, 41 x 27.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/484); Arms of Fitzhugh, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 20 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/124), images courtesy of GMRC.

235. The author, window, servants’ staircase, ground floor, photograph of the panel inserted into a window frame, not to scale, location indicated by the author on 1984 plan of the building, image courtesy of RCAHMS; Arms of Withypoule, English sixteenth century, stained glass, 35 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/225), image courtesy of GMRC.

236. The author, window, cook’s bedroom, location in the house unknown, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (upper light, left to right) A Helm, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 14.5 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/541); A Helm, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 14.5 x 12.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/542); (central panel) Armorial, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 30 x 25 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/540); (lower light, left to right) A Horseman, German eighteenth century, stained glass, 13.5 x 13.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/491); A Horseman, German eighteenth century, stained glass, 13.5 x 13.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/492), images courtesy of GMRC.

237. The author, window, first housemaids’ bedroom, location in the house unknown, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (upper light, left to right) Shield, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 23.5 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/543); shield, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 23.5 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/544); (central panel) Mary Magdalene, Swiss sixteenth century, stained glass, 25 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/498); (lower light, left to right) Shield, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 23.5 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/545); Shield, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 23.5 x 17.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/546), images courtesy of GMRC.
238. The author, window, second and third housemaids’ bedroom, location in the house unknown, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (left light, descending) Armorial, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/547); Armorial, Swiss seventeenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 27.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/518); Female Figure, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/548); (right light, descending) Armorial, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 27.5 x 20 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/560); Standard Bearer, Swiss eighteenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 27.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/531); Female Figure, Dutch seventeenth century, stained glass, 22.5 x 27.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/549), images courtesy of GMRC.

239. The author, window, lady’s maid’s bedroom, location in the house unknown, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (descending) Gothic Window Head, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 20 x 22.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/18); Trefoil, English fourteenth century, stained glass, 48.5 x 50 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/19); Seven Green Vine Leaves, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 26 cm diameter, now in the Burrell Collection (45/68), images courtesy of GMRC.

240. The author, window, attic bedroom, location in the house unknown, photographs of the panels inserted into a window frame, not to scale; (descending) Prophet from a Jesse Window, Flemish fifteenth century, stained glass, 21 x 32.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/430); Achievement of King Richard III, English fifteenth century, stained glass, 57.5 x 42.5 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/161), images courtesy of GMRC.

241. Unknown, plans and elevations showing Burrell’s main entertaining spaces in the western wing of Hutton Castle (circled by the author) including the great hall, drawing room, as well as the western staircase, male and female lavatories and cloak rooms, and entrance vestibule, 1984, dimensions unknown, images courtesy of RCAHMS.

242. Unknown, plans and elevations showing rooms in the middle range of Hutton Castle (circled by the author) including the business, billiard, and dining rooms, as
well as the family and guest bedrooms, 1984, dimensions unknown, images courtesy of RCAHMS.

243. Unknown, plans and elevations showing rooms in the eastern range of Hutton Castle (circled by the author), where the servants’ quarters were located, 1984, dimensions unknown, image courtesy of RCAHMS; and, photograph taken c.1960s of the exterior of the servants’ wing and tower, image courtesy of GMRC.

244. William Burrell, drawings of the hall windows, showing how quarries might be arranged, 1929, sketch, unknown dimensions, image from GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.35, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, January 28, 1929 (Appendix A, document 38).

245. Unknown, (descending) Virgin and Child, French fourteenth-century, stained glass, 42.5 x 36 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/381); Mary Magdalene, German fourteenth-century, stained glass, 51 x 28 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/479), images courtesy of GMRC.

246. Unknown, (above) Scenes from the Life of St John the Baptist, French sixteenth century, stained glass, 195 x 50 cm each light, now in the Burrell Collection (45/417-24), images courtesy of GMRC; (below) John Buckler, South-West View of the Hall from the Gardens, Blithfield Hall, Staffordshire (the long gallery window, where this glass was removed from by Wilfred Drake, window circled by the author), 1823, engraving, image from William Salt Library, Views of Staffordshire, SV II.68, 45/7666.

247. Unknown, panels formerly in Phillip Nelson’s collection but sold to William Burrell, stained glass, various dimensions now in the Burrell Collection (45/3, 45/27, 45/31, 45/76, 45/83-84, 45/87, 45/128-29, 45/363), images courtesy of GMRC.

248. Unknown, panels formerly in William Randolph Hearst’s collection but sold to William Burrell, stained glass, various dimensions, now in the Burrell Collection 45/144, 45/203, 45/233-34, 45/236-37, 45/365-66, 45/372, 45/382-83, 45/410, 45/480-81, 45/485-87, images courtesy of GMRC.

249. Unknown, panels formerly in Ogden and Robert Goelet’s collection but sold to William Burrell, (descending) the Ninth Commandment and Glorification of the Virgin, both German sixteenth century, stained glass, 377.5 x 73.5 cm overall, both now in the Burrell Collection (45/487 a-b), images courtesy of GMRC.
250. Matthijs Maris, *the Lady of Shallot*, 1870s or 1880s, stained glass, 51 x 28 cm, now in the Burrell Collection (45/561), image courtesy of GMRC.

251. Thomas and Drake, *panels sent to auction at Christie’s, London, in December 1931*, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 69, 86, 89, 128-29, 132, 237, 293, 466, 832, 872, 888, 918, 926, 1102, 1168, 1179, 1180, 1182, 1241, 1321, 1345, 1379, 1465, 1484, 1486, 1508, 1518, 1827, 1837, 1919.

252. Thomas and Drake, *panels sold at Sotheby’s, London during the second world war*, stock cards, dates and dimensions unknown, images from SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 1173, 1239, 1335, 1369.


255. Colin Smith, *east window of St Nicholas Church, Great Bookham, Surrey*, photograph, date and dimensions unknown, image from geograph.org.uk.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to establish the origins and formation of the company Thomas and Drake (founded 1922) and its predecessor the ‘Grosvenor Thomas Collection of Stained Glass’ (begun c.1905). In this enterprise, initiated by George Grosvenor Thomas (1856–1923), Grosvenor was later joined by his son Roy Grosvenor Thomas (1886–1952), and the glass-painter, glazier, and restorer Wilfred Drake (1879–1948); the resulting company was incorporated in London as Thomas and Drake Ltd, and in New York as Thomas and Drake Inc. The ways in which the company was structured, and operated, and the roles of the firm’s three partners will be established, with each chapter corresponding to a chapter in the firm’s history. They were the only specialist suppliers of stained glass during the first half of the twentieth century, and theirs was an enterprise that left an indelible mark on three of the world’s most important museum collections, on either side of the Atlantic.

Together they handled thousands of medieval and Renaissance panels. Sourced by Grosvenor, their stock ranged in date from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries, and contained examples of Austrian, Dutch, English, Flemish, French, German, Italian, and Swiss stained glass. Their high-quality stock was probably the largest assemblage of stained glass in the world, and likely remains unrivalled to this day. Their stock flooded the art market in great volume, and made a comprehensive range of stained-glass pieces commercially accessible in huge, never before seen, numbers. This thesis will explore the evolution of this business from its roots as a series of exhibitions – hosted by other art dealers, interior designers, and stained-glass manufacturers – to its transformation into a fully incorporated transatlantic firm, with permanent branches in both London and New York.

This thesis will also expose the networks of major dealers and buyers associated with the medium during the period 1900–1950, offering a more complete understanding of this early twentieth-century transatlantic commerce, which was responsible for the dispersal across several continents of some of the great glazing schemes of medieval and Renaissance

---

1 To avoid confusion with other family members involved in the stained-glass world, Wilfred and Roy will be referred to by their first names, and George Grosvenor Thomas will be known hereafter as Grosvenor, the preferred name he has used in all of his surviving correspondence.

Europe. Although Grosvenor, and later Thomas and Drake, were not the only sellers of stained glass during the period—others handled some panels on occasion—the fact that they had a stock exclusively composed of stained glass meant that they maintained a monopoly, and constantly had examples of stained glass at hand for potential purchasers to see.

Over their five decades of activity, Grosvenor, and later Thomas and Drake, directly supplied well over 130 public institutions and private patrons. Hundreds of public and private collections worldwide still feature panels that had at one time passed through their hands, underlining their vast reach and the high quality of their stock. While their customers were principally American and British, which is reflected in their permanent presence in those countries, they also dealt with customers in Australia, Belgium, Canada, the Netherlands, and Switzerland. This thesis critically examines the types and locations of buyers of stained glass, and the formation, arrangement, cost, and display of their acquisitions. How these collections were assembled and displayed has largely gone uninvestigated, especially in relation to European buyers of the medium. Grosvenor’s, and later Thomas and Drake’s, central role in the sourcing, arranging, adapting, and supplying of stained glass to so many was an accomplishment, acknowledged even during their lifetimes in various contemporary sources and in their own obituaries. On his death in February 1923, for example, Grosvenor’s significant achievement was underlined in one of his obituaries, in the Glasgow Herald, which recorded: ‘all the valuable stained glass which has come onto the market during the last quarter of a century has passed through Mr Thomas’s hands’.3 However, their substantial legacy, and importance to stained-glass studies, and to collection histories, has since often been taken for granted or overlooked entirely.

Three of the world’s largest museum collections of stained glass are all greatly underpinned by Grosvenor’s and Thomas and Drake’s stock—those of the Victoria and Albert Museum (London, hereafter V&A), the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York, hereafter MMA), and the Burrell Collection (Glasgow). The twentieth-century escalation and strengthening of these institutions’ stained-glass purchases was largely made possible by their use of Grosvenor’s and Thomas and Drake’s services, who even today stand comfortably as their single biggest vendors in the medium. By 1948, Edward Arthur Lane (1909–1963), then

3 “Mr Grosvenor Thomas’s Death,” Glasgow Herald, February 7, 1923, 10.
assistant keeper of ceramics and stained glass at the V&A (1934–1950), recognised this, noting: ‘Thomas and Drake were practically the only dealers in stained glass, much of the Victoria and Albert Museum collection comes from them’. A minimum of around 150 panels and windows out of an estimated 1,500 panels now held by the V&A came through them, at least 115 out of the MMA’s approximate 1,100 total, as well as over 170 of the 700 panels acquired by Glasgow-born shipping magnate William Burrell (1861–1958). The importance of the firm to these institutional buyers, and particularly to Burrell, as the only private creator of a museum collection amongst this triumvirate, will be elaborated.

Secondary literature that deals directly with the trade in stained glass and the formation of stained-glass collections during this period is very scarce. In general, provenance research has often looked at the study of dispersed objects in terms of assigning and discussing a panel in its original context; rarely does focus turn to its subsequent treatment, alteration, and display. Perhaps by necessity, as United States has no indigenous glass of medieval and Renaissance date, American collections research has been more thorough, relatively speaking. Often it has considered the formation of collections of stained glass in overview as part of geographically divided surveys. These catalogues and checklists, produced by the Corpus Vitrearum, provide thorough provenance information, and are vital starting points. Their general introductions provide several important summaries of the main dealers, curators, and buyers of stained glass. Ambitious publications such as Jane Hayward’s English and French Medieval Stained Glass in the Collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

---

4 Edward Arthur Lane, letter to Christopher Woodforde, SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 52, December 9, 1948.
5 Thomas and Drake likely supplied Burrell with a figure far higher than this; this sum represents only the amount that can be traced to them with certainty.
(2003), for example, delivers an extensive two-volume illustrated catalogue of over 120 of the museum’s panels. Concerned not only with listing key provenance information, this book also discusses themes such as a panel’s iconography, dating, and style. Due to the wide and rich range of information volumes such as these attempt to provide, collection histories invariably have frequently only been discussed in general ways.

Frances Fowle’s 2010 monograph, *Van Gogh’s Twin: The Scottish Dealer Alexander Reid (1854–1928)* provides the most critical outline of a single art dealership and its figurehead operating during the period. However, although Reid hosted Grosvenor’s first Glasgow-based exhibition of stained glass in 1919, Reid’s handling and sale of stained glass is entirely absent from Fowle’s account. Other published material positions art dealers contemporary with Thomas and Drake as arbiters of taste, but base their discussions almost entirely on anecdotal information, avoiding any reference to stained glass, despite provenance research confirming their handling of the medium. The total absence of the medium from the 1961 publication *Merchants of Art, 1880–1960: Eighty Years of Professional Collecting* by Germain Seligman (1893–1978) is a case in point. The Duveen firm has proved a particularly popular subject amongst authors, with several books devoted to recording the activities of its founding members. Despite this, the biography by Samuel Nathaniel Behrman (1893–1973) (*Duveen: The Story of the Most Spectacular Art Dealer of All Time* (1952)), the accounts by James Henry Duveen (b.1873) (*Collections and Recollections* (1935), *Secrets of an Art Dealer* (1937), and *The Rise of the House of Duveen* (1957)), and the work by Meryle Secrest (b.1930) (*Duveen: A Life in Art* (2004)) all neglect to mention the company’s stained-glass sales.

---

7 Hayward, *English and French*.
10 After becoming a US citizen in 1943, Germain Seligmann (two Ns) changed his name to Germain Seligman. He will be referred to in this thesis by the later spelling of his name. His company did not change its name, and so will be known in the thesis as Seligmann’s.
Although many of their colleagues in the industry had recorded their careers, there is no evidence of Grosvenor, Roy, or Wilfred having produced any sort of written account of this kind. In fact, the first published overview of Thomas and Drake’s firm was a brief outline provided by William Cole (1909–1997) in the 1988 publication *The Windows of King’s College Chapel, Cambridge: The Side-Chapel Glass* by Hilary Wayment (1912–2005). Although Cole was a friend and customer of Roy’s from the late 1940s, his unsourced overview unfortunately relied on later recollections, the accuracy of which it is difficult to assess.

The thesis has been split into three chapters to reflect the key achievements and differing roles of each of the three partners in the firm. Broadly, Grosvenor was their principal buyer, Roy their main salesman, and Wilfred their restorer and adapter, with a minor focus on European sales. The first chapter will therefore deal with Grosvenor’s sourcing, exhibiting, and selling of the ‘Grosvenor Thomas Collection’. It also explores the salient factors relevant to the formation of Thomas and Drake. The second chapter focuses entirely on Roy’s American branch, where, it is argued, Thomas and Drake heavily concentrated their sales. It unravels some of the leading networks of buyers and collaborators in the trade that were operating at the time. The final chapter demonstrates Wilfred’s multifaceted role as the firm’s British anchor, after the death of Grosvenor, and looks at him as both restorer and salesman. It reveals the ways in which he physically transformed their stock. It also brings to the fore his exceptional relationship with the firm’s most longstanding and prolific buyer, William Burrell, a theme further extended in the appendices, where their extensive surviving correspondence has, for the first time, been fully transcribed.

Where sales prices are known, an estimated equivalent of its worth today has been included to give a sense of perspective of the values changing hands, using the ‘currency convertor’ tool of The National Archives, and its American equivalent, the Dollar Times’s ‘inflation calculator’. It should also be noted that although later scholarship has provided prestigious provenances for some of Thomas and Drake’s stock, rarely were such factors made explicit.

---

in their selling, suggesting that they were largely unaware of how exceptional some of these panels really were. Stained-glass scholarship was in its infancy, and dealers were often reluctant to provide full accounts of a window’s provenance, either because it was not known, or as a result of the need to obscure a previous deal. Rarely will original provenances be discussed here, as these were not the terms through which the company sold or buyers bought, but references to sources that have traced this subsequently will be provided.

**Chapter One: Grosvenor**

Chapter one scrutinises the role played by Grosvenor Thomas, a pioneering and market-leading collector and seller of European medieval and Renaissance stained glass in the early twentieth century. It will be argued that Grosvenor’s greatest contributions were in the formation and marketing of the ‘Grosvenor Thomas Collection’, which created a renewed appetite for the medium among collectors and dealers. His privately formed collection went on to create Thomas and Drake’s stock.

The chapter aims to establish the factors that led to Grosvenor’s association with the medium of stained glass, through a careful unpicking of his early life and previous occupations. His collection, taken almost exclusively from English country houses, was formed from around 1905 onwards, and became the only widely accessible assemblage of stained glass available for sale on both sides of the Atlantic. The stripping of country estates for their contents was an occurrence that went largely undocumented during the period, and remains obscure. The 2007 book *Moving Rooms: The Trade in Architectural Salvages* by John Harris (b.1931) has demonstrated that thousands of British country houses were relieved of their fixtures and fittings during the period, and the houses themselves demolished, at a ferocious pace. However, what happened to the hundreds of thousands of items that were publicly auctioned, or privately and quietly sold – most of which were channelled to the United States – has received little attention relative to the scale of these operations.

---

Apart from a handful of his letters, none of Grosvenor’s own records from this period survive. However, this chapter will provide close analysis of Grosvenor’s life and career through the bringing together of a series of so far unexamined primary and secondary sources. It will reveal Grosvenor’s construction of his vast collection, and its early dispersal through various public sales in London, Glasgow, and New York, brought about through collaborations with established transatlantic art dealers, period-room importers, interior designers, and stained-glass manufacturers.

Aside from Marilyn Beaven’s pioneering fifteen-page article published in 2009 – ‘Grosvenor Thomas and the Making of the American Market for Medieval Stained Glass’ – which critically assessed Grosvenor’s debut American exhibitions held in New York in 1913 – there has so far been no other study of Grosvenor’s early collection.16 Beaven credits Grosvenor as having created an appetite for stained glass at a time when no significant market for the medium existed, establishing Grosvenor’s central importance to American collectors and collections. Her article also identified key buyers of stained glass, and presented some important American case studies that heavily relied on panels supplied by Grosvenor. Building upon these solid foundations, this chapter will further investigate these and others of Grosvenor’s exhibitions. It will look at the types of buyers, and the content of Grosvenor’s early, vast, but undocumented collection, reconstructing for the first time a more complete picture of Grosvenor’s activities from the late nineteenth century to his death in 1923.

The origins and circumstances of the incorporation of the Thomas and Drake firm, co-founded by Grosvenor Thomas, which used Grosvenor’s huge collection as its stock, will be assessed. Grosvenor furnished the company with enough panels to last its entire twenty-five-year trading history, the partners only having to make minor acquisitions as and when warranted. Roy’s growth from his position as Grosvenor’s assistant, to his establishing himself as permanent sole American representative, will also be described; his increasing autonomy is exemplified by the 1922 publication of his first and only book, Stained Glass: Its Origin and Application.17

---

An extensive portion of research into Grosvenor’s life, and the factors relevant to the creation of his stained-glass collection, has been enabled by the survival of rich primary resources. Some of Grosvenor’s exhibition catalogues survive; these provide essential, but sometimes vague, information on what was contained in this early collection. However, Grosvenor’s early business can be recreated by combining surviving letters with accounts relating to sales of his panels (such as the day books retained by the art dealers Reid and Lefevre, stored at the archives at London’s Tate Britain). Further key information has been provided by curator’s notes, reports, and object files at several institutions where high concentrations of Grosvenor panels are deposited. The extensive archival holdings in New York, at both The Cloisters and the MMA, and in London at the V&A and the Society of Antiquaries, where a cache of Grosvenor’s own papers are stored, have offered crucial information. This has been greatly enhanced by the drawing together of smaller archival collections, such as a store of primary records held at the Cleveland Museum (Ohio), relating to purchases of Grosvenor’s panels made by iron magnate William Gwinn Mather (1857–1951), and the papers held at the Glencairn Museum (Pennsylvania) relating to businessman Raymond Pitcairn (1885–1966). Census documents, directories, war rolls, and ships’ logs have also offered insights into the movements, and changing occupations, of Grosvenor and others associated with his business. Similarly, contemporary adverts, newspaper reports, and journal articles have presented new layers of information, which has facilitated a much more sophisticated exploration of Grosvenor’s, and the firm’s, origins.

Chapter Two: Roy

Thomas and Drake’s sales powerhouse, it will be argued, was their New York branch, led by Roy and established in the early 1920s. The sometimes obscure relationships and networks between dealers and their customers will emerge here with greater clarity, and the commercial impact of this trade revealed for the first time. It will examine Thomas and Drake’s appeal to families of exceptional wealth—to businessmen, financiers, industrialists, and heiresses. However, due to the number of buyers known to have used the firm in the

---

19 WRHS, Mather Papers, box 15. Access to these documents was made possible by Marilyn Beaven, who kindly shared her facsimiles of this series.
20 GMA, dealer correspondence, boxes 1–5, sub-series 1.
United States alone – over 75 customers are recorded in the New York stock books – it has not been possible to look at every single buyer in depth. Instead this chapter presents an overview of Roy’s buyers within a framework structured to reveal some of their multiple associations and networks.

The records of the New York branch of Thomas and Drake are significantly better preserved than those of the London branch, deposited amongst the files of glazier Dennis King (1912–1995) at the Society of Antiquaries (London). The survival of Roy’s only two stock books has allowed for a complete overview of the stock held by Thomas and Drake in New York, showing the number and type of panels transferred for sale in the United States, and the minimum values accorded to each panel. Unfortunately, the exact price that changed hands in sales is only known sporadically, as Roy’s cash books and journals, where this information would have been stored, and to which Roy cross-references in annotations in the stock books, are no longer extant. However, the names of buyers, and sometimes their month and year of acquisition, are listed in the stock books. Small black and white photographs of panels in Thomas and Drake’s possession, which were termed ‘stock cards’, also survive, although the series is not complete. Nonetheless, those that are still available are invaluable, not only as records of the appearance of the panels during Thomas and Drake’s time, but also for containing annotations in both Roy’s and Wilfred’s hands, which note buyers, and occasionally the prices offered or paid.

Our understanding of both branches would have been greatly enhanced had Roy’s wife Winifred Bartlett Thomas (1890–1970) not followed the recommendations of an unnamed V&A staff member, when she closed the business in the 1960s. A whole tranche of the firm’s documents was destroyed at this time, a process she described in correspondence: ‘I had files and files of letters with reference to buyers and sellers through the years. I asked the V&A man what to do with them, in case they were of historical interest, and when he saw the trunk-full he advised me to throw them all away, which I did’.  

21 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, boxes 41–63.
22 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, boxes 50, 53, 54.
Few have explored in detail the inextricable link between the fall of the English country house and the simultaneous rise of the transatlantic art dealer and the American new rich set whose members were its principal beneficiaries. Aside from the aforementioned specialised output of the American Corpus Vitrearum, research on the twentieth-century transatlantic art market has been conducted more broadly by Harris, whose book offers the first sustained analysis of British and American interior designers and period-room importers during Thomas and Drake’s period. His book suggests links between the acquisition of European art from country estates, particularly architectonic objects (although excluding stained glass), and the furnishing of grand American homes. The 2005 publication *Stanford White: Decorator in Opulence and Dealer in Antiquities* by Wayne Craven (b.1930) has also explored these sorts of intersections, between the interior design, architecture, and art-dealing spheres, incorporating references to stained glass, modern and ancient, in his discussions. His book deals with the late nineteenth-century output of New York architect Stanford White (1853–1906), a figure who readily incorporated genuine imported objects into the homes he designed. However, White had been murdered before Grosvenor’s emergence as a stained-glass dealer, and so does not feature in Craven’s publication, although his firm did make acquisitions from Grosvenor almost a decade later, as discussed shortly.

Chapter Two aims to situate Roy as another participant in the supply of architectural goods. Roy acted as a specialist seller of stained glass, commonly selling directly to those associated with the building of mansions of newly wealthy millionaires and billionaires. Roy’s biggest customer base was formed of those involved and associated with the construction of Revival-style mansions modelled on the European country house, and who consequently sought to furnish these homes appropriately with genuine European accessories. In doing so, Roy formed collaborations with British-born interior designers and period-room importers active in the United States, perhaps suggesting that British dealers stuck together in New York, forming their own informal consortiums. This chapter situates the purchase of stained glass alongside that of other interior decorations and architectural salvages, and closely associates it with the interior-design and house-decoration industry. It examines the role of women as major buyers of the medium, a factor that has previously received little attention. Roy’s own

24 Harris, *Moving Rooms.*
records reveal that significant numbers of females supervised the purchase of panels from Roy. It places early twentieth-century women at the forefront, as not just the wives and daughters of exceptionally wealthy men, but as decision-makers, house decorators, and by consequence, as major patrons of the arts.

**Chapter Three: Wilfred**

Chapter Three assesses the importance of Wilfred Drake as Thomas and Drake’s British representative. He will be seen as the firm’s technical director, and the thesis explores the role of the glass-painter, glazier, and restorer in determining the appearance and appeal of individual panels, within the wider context of contemporary restoration principles, and also the needs and tastes of buyers. It will be argued that Wilfred’s appointment and the establishment of Thomas and Drake’s workshop at Holland Park signalled their need for a permanent in-house stained-glass specialist. Much of what we see today is as a result of Wilfred’s handiwork. The most important source in this regard has been the physical and archival analysis of large portions of surviving panels and windows, with the objects themselves revealing much about Wilfred’s treatment of the firm’s stock. While several contemporary books and glazing manuals reveal the working practices of stained-glass artists during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, these have often only dedicated small sections to restoration techniques, and it is likely that these were ideal principles, and not how the average workshop operated. There has not been any sort of close analysis of how restoration was actually performed by those involved in the art-dealing world. Wilfred’s main criteria were to satisfy the practical needs, aesthetic concerns, and tastes, of his clients, arranging and adapting their purchases, and reinterpreting Thomas and Drake’s stock for new audiences of buyers. While later conservation has largely erased Wilfred’s work, fortunately his interventions are still visible across many of panels at the Burrell Collection.

---

Special access to the collections there, and more widely to the vast resources of Glasgow Museums, has proved critical in the examination of Wilfred’s role.\textsuperscript{28}

Although he was an art-dealing novice, the fact Wilfred managed to complete sales to over forty separate customers deserves credit, and that one of those customers was William Burrell, the firm’s most prolific and long-standing buyer, is even more remarkable. Wilfred’s practical training afforded him the ability to offer many more in-house services than Roy could, so Wilfred was an indispensable part of the firm. He could derive subsidiary incomes from new glazing commissions, and restorations of stained glass \textit{in situ}. He also often designed, arranged, and glazed window schemes for Thomas and Drake’s many customers on both sides of the Atlantic. Wilfred was also a proficient researcher, appraiser, and cataloguer, and so he had a rich skill-set that proved crucial to both the running of the firm, and to gaining the trust and continued custom of a man like Burrell, who was a formidable figure. Hitherto, Wilfred Drake has received little attention. By way of underlining his position as an art world authority, almost a decade after Wilfred’s death, respected York-based glass-painter John Alder Knowles (1881–1961) continued to lament his loss, observing: ‘since Drake’s death I know of nobody capable of forming an opinion; there are a lot of forgeries about’.\textsuperscript{29}

While primary resources are relatively abundant for Thomas and Drake’s European buyers, little is available by way of secondary literature. There have, so far, been no detailed surveys of British collections of stained glass during this period comparable with those we find in the United States. William Cole’s 1993 \textit{Catalogue of Netherlandish and North European Roundels in Britain} is perhaps the most recent and critical survey of specifically non-indigenous stained glass now found in Britain.\textsuperscript{30} Fortunately, large portions of Britain’s medieval and Renaissance stained glass is still \textit{in situ}, and so research has prioritised these schemes. There has otherwise not been the same close attention to Britain’s collections of imported and

\textsuperscript{28} This was made possible by my status as Arts and Humanities Research Council Collaborative Doctoral Award holder, and the organisational partnership between the University of York and Glasgow Museums that this afforded.

\textsuperscript{29} University of York, William Cole Papers, John Alder Knowles, letter to William Cole, September 21, 1956.

assembled collections of stained glass to date. Even in the case of the V&A, which contains the largest collection of stained glass in the world, comparatively little has been published. The *Guide to the Collections of Stained Glass* (1936) by Bernard Rackham (1876–1964) and *Medieval and Renaissance Stained Glass in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (2003) by Paul Williamson (b.1954) both offer only general surveys and discussions of their holdings in this medium.

Using Burrell as a central case study, a distinction will be drawn between those who fundamentally used stained glass as an accessory in the decoration of their manorial homes, and those who were collectors of the medium because of its intrinsic artistic, historical, and technical interest. Burrell deliberately expanded his purchases of stained glass beyond that which he could accommodate in his homes, and looked instead towards the formation of a comprehensive museum collection. His name is now associated with the Glasgow art museum he helped found, which opened to the public in 1982, and a large proportion of its total holdings is made up of stained glass. Burrell’s is an enormous and unrelentingly high-quality collection, formed under the heavy guidance of Wilfred Drake. The stained glass of the Burrell Collection includes mainly late Gothic and early Renaissance examples from Switzerland, Germany, France, the Netherlands, and England. The glass dates from the fourteenth to the nineteenth centuries, with the majority of pieces from the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. In volume and quality, it is not only testament to Burrell’s passion and ambition, but is also a lasting legacy of Wilfred Drake’s expertise as *de facto* advisor. In its longevity and volume Burrell’s collecting activity was unsurpassed: he bought hundreds of panels and windows from Grosvenor and both branches of Thomas and Drake, across a five-decade period, creating the third-largest assemblage of stained glass in the world. That Wilfred was able to elevate Burrell’s collection to such a high status underlines his importance and ability not just as an art dealer and restorer, but as a consultant and astute

---


appraiser. Wilfred’s chapter is deliberately and appropriately shared with Burrell, in order to illustrate their special importance to one another.

Despite the international significance of Burrell’s collection of stained glass, there have been few publications that address its formation. The collection’s second keeper (1956-1978), William Wells (1913–2003), produced two catalogues of its stained glass, which accompanied a series of exhibitions of the medium in the 1960s. Richard Marks (b.1945), third keeper of the collection (1979–1985) – who oversaw the opening of the new museum and the first permanent public display of the stained glass – produced Burrell’s only published biography. At the same time, he also provided a general illustrated guide to the collections. Volumes dealing with several of Burrell’s most important collecting areas, such as its internationally significant tapestries, are currently in production. Despite the importance of the Burrell Collection’s stained-glass holdings, so far there has only been one brief book on this topic, the 1991 *Stained Glass in the Burrell Collection* by Linda Cannon (b.1960), which is heavily indebted to Marks’s research.

Until now, only minimal attention has been afforded to Burrell’s different phases of collecting, and how he incorporated and displayed his acquisitions of stained glass. This thesis aims to shed new light on Burrell’s incorporation of medieval and Renaissance stained glass at his homes, and how his subsequent decision to gift his collection, and found a museum, affected his acquisitions. Despite the importance of Hutton Castle in the Scottish Borders (Burrell’s home between 1916 and his death in 1958) to the history of collecting, it has received minimal attention and has been poorly documented. It remains as a private residence, and has been subjected to much internal and external modifications since Burrell’s time. This chapter provides a full reconstruction of the glazing of the castle, and shows the positioning and layout of all of the rooms there. Surviving architectural plans, and a selection

36 Elizabeth Cleland’s *Tapestries in the Burrell Collection* (London: Philip Wilson Publishers) is expected to go to print in December 2016.
38 Hutton Castle, however, was not inhabited full-time by the Burrells until around 1927.
of photographs of the interiors of Burrell’s homes, have proved indispensable. Wilfred Drake’s unpublished 1932 catalogue, ‘List of Ancient Stained Glass at Hutton Castle’, has not previously been analysed in depth, despite the remarkable breadth of information it contains regarding the glazing of this building. It gives the number and orientation of windows in each room, which, when matched with the surviving floor-plans and photographs, allows for the first time for an almost complete mapping of the distribution of the rooms.

---

CHAPTER ONE: The Grosvenor Thomas Collection, and the Formation of Thomas and Drake

Grosvenor Thomas became active as a trader in medieval and Renaissance stained glass around 1905. Directly before Grosvenor’s involvement, the medium was not a particularly fashionable or saleable commodity; consequently few art dealers handled it in any significant quantity. However, Grosvenor’s quickly became the only widely accessible collection dedicated almost entirely to stained glass, which he stocked in unprecedented and unsurpassed volume. The Grosvenor Thomas Collection, predecessor to the Thomas and Drake firm, offered extraordinary range and quality, and was introduced to the general public and trade through a series of carefully selected exhibitions and collaborations with established art dealers and interior designers. So far, little has been published on Grosvenor’s origins, or the origins of his remarkable firm. This chapter therefore aims closely to examine the life and career of Grosvenor, as founder and figurehead of the Thomas and Drake firm, and the early formation and dispersal of his privately formed collection.

Grosvenor’s Early Life (1856–85)

Grosvenor’s early life was punctuated by long-distance travel. However, nothing in Grosvenor’s background suggested he was a person of immense wealth or social standing. Rather, he hailed from an industrious, self-made family. He was born in Sydney (Australia) in May 1856 to British parents: Bristol-born master mariner John George Thomas (1824 – c.1868) and Frome-born milliner Mary Ann Coward (1834–1908).\(^4\) Grosvenor’s older sister Mary Helen Thomas (1854 – c.1880) was born in Hobart (Tasmania).\(^5\) As is evident from surviving photographs and paintings of the family, and confirmed by descriptions of daily life in his mother’s surviving journals, by all appearances the family enjoyed a comfortable

\(^4\) They married in 1852 in Geelong, Australia; “Intercolonial News,” *Melbourne Argus*, July 6, 1863, 6.

expatriate existence (figs 1–2). On account of John’s occupation, for several years the family moved frequently between ports in Australia and New Zealand, before transferring to China. This period was documented in detail by Grosvenor’s mother, who described encounters with typhoons, ship wrecks, pirates, and tribes of cannibals.\(^{42}\) Navigating through Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, and Malaysia, they then docked in two British colonies—reaching Singapore, and then Hong Kong by August 1862.\(^{43}\) They reached their final destination, Shanghai (China), by November 1862, and lived in the city’s ‘international settlement’, a western commercial and residential enclave.\(^{44}\) For several months in early 1863, the Thomases lived in Foochow in southern China—where Mary Ann’s sister Fanny (1843–1930), also married to a mariner, had settled—\(^{45}\) before returning to Shanghai. Mary Ann’s diary graphically records a deadly cholera outbreak in 1864, prompting the family’s permanent return to Britain. They again used British overseas territories as stopping ports, landing at the South Atlantic island of St Helena by October 1864, where Mary Ann’s diary for some reason ends. By mid-1866 at the latest, when Grosvenor was about eleven years old, the family had arrived in Britain.\(^{46}\) The Thomases initially lived in Westbury and Warminster (Wiltshire), where Grosvenor’s maternal grandparents owned a fellmonger’s business.\(^{47}\) According to brief printed accounts of Grosvenor’s life, he was enrolled at the local independent school, Lord Weymouth’s.\(^{48}\) Mention of Grosvenor’s father ceases upon their return; however, a photograph of him taken at a studio in Bristol in 1868, confirms he survived the journey home (fig. 3).

By the 1871 census, Mary Ann was listed as a widow living in Tottenham (London), with her two teenage children, and a young male lodger.\(^{49}\) None of the occupants had declared a profession, suggesting that the family may have been in receipt of some other form of
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\(^{42}\) Private Collection, Diary of Mary Ann Thomas, s.v. June 3, 1962: ‘We left the Phoenix Wharf at 12pm on the night of the 3rd June 1862 for China via Wollongong; Captain Thomas commander, myself, my little girl eight-years of age and boy six-years, the latter very delicate […];’ with thanks to Peter Rook.

\(^{43}\) Private Collection, Diary of Mary Ann Thomas, s.v. August and November, 1862.


\(^{45}\) TNA, 1881 England and Wales Household Census, “Fanny Coward.”


\(^{47}\) TNA, 1861 England and Wales Household Census, “Coward, Lewis.”

\(^{48}\) David Martin, *Glasgow School of Painting* (London: Kissenger, 1897), 65.

\(^{49}\) TNA, 1871 England and Wales Household Census, “Thomas, Mary Ann.”
income, such as a widow’s pension or mariners’ benevolence. At some stage in 1878, Grosvenor, by now in his early twenties, travelled to South America with his sister and mother,\textsuperscript{50} becoming a sheep farmer working in the Patagónian grasslands of Argentina.\textsuperscript{51} Grosvenor’s sister died there, together with her infant child,\textsuperscript{52} which may have prompted Grosvenor’s and his mother’s return to England soon after. Another of Mary Ann’s surviving journals shows that she and Grosvenor then embarked on a European trip, departing London for Paris on 17 December 1880.\textsuperscript{53} The pair reached Rome by mid-January 1881, taking in many of Europe’s cultural sites, indicating their interest in the arts. Their travels continued for at least another month or two, before their return to London by April 1881, when Grosvenor appears on the 1881 census, lodging on Fentiman Road in Lambeth, south London. Listed as a ‘commercial traveller’\textsuperscript{54} and probably trading in oriental goods, he boarded with oriental salesman, Alexander EGISIPPO NORCHI (1855–1908),\textsuperscript{55} son of Italian-born marble and sculpture dealer EGISIPPO Luigi Norchi (1812–1894);\textsuperscript{56} this marks Grosvenor’s first potential association with the sale of objets d’art.

In April 1884, while living in a flat on Eardley Crescent (Kensington), Grosvenor had married a local grocer’s daughter, Matilda Jane Goulden (1863–1936).\textsuperscript{57} This was a relatively affluent area, described a decade later in a survey of London by economist Charles Booth (1840–1916) as follows: ‘people are better, servants kept [...] middle class, well-to-do’.\textsuperscript{58} Grosvenor’s previous lodgings in Lambeth were described in the same survey in more modest terms as ‘fairly comfortable, ordinary earnings’,\textsuperscript{59} suggesting his increasing finances.

\textsuperscript{50} Martin, Glasgow School, 65.
\textsuperscript{51} This is mentioned in, “Unique Old Glass Collection Shown Here,” New York Sun, March 2, 1913, 15. Patagonia experienced an agricultural boom during this period, and many British emigrants found work in this industry; Mateo Martínic Beros, “La Participacion de Capitales Britanicos en el Desarrollo Economico del Territorio de Magallanes,” Historia, 35 (2002): 299–321.
\textsuperscript{52} Information provided by David Ockleshaw.
\textsuperscript{53} Private Collection, Mary Ann Thomas’s European Travel Journal, 1880; with thanks to David Ockleshaw.
\textsuperscript{54} Grosvenor was not necessarily advanced in this career, as would be inferred by the job titles of ‘merchant’ or ‘trader’; Michael French, “Commercials, Careers and Culture: Travelling Salesmen in Britain 1890s – 1930s,” Economic History Review, 58, no. 2 (2005): 352–77.
\textsuperscript{55} TNA, 1881 England and Wales Household Census, “Thomas, Grosvenor.”
\textsuperscript{57} LMA, Register of Marriages, April 26, 1884, “Thomas, Grosvenor and Goulden, Matilda Jane.”
\textsuperscript{59} London School of Economics Archive, Charles Booth Records, B.366, 9.
After his marriage, Grosvenor and his family moved to a four-bedroom house at 24 Eyot Gardens in Hammersmith, which was classified by Booth as being in an area of ‘mixed incomes’. Presumably in order to be able to afford a larger house, to accommodate his new wife and child, Grosvenor had to move to a less exclusive area.

Simultaneously, Grosvenor’s mother began a new London business venture. In 1881, architect Charles Harrison Townsend (1851–1928) submitted plans for the ‘Thomas and Company Turkish Baths’, located at 25 and 26 Earls Court Gardens in west London. The work cost Mary Ann just under £1,000, and it presumably took her some time to raise the necessary capital. It was not until 1885 that the work of converting the two large terraced houses into a male and female baths began; they opened in 1886, and were co-managed by Mary Ann and her Foochow-born nephew William Mitchell (b.1869). Illustrations found in a 1927 booklet, after the baths had changed ownership, give an indication of the scale and furnishing of this venue—the firm’s successor did not submit plans to modify the baths, and so it is unlikely that any drastic changes had taken place since Mary Ann’s time (fig. 4). From 1888, the London architects Morley and Letts made alterations to the baths for Mary Ann, including converting the upper rooms into a lodging house. A new manager was appointed, John Walkey (1820–1905), who by 1895 had married Grosvenor’s mother. Incorporation papers for the business show Grosvenor as one of the bath’s four directors, all of whom were family members. There were also three subsidiary investors, all connected to the London
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60 LMA, Board of Guardian Records and Parish Registers, May 13, 1885, “Roy Grosvenor Thomas.”
61 Townsend was the designer of several public buildings in London, such as the Bishopsgate Institute (1892–94), the Whitechapel Art Gallery (1895–99), and the Horniman Museum (1898–1901); Ann Compton, “Charles Harrison Townsend,” Mapping the Practice and Profession of Sculpture in Britain and Ireland 1851–1951, University of Glasgow, http://sculpture.gla.ac.uk/view/person.php?id=msib2_1213361095 (accessed April 23, 2015). With thanks to Malcolm Shifrin for sharing information on the Thomas Turkish baths.
62 Royal Institute of British Architects Library, Valuation Notebooks 1885–86, “Harrison Townsend,” April 4, 1885, 504. Almost half of the funds may have come from a family inheritance. When Grosvenor’s grandmother Sarah Golledge Coward died in 1885, Mary Ann and her brother Henry Coward (1853–1932) inherited a sum of £433, and both became shareholders in the baths; London, High Court of Justice, England and Wales National Probate Registry, July 22, 1885, “Sarah Coward.”
65 LMA, Register of Marriages, December 26, 1895, “John Walkey and Mary Ann Thomas.”
66 Jordan and Sons made speculative investments in several companies around this time; “Jordan and Sons,” The Engineer, March 1900, 343; TNA, Files of Dissolved Companies, 1902, “Earl’s Court Turkish Baths Ltd.”
printers Jordan and Sons. When the company went to allotment at the turn of the century, 10,000 shares were available, priced at £1 each, showing that Mary Ann had developed the business into something that was now valued at £10,000 (equivalent to around £600,000 today). By 1902, with Mary Ann now almost seventy, and presumably looking to her retirement, the business was sold to a Midlands hotelier, Archibald James (1859–1931). The sale of this family business left Grosvenor and the other directors presumably with considerable savings. Grosvenor was sole heir to Mary Ann’s and her husband’s assets of around £5,000 (around £290,000 today) after their respective deaths in 1905 and 1908. He may have opted to invest some of this money in stained glass, as his inheritance coincides loosely with Grosvenor’s beginning to purchase the medium.

Grosvenor in Glasgow (1885–1901)

Grosvenor and his young family had moved to Glasgow by mid- to late-1885 at the latest, presumably soon after his son Roy (1885–1952) had been baptised in Hammersmith (London) in May 1885. Grosvenor’s daughter Dorothy (1887–1971) was born 30 miles south-east of Glasgow, in Lanark in 1887. By 1888, the family were living at Highbury House in Lenzie, a commuter town six miles north of Glasgow. Photographs of Grosvenor and Roy taken at Annan and Sons, a photographic studio and art dealers in Glasgow, can be associated with this period (fig. 5). As there are no known familial links to Scotland, the impetus for this move was presumably related to Grosvenor’s career, and the city’s ties to the art world. Glasgow was home to a large enclave of wealthy industrialists and merchants, several of whom collected both traditional and avant garde works. Many art dealers established themselves in the city in order to serve as their advisors and agents. The city was also a stimulating place for practising artists. Grosvenor would soon become affiliated with the Glasgow Boys, an artists’ collective that flourished from the late 1880s and drew heavily on

67 Ibid.
68 Ibid.
69 London, High Court of Justice, Principal Probate Registry, September 13, 1906, “John Walkey,” and January 28, 1908, “Mary Ann Walkey.”
70 LMA, Register of Baptisms, May 13, 1885, “Roy Grosvenor Thomas.”
71 NRS, 1891 Scotland Household Census, “Dorothy Grosvenor Thomas.”
72 Post Office Annual Glasgow Directory, 1888–89 (Glasgow: John Graham, 1888), 586; NRS, 1891 Scotland Household Census, “Thomas, Grosvenor.”
73 Mavor, Pictures by Glasgow Painters, 22.

From 1888, the year of the Glasgow International Exhibition (which Grosvenor is known to have attended)\footnote{At the 1888 Glasgow International Exhibition, Glasgow Boy John Lavery (1856–1941) depicted the event of Queen Victoria’s state visit, showing 253 attendees who were at the inauguration ceremony. Both Burrell and Grosvenor have been identified in this crowd; Stanley Hunter, \textit{Sir John Lavery and the 1888 International Exhibition} (Glasgow: privately printed, 1997), 1–3. This painting is now at Kelvingrove Art Gallery (Glasgow), acc. no. 710.} to 1891, Grosvenor was listed in trade directories as a ‘wholesale oriental art merchant’ with a gallery in the city centre, at 46 Gordon Street.\footnote{“Oriental Art Productions,” \textit{Dundee Courier}, October 28, 1889, 1.} A 1889 advertisement records that Grosvenor also displayed some of his stock at the Royal Hotel on Sauchiehall Street, in Glasgow’s affluent west end.\footnote{Post Office Annual Glasgow Directory 1888–89, 212.} Grosvenor sold carpets, screens, bronzes, ivories, curtains, porcelain, and inlaid cabinets from Japan, China, Turkey, and India.\footnote{Post Office Annual ... 1888–89, 212; David Hussey, \textit{Buying for the Home: Shopping for the Domestic from the Seventeenth Century to the Present} (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 98.} He had also secured the sole distribution rights (in Scotland and Ireland) for Japanese leather paper hangings, manufactured by Rottmann Strome.\footnote{Ayako Ono, \textit{Japonisme in Britain: Whistler, Menpes, Henry, Hornel and Nineteenth-Century Japan} (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 22.} During this period, Grosvenor alternated between art dealing and his work as a self-taught artist, presumably falling back on art dealing when there was a drop in sales of his own paintings, a small handful of which remain in public collections in Britain (fig. 6). Oriental, especially Japanese, art was a common influence for the Glasgow Boys. In 1893, two of the circle, George Henry (1858–1943), with whom Grosvenor later shared a studio, and Edward Atkinson (1864–1933), went on an eighteen-month artistic expedition to Japan, funded by William Burrell.\footnote{“Notices,” \textit{London Gazette}, August 28, 1891, 4629.}

By the 1890s, Grosvenor moved away from art dealing, closing his oriental business and dissolving his partnership with Rottmann Strome.\footnote{“Notices,” \textit{London Gazette}, August 28, 1891, 4629.} His success as a landscape artist was now becoming more firmly established, as suggested by his award in 1890 of a prestigious gold
medal for his painting *Dawn* (1890) at the Munich International Exhibition.\(^{83}\) The 1891 census reveals that Grosvenor was now listing his occupation as an ‘artist and landscape painter’, and a photograph showing Grosvenor at work in his studio presumably relates to around this time (fig. 7).\(^{84}\) Grosvenor exhibited his own paintings at Glasgow-based picture dealer John Bennett and Sons, at 50 Gordon Street.\(^{85}\) By 1892, Grosvenor was affiliated with several artistic organisations, including the Royal Society of Watercolourists, and the Glasgow Art Club.\(^{86}\) At the same time, Grosvenor’s work was shown alongside that of the Glasgow Boys at the Royal Glasgow Institute of the Fine Arts, and London’s Royal Academy of Art.\(^{87}\)

Despite these successes, Grosvenor still reverted to art dealing, forming a partnership with art dealer William Bell Paterson (1859–1952) in September 1892.\(^{88}\) An 1893 advertisement reveals that their 33 Renfield Street gallery stocked Grosvenor’s usual repertoire of oriental goods, with the addition of contemporary European paintings of the Hague and Barbizon schools (other known Glasgow Boy influences), including paintings by Victor Vincelet (1840–71), Mattijs Maris (1839–1917), Adolphe Monticelli (1824–1886), and Henry Muhrmann (1854–1916).\(^{89}\) Grosvenor’s and Paterson’s gallery also held an important exhibition of sixty works by American painter James McNeill Whistler (1834–1903) and French etcher Charles Méryon (1821–1868).\(^{90}\) This was a short-lived venture, as the partnership was dissolved by September 1893 at the latest. Trading under his own name, Paterson remained at the gallery, and continued to hold exhibitions of Grosvenor’s own works there.\(^{91}\)
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83 Grosvenor’s painting was exhibited at the Glaspalast (Munich), before its purchase by Bavarian Prince Luitpold (1821–1912); Martin, *Glasgow School*, 65.
84 NRS, *1891 Scotland Household Census*, “Thomas, Grosvenor.”
85 “Messrs Bennett and Sons,” *Dundee Courier*, June 4, 1891, 1.
86 *Post Office Annual Glasgow Directory* 1892–93 (Glasgow: John Graham, 1892), 188.
89 *Post Office Annual* ... 1893–94, 306.
Grosvenor next appears in the 1896 trade directory, sharing a studio at 2 West Regent Street with George Henry (1858–1943), a prominent member of the Glasgow Boys. Grosvenor was awarded another gold medal, at the 1897 Dresden International Exhibition, and his work was also displayed at the Venice Biennale and at Pittsburgh’s Carnegie Institute in the United States. By 1898, Grosvenor had moved to a combined home and studio at 118 Main Street (now Gorbals Street), where he remained until at least 1900. In October 1898, two of Grosvenor’s landscape paintings submitted for the Edinburgh Watercolour Exhibition were reported as sold, giving the first indication of the market value of his artworks: Moorland fetched £8 8s and Moonrise £6 6s (equivalent to a modest combined total of around £750 today). Later, in October 1899, a newspaper article recorded further sales, this time at the Glasgow auctioneers McTear and Company of the Royal Exchange Gallery, where 100 of Grosvenor’s paintings were auctioned, reportedly in preparation for his move back to England. The highest price fetched was £28 for Cluden Mill (around £1,500 today), reproduced in the January 1907 edition of The Studio, and reprinted in the October 1907 edition of the International Studio as part of a fully illustrated feature on Grosvenor’s work (fig. 8). Many of his other paintings fetched around £10 each.

**Grosvenor in London (1901–23)**

After sixteen years in Glasgow, Grosvenor returned to England. Newspaper reports initially stated that he intended to join an artists’ colony in Amberley (West Sussex), while maintaining a studio in London to show his work. Plans seemed to have changed, however, and instead the family kept only a combined home and studio in London, as confirmed by
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92 “Exhibition of Paintings,” Glasgow Herald, April 24, 1897, 6; Post Office Annual Glasgow Directory 1896–97 (Glasgow: John Graham, 1896), 553; Post Office Annual Glasgow Directory 1897–98 (Glasgow: John Graham, 1897), 565, 893, 925.
93 “Picture Exhibition,” Glasgow Herald, April 16 1897, 6.
94 Post Office Annual Glasgow Directory 1898–99 (Glasgow: John Graham, 1898), 585; Post Office Annual Glasgow Directory 1899–1900 (Glasgow: John Graham, 1899), 820, 924.
96 “Art Auction,” Glasgow Herald, October 21, 1899, 6.
the 1901 census.\textsuperscript{100} They lived at 1 St Paul’s Studio (Talgarth Road),\textsuperscript{101} part of a row of houses originally designed in 1891 by architect Frederick Wheeler (1853–1931) for bachelor artists. The house was consequently relatively small for Grosvenor’s family, perhaps suggesting monetary issues. Ground-plans reprinted in \textit{Country Life Magazine} show that the property consisted of a scullery, kitchen, and servants’ bedroom in the basement, with a set of reception rooms and a bedroom above, and a double-height studio occupying the top floor, where an attic had been inserted for Roy to sleep (fig. 9).\textsuperscript{102} Grosvenor, his wife, and now teenage children all lived there, as well as a cook and housemaid.\textsuperscript{103} Neighbours included bachelor Philip Burne Jones (1861–1921), son of the pre-Raphaelite painter and stained-glass designer Edward Burne-Jones (1833–1898), for whom Grosvenor’s wife had modelled (fig. 10).\textsuperscript{104} Others included the painters Arthur Dampier May (1857–1916), Frederic de Haenen (1853–1928), Herbert Sidney (1858–1923), and Gertrude McMurdie Hammond (1862–1952), whose brother Percy Hammond (1866–1946) was a stained-glass artist.\textsuperscript{105}

Several of the Glasgow Boys also transferred from Glasgow to Kensington around this time, including Belfast-born John Lavery (1856–1941) and Glasgow-born Harrington Mann (1864–1937).\textsuperscript{106} While in London, Grosvenor maintained ties to the Glasgow Boys. On or before 1904, Edinburgh-based Alexander Roche (1861–1921) painted Grosvenor’s wife and daughter (fig. 11).\textsuperscript{107} In 1908, an American travel writer described a visit to the London-based Glasgow Boys set: ‘While we were at Mr Harrington Mann’s house a telephone message came from Mr Grosvenor Thomas, another prominent artist of the Glasgow School, saying that his son [Roy] would soon come for us in an automobile, and take us to his studio’.\textsuperscript{108} This account contains a first mention of stained glass. Continuing his report he said: ‘the Thomas house is very attractive, for besides some few of his own beautiful pictures, the artist has

\textsuperscript{100} TNA, \textit{1901 England and Wales Household Census}, “Thomas, Grosvenor.” \\
\textsuperscript{102} From 1910, Grosvenor was recorded to have charged him rent of £30 per annum for this room (around £1,500 today); TNA, \textit{London Electoral Registers}, 1910, “Roy Thomas.” \\
\textsuperscript{103} TNA, \textit{1901 England and Wales Household Census}, “Thomas, Grosvenor.” \\
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{105} TNA, \textit{1891 England and Wales Household Census}, “Percy Hammond.” \\
\textsuperscript{106} TNA, \textit{1901 England and Wales Household Census}, “Lavery, John” and “Mann, Harrington.” \\
\textsuperscript{107} “International Society of Sculptors and Painters Exhibition,” \textit{Aberdeen Journal}, October 4, 1904, 6. \\
\textsuperscript{108} “A Traveller’s Notes,” \textit{Wyoming Reporter}, August 19, 1908, 4.
others, and is also a collector of stained glass and various other things’. Later, his son Roy stated that Grosvenor’s first purchases of the medium began in 1905. This was not a medium entirely removed from the œuvre of the Glasgow Boys: Mann, David Gauld (1865–1936), and James Guthrie (1859–1930) had all been employed from the 1890s as designers for Glasgow stained-glass manufacturers J. and W. Guthrie. London- and Glasgow-based interior designer George Walton (1867–1933), the brother of Glasgow Boy Edward Arthur Walton (1860–1922), also had an association with stained glass, as discussed later.

Grosvenor remained active as an artist, exhibiting forty-eight of his own paintings at the Woodbury Gallery in New Bond Street (London) in January 1904. Prices ranged from £12 all the way up to £100 (the latter the equivalent of several thousands of pounds today). Again in February 1906, Grosvenor exhibited 38 landscapes at the Dowdeswell Gallery in New Bond Street, although no prices were advertised. Grosvenor was also on the hanging committee, and secretary of the subcommittee, for the Venice Biennale, where he showed his own paintings in 1907, 1909 and 1911; he was subsequently given the Order of the Crown from King Emanuele of Italy (1869–1947) for his services. He was also on the jury of the 1912 Amsterdam Exhibition, where he also exhibited his own work, for which he again achieved a prestigious gold medal.

_Sellers of Stained Glass in the Early Twentieth Century_

From the late-nineteenth and into the early-twentieth centuries, many English aristocrats were experiencing serious financial difficulties on account of an agricultural depression and increases in death duties and land taxes, becoming what one contemporary reviewer had
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109 Ibid.
110 MMA, Dealer Correspondence, G. Thomas file, Roy Thomas, letter to John Rockefeller Jr., February 1930.
113 Ibid.
termed ‘the splendid paupers’.\textsuperscript{117} Assets were removed from many country estates in order to raise capital, and at the turn of the twentieth century: ‘the housebreaker made his appearance, dismantling manor houses bit by bit and selling their contents’.\textsuperscript{118} While other dealers competed for the paintings, sculptures, furniture, and architectural salvage, Grosvenor probably encountered little competition in the field of stained glass, as many dealers, especially British ones, were uninterested in the medium. Art dealer Germain Seligman (1893–1978) noted the emergence of a type of collector at this time who bought and held onto out-of-fashion art, which could be obtained at low prices, before selling when the market for those items picked up.\textsuperscript{119} Staff from New York’s Anderson Gallery acquired a collection of stained glass in Paris in 1922 in this manner, noting it was ‘for the account of one of our American clients, as an investment, or perhaps should I say, speculation’.\textsuperscript{120} Grosvenor’s initial interest in the medium was probably as part of a similar speculative investment. As a man of relatively ordinary means, in a remarkably perceptive move, Grosvenor seems to have deliberately chosen an area where he would have few rivals, and so could obtain high-quality objects at relatively little cost.

Although Grosvenor was credited as having created a market for ancient stained glass where there was virtually none before,\textsuperscript{121} he did not have a complete monopoly. While there were notable dealers in several European countries, those based in Paris brokered a number of important sales, and the city became the \textit{de facto} centre for the trade in the medium. They commonly sold French stained glass, which had been introduced onto the art market since the French Revolution (1789–99) and Napoleonic Wars (1799–1815).\textsuperscript{122} Infrequently in


\textsuperscript{118} Mandler, \textit{Fall and Rise}, 173–91.

\textsuperscript{119} Seligman, \textit{Merchants of Art}, 158–59.

\textsuperscript{120} GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 3, Mitchell Kennerley, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, December 13, 1923.


\textsuperscript{122} This brought about an increasing secularisation on the Continent, which led to the decommissioning of many religious buildings, pushing large amounts of principally French glass onto the art market; Richard Marks, \textit{Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages} (London: Routledge, 1993), 243.
demand amongst buyers, stained glass was not a popular medium in which to trade,\textsuperscript{123} and consequently dealers only handled a few panels or windows at a time. Often, they acted as middlemen, buying from auction only once an onward buyer had been secured; such was the case when a collection of French thirteenth-century grisaille was auctioned in Paris in July 1923 and obtained by Bacri Frères on behalf of Pennsylvania businessman Raymond Pitcairn (1885–1966).\textsuperscript{124} In contemporary correspondence, Belgian-born dealer Lucien Demotte (1906–1934) remarked unfavourably on the stained glass expertise of some of these, although he was probably seeking to slate his competition.\textsuperscript{125} Nonetheless, he commented: ‘[Jacques] Bacri is a dealer who buys everything he can find, [Nicolas] Brimo is just the same. [Henri] Daguerre is dead, but his son is keeping the business and has not a very great interest in glass, Assenza has a knowledge of stained glass of a very good layman, but it stops there’.\textsuperscript{126}

Grosvenor had none of the French dealers’ reticence, instead handling stained glass in high volume. For the most part, Grosvenor avoided the auction house, and instead privately purchased in bulk directly from custodians of English country houses, before displaying his acquisitions to American and British audiences. This was a tactic not without risk, as there was only a handful of identifiable buyers of the medium, notably the V&A (London), Glasgow-based shipping magnate William Burrell (1861–1958), and Devon-based electrical contractor Arthur Lock Radford (1862–1925).\textsuperscript{127} Likewise, a small circle of Americans counted stained glass as part of their collecting repertoire, such as New York-born but Paris-based banking heir William Riggs (1837–1924), and curator of the MMA Bashford Dean (1867–1928),\textsuperscript{128} both of whom used stained glass pieces primarily for their ambient and atmospheric qualities, and to enrich their displays of arms and armour.\textsuperscript{129} Other American buyers included

\textsuperscript{123} GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 3, Michael Kennerley, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, December 13, 1923.
\textsuperscript{124} GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 1, Jacques Bacri, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, June 25, 1923.
\textsuperscript{125} GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 2, Lucien Demotte, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, April 17, 1933.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{127} Radford’s records were destroyed in a bombing raid during the Second World War. However, it is likely that he obtained his glass, such as an English fifteenth-century panel depicting Princess Cecily (now in the Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/75), from Canterbury Cathedral’s glazier Samuel Caldwell (1860–1963); Elizabeth Dent, “The goodly and glorious window [...] a piece in it kinde beyond compare”: A History of the Royal Window, Canterbury Cathedral” (MA dissertation, University of York, 2012), 79–81. Radford also acquired much stained glass from country houses and churches in Devon, including panels sold to the V&A in 1919 (VAA, acc. nos. c.453-1919, c.452-1919).
\textsuperscript{128} Hayward, English and French, 18–20; Caviness, New England, 14.
\textsuperscript{129} Hayward, English and French, 20.
Riggs’s school friend and president of the MMA John Pierpont Morgan (1837–1913), as well as Henry Lawrence (1859–1919), George Grey Barnard (1863–1938), William Randolph Hearst (1863–1951), George Dupont Pratt (1869–1935), Clarence Hungerford MacKay (1874–1938), and Raymond Pitcairn (1885–1966), all of whom later purchased from Grosvenor.\textsuperscript{130}

Notable sales of stained glass prior to Grosvenor’s emergence as a seller of the medium reveal the market was very limited. Fifty mixed-quality Swiss panels secured on a European buying trip in 1880 by Pennsylvanian physician Francis West Lewis (1825–1902)\textsuperscript{131} were installed at his home on Spruce Street (Philadelphia). Boston-based Isabella Stewart Gardner (1840–1924) collected stained glass from the 1870s until the 1900s, also through European buying trips, including sixteen panels that at the time had recently been removed from Milan Cathedral.\textsuperscript{132} Amongst her later acquisitions was a monumental thirteenth-century window depicting the \textit{Martyrdom of St Nicasius and St Eutropia} (originally thought to be from Soissons Cathedral), purchased in 1906 from Bacri Frères.\textsuperscript{133} The Musée du Louvre (Paris) has the remaining panels from this window, donated c.1905 by Marie Kolb Homberg (1855–1907), wife of Parisian financier Octave Homberg (1844–1907).\textsuperscript{134} Gardner’s purchases were transferred to the museum she founded at nearby Fenway Court (opened in 1903), where they are displayed as part of a recreated medieval chapel setting, a common display method at Gardner’s time (fig. 12).\textsuperscript{135} Moreover, a series of German sixteenth-century panels (originally from the Carmelite monastery at Boppard am Rhein), sold in Paris in 1893\textsuperscript{136} and acquired by the Duveen Brothers firm, passed to New York businessman Ogden Goelet.

\textsuperscript{131} These were donated to the Pennsylvania Museum in 1903, but then sold in 1949; “New Accessions,” \textit{Bulletin of the Pennsylvania Museum}, 1, no. 2 (April 1903): 4; Caviness, \textit{Midwestern}, 14; Burnham, \textit{Philadelphia}, 21–22, 48.
\textsuperscript{132} Hayward, \textit{English and French}, 20.
\textsuperscript{134} Paris, Louvre, acc. nos. 6006–6119.
(1851–1897) for his French-style summer retreat Ochre Court (Rhode Island).\(^{137}\) The survival of this monumental window depicting saints Quirinus and George in its original spot in the staircase window at Ochre Court gives an indication as to the scale of some of these notable acquisitions, and the types of buyer to whom this type of large-scale glazing appealed (fig. 13). Grosvenor also invested in partial or full shares in some of Duveen’s Boppard panels sometime before Grosvenor exhibited them in New York in 1913 (see below).\(^{138}\) The New York Beaux-Arts architectural firm McKim, Mead, and White, were also known to have used ancient stained glass. Stanford White (1853–1906), one of the firm’s partners, was a known purchaser of original medieval furnishings, of which he kept a stock in his New York warehouse.\(^{139}\) On one documented European buying trip, White obtained objects to decorate the Fifth Avenue (New York) mansion of financier William Payne Whitney (1876–1927), a consignment that included French medieval stained glass from the German-born, Paris-based dealer Raoul Heilbronner (1887–1952).\(^{140}\)

While changing taste played a part, general market reticence to stained glass was also due to difficulties in handling, lighting, and installing panels. As Demotte summed up in 1929: ‘problems of installation confront every museum and collector of glass’.\(^{141}\) In 1901, Grosvenor’s son Roy had enrolled at the Northampton Institute (later City University, London) on an electrical-engineering course spanning at least three years, a complex and still cutting-edge technology at the time.\(^{142}\) It is conceivable that he worked as an electrician after graduation, and may even have been involved in manufacturing lighting systems for Grosvenor’s exhibitions. By the 1911 census, however, Roy’s occupation was recorded rather


\(^{138}\) Drake, Thomas Collection … Part I, 44, nos. 224–27.

\(^{139}\) Caviness, Midwestern, 14; Beaven, “Grosvenor Thomas,” 485, 491–93; Craven, Stanford White, n.p.

\(^{140}\) Thomas and Drake later supplied some of the stained glass for his country retreat; see further below.


\(^{142}\) LMA, Archives of the Northampton Institute, Book of Prizes and Certificates, Students Who Passed the City and Guild’s Preliminary Examinations, 1901, “Roy Grosvenor Thomas,” 5 (with thanks to Sheila Munton); LMA, Archives of the Northampton Institute, Prospectus, Applied Electricity Courses, 1901–02, “Roy Thomas,” 115; LMA, Archives of the Institution of Engineering and Technology, London, Society of Telegraph Engineers Membership Lists, 1887–1930, 1903, 170, “Roy Thomas.”
fancifully as a ‘student of antiquities’, which the enumerator had considerable problems in categorising, according to the crossings out of several occupational codes next to Roy’s entry. He was probably now working as Grosvenor’s assistant, sourcing, cataloguing, and selling stained glass.

**Grosvenor’s Early Stained Glass Collection**

The French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars had caused an influx of medieval and Renaissance Continental glazing into Britain at the beginning of the nineteenth century, purchased by many English aristocrats for their houses and chapels. The British were such omnivorous collectors at this time that examples of almost every kind of stained glass, many of exceptional quality, came to Britain. By the twentieth century, when these fine quality and voluminous collections became available for sale again, Grosvenor was able to gather whole ranges of panels of various dates and origins without even having to leave Britain. A friend of the Thomas and Drake firm and collector of stained glass, William Cole (1909–1997), summarised the method by which Grosvenor operated: ‘Grosvenor had an uncanny way of ‘smelling out’ glass in private houses, he went to many on spec[ulation] and was often right’. More likely, however, as an experienced art dealer, Grosvenor was presumably using his former customer and dealer networks to target specific locations. Journals and magazines such as the features in widely read publications, for example *Country Life Magazine*, or books such as Fletcher Moss’s (1843–1919) *Pilgrimages to Old Homes*, published in nine volumes from 1903, would also have signalled where collections of stained glass were installed.

---

143 Roy’s occupation was first classified as part of a scientific pursuit, but then changed to a category that included writers, and other literary professions; TNA, 1911 England and Wales Household Census, “Roy Thomas.”
Grosvenor developed a very discerning skill for identifying British repositories of glass, and nurturing discrete relationships with owners who might not wish it known that they were disposing of family treasures. Owners were in serious financial decline, and the burden of costs associated with maintaining and repairing their glazing may also have been a factor in their willingness to sell. At Dagnam Park, for example, Grosvenor was permitted to purchase a large collection – a mixed grouping of Dutch, English, and Flemish heraldic and figural panels of thirteenth to seventeenth-century date – in at least three instalments. By way of testing the waters perhaps, Grosvenor purchased around twenty panels in 1908 before acquiring a further sixty panels around 1914. A letter dated March 1926 confirms that the remainder of the glass from this property was acquired by Grosvenor in around 1922.

Although large public auctions of the contents of many of these ailing estates were eventually held, Grosvenor was able to acquire the stained glass beforehand. For example, Grosvenor privately secured a collection of fifteenth-century Flemish figural and heraldic windows, which he termed the ‘Maximilian series’ (originally from the Chapel of the Holy Blood, Bruges, unbeknownst to Grosvenor), and removed from Kilburn Grange (London) around 1910, before the house was demolished the following year (fig. 14). Grosvenor had also acquired panels from Stowe Park (Buckinghamshire) in c.1917, but it was not until 1921 that there was an extensive public auction of the house’s contents. The same can be said of Wroxton Abbey (Oxfordshire), where Grosvenor must have purchased the stained

148 Private Collection, Wilfred Drake, letter to the Revd Stewart, March 12, 1926; with thanks to David Ockleshaw. The Neave family retained a selection of roundels of the same type as those that Grosvenor had acquired. These panels have recently received their first public exhibition at the gallery of London art dealer Sam Fogg; Cees Berserik and Joost Caen, “Silver-stained roundels and stained-glass panels from the collection of Sir Thomas Neave, Dagnam Park, Noak Hill (Essex)” (1–8 July 2016): 1–30.
151 Grosvenor purchased this collection by early 1918 at the latest, when it was exhibited at the Fine Art Society; “Catalogue of a Collection of Early Stained Glass, Heraldic, Ecclesiastical and Domestic, Exhibited at the Fine Art Society’s 148 New Bond Street Premises” (May 1918): 1–16.
glass before January 1924, when there are recorded instances of his selling panels from this collection. He cleared the house of its stained glass, aside from four Continental roundels that were retained in the entranceway, but it was not until 1933 that the rest of the contents of this estate went to auction. At Ashridge Park (Hertfordshire) Grosvenor had bought panels as early as 1919, said to have been installed in the picture gallery there, although the house was not broken up and sold until 1925, and the impressive German stained glass in the adjoining chapel (which Grosvenor did not acquire) did not sell at auction until 1928.

Grosvenor also expanded into other areas of medieval and Renaissance art, acquiring English medieval alabaster carvings, ivories, and sarcophagi, showing that he was not afraid to handle items that were difficult to move, had limited market appeal, and would be hard to store and sell. Although there is no evidence to suggest that Grosvenor exhibited these, as he did his stained glass, stock cards survive for several of his stone carvings, showing this subsidiary collection also contained important and high-quality examples (fig. 15). By 1919, Grosvenor sold a fifteenth-century Nottingham alabaster relief depicting the Annunciation and Trinity to Liverpool shipping heir Philip Nelson (1872–1953), which he was said to have acquired on a trip to Spain that year. In turn, almost all of Grosvenor’s alabaster collection was described and illustrated in an article written by Nelson in 1920. Other alabasters from this source were sold to the V&A. Via the London furniture dealer George Harding (b.1845), Grosvenor sold William Burrell an alabaster depicting St John’s Head, which he had bought from an unnamed house in Ipswich (Suffolk). Moreover, in 1923 two English fifteenth-century paintings, representing King Henry II and St Thomas of Canterbury, as well as a fourteenth-century altarpiece – all with a Grosvenor provenance – were part of an
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153 “Catalogue of the Contents of Wroxton Abbey, Oxon, the Home of the North Family, Sold at Auction on the Premises by E. Tipping” (22 May 1933): 1–52.
154 Caviness, Mid-Atlantic, 174.
155 “Ashridge Park,” The Spectator, September 25, 1925, 18; Williamson, Medieval and Renaissance, 12.
156 “Catalogue of Babylonian, Egyptian, Greek, and Roman Antiquities, Sotheby’s London” (June 18, 1923): 29, lots 311, 312.
159 Ibid.
160 Nelson, “English Medieval Alabaster Carvings,” 213; Glasgow, Burrell Collection, acc. no. 1.34.
exhibition of primitive paintings at London’s Royal Academy.\textsuperscript{161} The catalogue records that Grosvenor had acquired the latter from a ‘warehouse in London’ in 1914, before it was sold to politician Arthur Lee (1868–1947) of Chequers (Buckinghamshire).\textsuperscript{162}

\textit{Grosvenor’s Early Stained Glass Sales (1905–1911)}

Unlike in Glasgow, where his oriental art and European paintings were sold as part of an official business formed by Grosvenor himself, he marketed and sold his stained glass through others, as the private ‘Grosvenor Thomas Collection’.\textsuperscript{163} Surviving correspondence shows that at this time Grosvenor strenuously avoided the label of art dealer, maintaining that he was an artist and a collector. For example, in 1912 he claimed he was selling his stained glass as a result of the collection having become too large, stating it was now more than he could ‘afford to keep’.\textsuperscript{164} These sentiments were largely repeated by Grosvenor in correspondence with a potential buyer in 1915: ‘I want you to understand that I am not a dealer. I have been [for] many years forming my collection of old stained glass until it became probably the finest private collection in Europe, but the last two or three years I have been disposing of some panels to different museums. I am really a landscape painter’.\textsuperscript{165} When in December 1913 the \textit{American Art News} reported on the movements of European art dealers, it too was careful to highlight that Grosvenor was an artist.\textsuperscript{166} It stated: ‘The departing dealers are Messrs Williamson of Paris, Julius Goldschmidt of Frankfurt, and Frank Partridge, John Duveen and Harding of London. Mr Grosvenor Thomas, the artist, who has been here with some choice early English and French stained glass, will also sail’.\textsuperscript{167}

Despite claims he was not an art dealer, Grosvenor was buying and selling stained glass in quick succession. In November 1912, a matter of months after his assertion that he was

\textsuperscript{163} Drake, \textit{Thomas Collection … Part I}, 1–2.
\textsuperscript{164} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 51, Grosvenor Thomas, letter Gordon Rushforth, September 16, 1912; Beaven, “Grosvenor Thomas,” 482.
\textsuperscript{165} WRHS, Mather Papers, box 15, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to William Mather, June 2, 1915.
\textsuperscript{166} “Dealer Exodus,” \textit{American Art News} (December 13, 1913), 3.
\textsuperscript{167} Ibid.
selling some panels only because his collection had become too large, a letter to the MMA indicates otherwise. In this letter Grosvenor urged the museum to send payment for their purchases, as the funds were needed to acquire another set of panels he wished to obtain, which might have been the next load of panels from Dagnam Park.  

He was not then simply downsizing his collection, but selling in order to buy more, an entirely different prospect.

Initially, Grosvenor sold his panels via a mixture of private piecemeal sales from his house, and public exhibitions, held on the premises of established art dealers, with the sales put through the dealers’ books – a practice that presumably meant that Grosvenor avoided having to pay corporation tax. In comparison with the known sale prices of his own paintings (see above), Grosvenor was able to command far higher figures for his stained glass. In the first three years of trading with the V&A, Grosvenor had sold £1,210 worth of ancient stained glass (excluding the 1908 sales, for which no prices were recorded). The total sale price across this time increased steadily, from £260 in 1909, to £410 in 1910, and then finally £540 in 1911 (see below). This was the equivalent of tens of thousands of pounds each year, underlining that Grosvenor did not have to sell much in order to have a decent turnover.

Grosvenor had initiated contact with the V&A in April 1908, when he invited the curators to view his panels, saying: ‘I have recently acquired a quantity of very fine stained glass of the early sixteenth-century, comprising sixteen panels. As it is my intention to dispose of it, I thought you might like to see it’.  

This was an opportune time to have begun trading with the museum. In 1908, curators had begun a reorganisation of the collections, and by 1909 were displaying objects by medium rather than by period groupings. This added a new emphasis on the materials themselves, and allowed media such as the stained glass to be shown centrally as artworks in themselves, and not just as peripheral accessories. The same cannot be said for New York’s MMA, which later became another major purchaser from
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168 MMA, Dealer Correspondence, G. Thomas file, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to MMA Secretary, November 9, 1912.
169 VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Arthur Banks Skinner, April 13, 1908.
Grosvenor. Their newly acquired Hoentschel Collection of European Art instead represented a continued commitment to displaying art as part of a period-room setting.\textsuperscript{170}

Assistant curator (later keeper) of ceramics and stained glass at the V&A Bernard Rackham (1876–1964) visited Grosvenor in April 1908. Rackham’s report demonstrates that Grosvenor showed him several biblical scenes of English, Dutch, and Flemish origin, as well as decorative and heraldic panels, spanning three centuries.\textsuperscript{171} Grosvenor priced this group at £1,000 (equivalent to almost £60,000 today), which Rackham concluded was in line with recent auction prices, even though he noted the figure as being ‘high’.\textsuperscript{172} Presumably because Grosvenor was a vendor new to the museum, a second report was produced by London glass-painter and decorative artist Lewis Foreman Day (1845–1910), who served as one of the museum’s consultants.\textsuperscript{173} Grosvenor’s debut offering resulted in the sale of three of the sixteen panels on offer, a set of relatively modestly sized sixteenth-century Dagnam Park panels depicting saints and donors, which were originally from the Charterhouse at Louvain (Brabant, Belgium);\textsuperscript{174} the museum already owned other panels from this Continental source (fig. 16), but their charterhouse provenance was not realised until much later.\textsuperscript{175}

In July 1909, Grosvenor sent the museum an eighteenth-century heraldic panel, which they returned, noting it was cracked.\textsuperscript{176} Despite this, a matter of days later Grosvenor sent a mixed collection of thirty-one panels.\textsuperscript{177} The museum made a shortlist of six, including a royal armorial on offer for £40, an English fifteenth-century Crucifixion for £60, a Dutch seventeenth-century secular scene for £5, and a Swiss sixteenth-century panel depicting


\textsuperscript{171} VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Bernard Rackham, “Report,” April 15, 1908.

\textsuperscript{172} VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Bernard Rackham, “Report,” April 15, 1908.

\textsuperscript{173} VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, “Lewis Day’s Report,” May 6, 1908.

\textsuperscript{174} Williamson, \textit{Medieval and Renaissance}, 146; VAA, acc. no. c.211-3-1911.

\textsuperscript{175} VAA, acc. nos. 2633-1855, 6914-1860.

\textsuperscript{176} VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Charles Wylde, “Memorandum of Objects Received,” July 8, 1909.

\textsuperscript{177} VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Charles Wylde, “Memorandum of Objects Received,” July 10, 1909.
Christ for £25.\textsuperscript{178} They rejected some Flemish and Dutch roundels priced between £5 and £15 each, many of which were described as broken or scratched, reflecting a preference for pieces in better condition.\textsuperscript{179} Eventually the museum purchased just one of Grosvenor’s panels, at a cost of £260: a French fourteenth-century window depicting St Peter from Séé Cathedral (Orne, Normandy; fig. 17).\textsuperscript{180}

In April of the following year, Grosvenor sent a further thirteen panels to the museum, offered at a total cost of £595.\textsuperscript{181} Correspondence shows that Grosvenor had now assigned stock numbers to these, indicating that he was beginning to organise his collection more formally. The museum kept seven. £220 was paid for two sixteenth-century Flemish armorials, £100 for a fourteenth-century Ascension, and £20 for a sixteenth-century ‘bishop’s head’.\textsuperscript{182} They also purchased three damaged panels at a reduced price of £70, to help the museum cover the costs of their restoration.\textsuperscript{183}

In July 1911, two further panels were sold to the museum; an English fourteenth-century Virgin for £40, and a sixteenth-century Swiss armorial for £75.\textsuperscript{184} By November, the curators considered a box of original fragments, stripped of their lead, which Grosvenor claimed he had been found boxed ‘in the crypt at Salisbury Cathedral’ (Wiltshire),\textsuperscript{185} although the cathedral actually did not have a crypt. As part of this offer, Grosvenor included a free gift in the form of an English thirteenth-century composite grisaille window, which Grosvenor had commissioned an unnamed glazier to make up from some of these fragments (fig. 18). The

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
  \item[178] Ibid.
  \item[179] Ibid.
  \item[181] VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Arthur Banks Skinner, April 4, 1910.
  \item[182] V&A, acc. no. c.54-1910.
  \item[183] V&A, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Charles Wylde, “Minute Paper,” April 22, 1910. Grosvenor’s wife negotiated these sales, while Grosvenor was at the Venice Biennale.
  \item[184] VAA, SMCG Department, object files for acc. nos. c.295-1911 and c.2-1912, Charles Wylde, “Objects Submitted,” July 27, 1911; Williamson, \textit{Medieval and Renaissance}, 139.
  \item[185] VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.278-1911, Charles Wylde, “Minute Paper,” November 5, 1911.
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museum was also offered sixteen panels, a mixture of religious scenes and heraldry ranging in price from £1 to £250. As part of a seven-month process, the museum kept four panels (totalling £390): a German fourteenth-century *Entry into Jerusalem*, later found to be originally from Erfurt Cathedral (Thurungien; fig. 19), and a trio of English fourteenth-century tracery panels showing ‘kneeling donors’ (said to have come from an unnamed church in Suffolk). Upon Day’s death in 1910, technical chemist and artists’ colourman Noel Heaton (1874–1955), son of stained glass artist Clement Heaton (1824–82) of London stained-glass manufacturers Heaton, Butler and Bayne, took over as stained-glass advisor. Although Heaton found Grosvenor’s prices ‘somewhat excessive’, his report of June 1912 confirmed the quality of the panels. In the interim (and perhaps in an effort to sweeten this still-pending deal), in March 1912 Grosvenor followed up with gifts of several sixteenth-century English fragments.

**Grosvenor’s Stained-Glass Exhibitions (1912–18)**

As no inventory of Grosvenor’s collection survives, its content is only known from brief catalogues accompanying his exhibitions, and records of his documented sales. From 1912, Grosvenor was now not just disposing of panels from his London home, but showing his collection in Britain and the United States as part of public exhibitions. In the United States, Grosvenor exhibited with British-born interior designers and importers of period rooms, suggesting that stained glass was seen there as a decorative accompaniment in the creation of period interiors, a display technique favoured also by the MMA’s continued use of period rooms. However, in Britain Grosvenor exhibited with painting specialists and stained-glass manufacturers, indicating that the medium was more strongly perceived as an art or craft in

---


189 VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.220-1912, Charles Wylde, “Gift of Objects,” March 11, 1912. In December 1911, the museum also purchased an English fourteenth-century canopy from Grosvenor for £35; VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.201-1911, Charles Wylde, “Objects Submitted,” December 5, 1911.
its own right, a notion that the V&A’s re-ordering of objects by material helped foster. Coinciding with the initiation of this series of public sales, Grosvenor and his family had moved to 13 Leonard Place, a large four-storey house with a substantial garden, on an affluent residential section of Kensington High Street (fig. 20).  

*The Fine Art Society, London (September 1912)*

Grosvenor chose London for his debut stained-glass exhibition, showing at the Fine Art Society, 148 New Bond Street (established in 1876). This gallery had supported the careers of many contemporary painters, some of which were connected to the Glasgow Boys, which is probably how Grosvenor’s association with them began. Opportunely, and perhaps deliberately, the exhibition coincided with the publication by novelist and stained-glass restorer Maurice Drake (1875–1923) of *A History of English Glass-Painting*, a book primarily concerned with educating collectors of stained glass, which was illustrated by Maurice’s brother and the Thomas’s future business partner, Wilfred Drake, with numerous panels from Grosvenor’s collection.  

The V&A made five purchases from the month-long sale, totalling £101. They began with an English fourteenth-century tracery head for £10, a Flemish sixteenth-century tracery head for £20, and a Flemish sixteenth-century panel depicting *St Barbara*, also for £20. Returning a second time, the museum purchased a German armorial for £25, and a Flemish sixteenth-century *Prodigal Son* scene for £26 (fig. 21). New York lawyer Samuel Untermeyer (1858–1940), also likely purchased from Grosvenor at this time, and probably installed his acquisitions at his mansion ‘Greystone’ in Yonkers (New York). Untermeyer is known to have acquired at least a sixteenth-century Flemish three-light window from Dagnam Park depicting the *Disciples in the Upper Room* (fig. 22). Ships’ records show that the Untermyers were in England in September 1912, where they might reasonably have  

192 VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.383-5-1912, “Fine Art Society and Grosvenor Thomas,” May 1912.  
193 VAA, object files for acc. nos. c.386-1912, c.307-1912.  
194 “Samuel Untermeyer,” *New York Times*, March 17, 1940, 1; MMA, acc. no. 52.75.  
viewed the glass.196 Another known buyer was the MMA, which obtained a sixteenth-century Dutch roundel depicting the Allegory of Rout and Pillage, illustrated in Maurice Drake’s History of English Glass-Painting,197 a Dutch sixteenth-century roundel of St Peter,198 and an English fourteenth-century armorial, representing the coat of the earls of Oxford.199 A Flemish sixteenth-century roundel depicting Joseph was also acquired by them,200 as were a Dutch seventeenth-century roundel,201 as well as a German fifteenth-century Entry into Jerusalem, stored and later installed at the Cloisters.202

During this time, representatives of the MMA probably also saw an English fifteenth-century composite window and tracery, composed of panels originally from Gloucestershire, Cheshire, Oxfordshire and London (fig. 22).203 After the museum had committed to its purchase, Grosvenor shipped this glass in October 1912, via specialist art transporters Jacques Chenue (1878–1951), before receiving payment in full (of £4,000) from the museum in March 1913 (the equivalent of around £230,000 today).204 The museum’s Bulletin reported that Grosvenor’s window was now one of only two specimens of monumental ancient glazing in the United States, the other being in the Gardner Museum (MA) (mentioned above).205
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197 Drake, English Glass-Painting, pl. 26; MMA, acc. no. 12.137.7.
198 MMA, acc. no. 12.137.6.
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Charles of London, New York (February – March 1913)

Perhaps encouraged by sales to American customers, Grosvenor next exhibited in New York with British-born interior designer and period-room importer Charles Joel Duveen (1871–1940). Charles had worked as part of the Duveen Brothers firm on New Bond Street (London) for several decades, before dissolving his interest in the business in 1904 and opening his own firm, Charles of London. Charles had obtained the lease of 718 Fifth Avenue in New York City by 1910; one of the first exhibitions at his new premises was of Grosvenor’s collection. This collaboration gave Grosvenor access to clients already interested in medieval and Renaissance architectonic objects. From February 1913, Grosvenor displayed just under 300 armorial, ornamental, and figural panels and windows there, of which were of English and Flemish origin. The remaining forty-five panels were a mixture of Swiss, German, Dutch, French, and Italian glass.

By now, the New York Times recorded Grosvenor’s as the largest privately owned collection of its type in the world. Despite its huge size, The Lotus Magazine (distributed in America from 1910) noted: ‘almost the entire collection of ancient stained glass brought over here by the English artist Grosvenor Thomas […] was sold’. Advertisements were wired to at least six major New York newspapers in the months leading up to the exhibition, a marketing campaign that continued for the full run of the show, sometimes with full-page spreads. The exhibition catalogue itself was a further extension of this advertising. An article on key

206 VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Bernard Rackham, May 6, 1918.
208 Harris, Moving Rooms, 104.
panels in the collection was written by the British antiquarian Aymer Vallance (1862–1943), and a second, authored by Maurice Drake, highlighted the art-historical significance of the collection. The majority of advertising for the exhibition centred on Grosvenor’s eleven full-length fifteenth-century Flemish ‘Maximilian’ windows, as they depicted figures associated with the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian; its provenance, having been originally placed in the Chapel of the Holy Blood in Bruges (West-Vlaanderen, Belgium), had not yet been discovered. Both articles in the exhibition catalogue discussed these windows, and they were also mentioned in every newspaper advert.

New York financier and president of the MMA (from 1904) John Pierpont Morgan (1837–1913) attempted to purchase the Maximilian windows for £25,000 (the equivalent of around £1.5 million today). Morgan was already an established buyer of stained glass. His classical revival offices (later the Pierpont Morgan Library) on Madison Avenue (built by McKim, Mead and White in 1906) incorporated fifteenth- to seventeenth-century Swiss stained glass. Morgan was not in New York by the time Grosvenor’s collection had arrived, having sailed to Egypt in January 1913. It is possible Morgan sent a representative to view Grosvenor’s New York exhibition, or Morgan may have already viewed this glass in London at some time before it was packed and transported, and was waiting for its importation into America for this exhibition before making his purchase. However, Morgan died in late March 1913 without having completed the deal.
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Maurice Drake and Roy Thomas had travelled to America in January 1913, in advance of Grosvenor’s arrival in early February.²²³ Maurice, as an experienced glazier and author on the subject, presumably acted as their technical advisor and historian.²²⁴ Most likely, he came into contact with Grosvenor the year previously, when he wrote A History of English Glass-Painting (see further above). Maurice’s Exeter-based firm Drake and Sons may even have restored some of Grosvenor’s stained glass, although so far only Burlison and Grylls are recorded as having restored Grosvenor’s collection during this period.²²⁵ Maurice had the glass-world credentials Grosvenor and Roy lacked. While in the United States, Maurice gave a lecture at Harvard University’s Fogg Museum (MA).²²⁶ He also likely had a hand in the sale of at least seven Dutch sixteenth-century panels from this exhibition to the Royal Clarence Hotel (Exeter), neighbouring his own workshop at 4 Cathedral Yard.²²⁷ Maurice had also travelled with a pair of panels belonging to his cousins at Exeter stained-glass firm Beer and Driffield, depicting the Goddess of Morn and Diana. According to Maurice’s daughter and successor in their family firm, Daphne, the panels failed to sell, and were later unfortunately ‘smashed by a small boy in 1927’.²²⁸ Maurice had paid £7 duty on their entry to America, the equivalent of around £350 today, underlining the huge tax burden Grosvenor must have initially encountered when selling his collection abroad, before the introduction of tax exemption on works of art, which was not fully ratified as part of the Underwood Tariff Act until October 1913, nine months after this collection passed through customs.²²⁹

Buyers included the agents of Elizabeth Mills Reid (1858–1931), widow of ambassador and politician Whitelaw Reid (1837–1912).²³⁰ From 1912, she had employed McKim, Mead and

²²⁶ “Lecture on Ancient Stained Glass,” Harvard Crimson, March 27, 1913, 1.
²²⁸ Daphne Drake relays this story in private family papers; with thanks to Frances Page.
White to reconstruct her country home Ophir Hall (New York), a Revival-style castle that had burned down a decade previously. On Reid’s behalf, the architectural firm made further purchases after the exhibition, numbering well over 100 panels, costing almost £8,000 (equivalent of over £350,000 today).

Other collectors were benefactors of the conglomerate Standard Oil. Florence Balsdon Gibb (b. 1872), and her husband industrialist and Standard Oil heir Herbert Lee Pratt (1871–1945), also purchased several panels. In 1913, Charles of London supplied to them a Jacobean period room, originally from Rotherwas Court (Herefordshire) and displayed at the gallery at the same time as the Grosvenor Thomas collection, and installed it in their Glen Cove (New York) mansion, The Braes, constructed in 1912 (fig. 24). This room included panels of stained glass set in plain surrounds. In 1914, several of the interiors were illustrated in the magazine Architecture. A photograph of the Jacobean living room shows further medallions in situ (fig. 25).

Helen Sherman Pratt (1869–1923), wife of Herbert’s brother George Dupont Pratt (1869–1935), another of the Standard Oil circle, and MMA trustee, also probably had a hand in the purchase of twenty-seven panels. This included a twelfth-century border fragment originally from the ambulatory of the royal abbey church of Saint-Denis (although this was not known to them at the time), two French thirteenth-century heraldic panels, and four sixteenth-century shields associated with the Johnson family (fig. 26). Helen and George Pratt had recently constructed their Tudor-style mansion Killenworth on Long Island (NY),
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where this glass was placed. \(^\text{239}\) The Pratts were probably also instrumental in the purchases of twelve panels made by George’s brother-in-law, Brooklyn Museum trustee Frank Babbott (1854–1933), for his neighbouring estate. \(^\text{240}\)

The Metropolitan and Brooklyn Museums, of which the Pratts were trustees, also made direct acquisitions. The MMA’s included a series of fifteenth-century German panels originally from a Jesse Tree window at the Carmelite monastery at Boppard – the Deposition, Entombment, Visitation and Nativity – sold to the museum at a cost of £2,150, the equivalent of over £100,000 today (fig. 27). \(^\text{241}\) The Brooklyn Museum purchased an English fourteenth-century lancet depicting the Virgin and Child, as well as an English medallion, and a fourteenth-century German canopy. \(^\text{242}\) Isabella Giles Tilford (b.1858), wife of Standard Oil Vice President Henry Morgan Tilford (1857–1919), also made acquisitions, including German and Flemish sixteenth-century roundels depicting the story of the Creation. \(^\text{243}\) Additionally, Caroline (1859–1937) and lumber wholesaler Martin Ryerson (1856–1933), trustees of the Art Institute of Chicago (founded in 1879), of which Martin was president from 1925, purchased at least three sixteenth-century Dutch panels showing scenes from the Life of Mordecai, \(^\text{244}\) one of which has ‘51’ still inscribed on the glass, which was its exhibition catalogue number (fig. 28). \(^\text{245}\) The Art Institute’s holdings of stained glass are greatly indebted to the donations made by the Ryersons, \(^\text{246}\) and by extension, to Grosvenor’s collection.

\(^{239}\) Drake, Thomas Collection ... Part II, 12.

\(^{240}\) Brooklyn Museum Archive, Babbott File, Frank Babbott, letter to Crawford, January 12, 1912; Beaven, “Grosvenor Thomas,” 490, 495.

\(^{241}\) MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 13.64.1-4 (a–b), Grosvenor Thomas, letter to the MMA’s Secretary, March 18, 1913; Caviness, New England, 120.


\(^{243}\) Drake, Thomas Collection ... Part I, 23, nos. 63, 64; Husband, Roundels, 71. These panels are now at the Bethesda-by-the-Sea Episcopal Church in Palm Beach (Florida).

\(^{244}\) Drake, Thomas Collection ... Part I, 13, nos. 15, 50–51; Husband, Roundels, 77; Beaven, “Grosvenor Thomas,” 496. Now at the Art Institute of Chicago, acc. no. 1937.863.

\(^{245}\) Drake, Thomas Collection ... Part I, no. 51; Husband, Roundels, 7; Raguin, Midwest, 84–86, no. AIC 4.

\(^{246}\) Caviness, Midwestern, 23.
Charles of London, New York (December 1913 – March 1914)

The Thomases returned to the Charles Gallery at the end of the year. Roy again arrived in advance, reaching New York by mid-September 1913, before Grosvenor’s arrival six weeks later. They were without Maurice, suggesting he was either unavailable, or that Roy felt able to handle preparations alone. Grosvenor and Roy stayed at the Hotel Gotham (Fifth Avenue), which catered to celebrities and members of high society. Grosvenor left in early January 1914, despite the exhibition continuing until March, showing that, relative to Roy, he stayed in the United States for only a very short time.

Although in duration and volume this was a more substantial exhibition than before, it was far more restricted in range. Grosvenor’s reserves in London were probably much depleted, leaving a less comprehensive selection. Again, the show was heavily weighted towards Flemish and English examples, numbering 235 and 70 respectively, making up 305 of the 358 total—a rise of over 100 Flemish and English panels compared with before. The remainder of Grosvenor’s display was restricted to French and Swiss panels, numbering 24 and 29 respectively. No glass of Dutch or Italian origin was in the exhibition. His supplies of this type of glass had been exhausted during his last New York show, when Reid and Ryerson had entirely cleared these sections out (see further above), and he perhaps had difficulty obtaining more examples in the interim. Subject matter also changed between exhibitions. For the first show, roughly a third were heraldic (90 out of 261). However, when Grosvenor exhibited in the winter, 157 armorials were displayed (out of roughly 358). Whether intentionally or out of necessity, the focus now was very much on small, secular panels.

249 TNA, UK Passenger Lists, January 11, 1914, “Thomas, G.”.
250 The exact number of panels is not known, as some catalogue entries refer to a ‘series of’ panels.
251 Drake, Thomas Collection … Part II, 2–8, 13–41.
252 Drake, Thomas Collection … Part II, 9–12.
254 Beaven, “Grosvenor Thomas,” 484.
As before, Grosvenor used local newspapers to alert audiences of the arrival of more of his collection. The foreword to the second colour-illustrated New York exhibition catalogue also singled out the still unsold Maximilian series, as well as highlighting new additions, such as a quantity of English medieval armorials. Some of the known buyers include New York stockbroker Henry Lawrence (1859–1919), who already had a well-established medieval art collection. Lawrence purchased at least two panels from Grosvenor at this time, including a fifteenth-century French window depicting St Catherine. Grosvenor must also have used his trip to transport more panels for Reid, whose agents continued to make bulk purchases.

Roy remained in New York for a total of nine months, eventually leaving in June 1914, three months after the stained-glass exhibition had finished but coinciding with the close of the American art season, which ran from autumn to spring. According to ships’ manifests, Charles and Roy made the five-day trip back to London together, highlighting their close ties. The Maximilian windows at the very least returned to Britain with them, as they were viewed by the V&A at Grosvenor’s studio (see further below), but other panels may have remained in New York.

The world changed a month later, in August 1914, when Britain entered the First World War. Many art dealers obtained war work. While Charles Duveen briefly returned to New York in October 1914, presumably to settle his affairs, the New York Herald announced that he had joined the British police as a staff sergeant, guarding transport systems and public works in

256 Drake, Thomas Collection … Part II, 1, 34–35, 36–37, nos. 199, 204.
257 Hayward, English and French, 17.
258 Drake, Thomas Collection … Part II, 3; Caviness, Midwestern, 208; Beaven, “Grosvenor Thomas,” 489–90. Now at the MMA, acc. no. 21.106.
260 TNA, UK Passenger Arrivals, June 22, 1914, “Thomas, Roy” and “Duveen, Chas.”
261 VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Bernard Rackham, May 6, 1918.
London. Another dealer, Frank Partridge, served in a similar role with the British Mounted Constabulary in Hertfordshire, and Germain Seligman, head of the New York branch of Jacques Seligmann and Fils, became an officer in the French Army. The newspaper also reported that: ‘Roy Grosvenor Thomas, who brought to this country last year the famous Thomas Collection of ancient English stained glass [...] is at the front with the British Army in France, as second lieutenant of the Sixth Battalion of Royal Fusiliers’. By 1915, he had been promoted to captain. He revealed in later correspondence that during this time he was unsurprisingly not able to ‘keep in touch with the collection’, that responsibility now falling entirely to Grosvenor.

Despite Roy’s absence, early in 1915 Grosvenor sold several Flemish panels to an unnamed buyer, for £800 each. Possibly this may have related to acquisitions made by railroad executive Isaac Dudley Fletcher (1844–1917), who selected panels principally from Grosvenor’s Flemish sixteenth-century Dagnam Park collection some time before his death in 1917, including several of the biblical scenes now known to have been created for the Charterhouse in Louvain. Fletcher’s French Gothic mansion on New York’s Fifth Avenue was designed in 1898 by New York architect Charles Pierrepon Henry Gilbert (1861–1952). Around the same time, Grosvenor offered the Maximilian windows to the V&A, which declined their purchase on account of their high price, and wartime budgetary restrictions. Perhaps by way of encouraging the museum to reconsider, Grosvenor donated 113 mixed fragments and small panels, which they accepted in November 1915. Despite these inducements, the Maximilian panels remained unsold.

265 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Roy Thomas, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, February 21, 1933.
266 WRHS, Mather Papers, box 15, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to William Mather, July 20, 1915.
267 Cavinness, New England, 141–48. Donated to the MMA in 1917, acc. nos. 17.120.11–15.
269 VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Bernard Rackham, November 1, 1915; VAA, acc. no. c.313-425-1915.
Warwick House Ltd., New York (1916–18)

In late 1914, Grosvenor had written to Allen Whiting (1873–1959), director of the newly built Cleveland Museum of Art (opened to the public in 1916), stating that more stained glass would arrive in New York by March 1915.²⁷⁰ Grosvenor’s glass was not exhibited with Charles of London (whose figurehead was still involved in war work), but instead displayed just around the corner, at 45 East 57th Street; these were the premises of newly formed Warwick House Ltd, an art-dealing and interior-design business owned by architect Frederick Soldwedel (1886–1957) and Swiss-born art dealer Martin Hofer (b.1890). Hofer had only just moved to New York, after dissolving his previous partnership with Berlin-born dealer Leo Blumenreich (1884–1932) at their Duke Street gallery in London.²⁷¹ At the time, Hofer was lodging at Charles Duveen’s premises, in accommodation above the gallery, suggesting a close link between the firms.²⁷²

A year later than he had initially stated, in March 1916, Grosvenor embarked for New York, which was not without risk after the recent escalation of submarine warfare in the Atlantic.²⁷³ Harry Grylls (1873–1953), director of London-based stained glass firm Burlison and Grylls, accompanied him. Grylls later confirmed that he had restored and adapted panels in Grosvenor’s collection; notably his studio inserted new canopies in order to square the arched tops of the Maximilian windows.²⁷⁴ Grylls’s firm was also responsible for adapting selected panels from Grosvenor’s collection for a composite medieval window for Cleveland’s Trinity Cathedral (Ohio) on Euclid Avenue designed by Charles Schweinfurth (1856–1919).²⁷⁵ The cathedral paid Grosvenor £5,250 for the window (equivalent to around

²⁷⁰ WRHS, Mather Papers, box 15, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Allen Whiting, December 23, 1914.
²⁷² NYSA, 1915 New York State Census, “Martin Hofer.”
²⁷³ Just months previously, the passenger ship Lusitania had been torpedoed, killing 1,200 passengers and crew. Eight art dealers were aboard, including British-born Frank Partridge (1875–1953); Gordon Spencer, Memoirs of the Late Frank Partridge (Essex: privately printed, 1961), 34; Colin Simpson, Lusitania (London: Longman, 1972), 69.
£225,000 today). Grosvenor also made a connected sale in 1916, to industrialist William Mather (1857–1951), whose Tudor-style mansion neighbouring the cathedral was also built by Schweinfurth.

The exhibition at Warwick House was assembled quickly, opening in April 1916. Grosvenor personally wrote to a number of collectors to invite them to view his glass. Unlike previous occasions, Grosvenor did not advertise in newspapers, which may have been deliberate. Coinciding with the start of the exhibition, in March 1916 Soldwedel was the subject of a highly publicised scandal concerning his affair with Ethel Abercrombie Stewart (1880–1957), the wife of New York stockbroker John Stewart (b.1884). This exhibition may also have been envisaged as a long-term venture. While Grylls left New York in late May 1916, and Grosvenor in July, the collection remained with Warwick House. Correspondence shows that more glass was shipped over at some point in July 1916, presumably sent not long after Grosvenor had arrived back in London. Later, in December 1916, Soldwedel applied for a passport, stating that he wished to visit England for two weeks in order to bring back art for his business. It is possible that this (amongst other things) represented another of Grosvenor’s stained-glass consignments bound for the United States.

With no known advertising, and no catalogues, details of Warwick House sales are sparse. It is possible that sales to banker George Blumenthal (1858–1941), trustee of the MMA and its President 1934–41, occurred around this time; he acquired several sixteenth-century panels from Grosvenor’s Flemish sixteenth-century Dagnam Park stock, none of which had appeared in the previous New York exhibitions. Other buyers included repeat customers,

276 WRHS, Mather Papers, box 15, William Mather, letter to Grosvenor Thomas, August 26, 1916.
277 WRHS, Mather Papers, box 15, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to William Mather, March 8, 1916.
278 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Raymond Pitcairn, letter to Grosvenor Thomas, April 13, 1916.
281 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, August 2, 1916.
282 NARA, Passport Applications, December 1916, “Frederick Soldwedel.”
among whom were Trinity Cathedral and Henry Lawrence, as well as his friend Raymond Pitcairn.\textsuperscript{284} In April 1916, Pitcairn bought a fourteenth-century English grisaille, originally from All Saints Church in Snodland (Kent),\textsuperscript{285} and a month later purchased two thirteenth-century grisaille lancets, originally from the chapter house at Salisbury Cathedral, which had first been exhibited in New York as part of the Charles Gallery exhibitions.\textsuperscript{286} He paid $125 for the former, and $2,300 for the latter pair.\textsuperscript{287} Pitcairn bought stained glass as exemplars for his glaziers at Bryn Athyn Cathedral (Pennsylvania), under construction from 1913. Grosvenor’s grisaille panels, however, are the only original medieval panels actually to be installed in the cathedral, rather than simply be copied.\textsuperscript{288}

Business must have been buoyant, as by August 1917, in correspondence between Soldwedel and Pitcairn it was revealed that most of the panels brought over in 1916 were now sold.\textsuperscript{289} Consequently, Pitcairn began writing directly to Grosvenor in London, requesting he source and bring over panels of the same quality as those Grosvenor had sold to Lawrence.\textsuperscript{290} However, Grosvenor seems to have been unable to fulfil this request, as no sales can be assigned to Pitcairn at this time. It is possible that Grosvenor was having issues sourcing additional stock during the war. His entire collection (as it stood at this time) may already have been in the United States, moved there in order to safeguard it from wartime conditions in Britain, where zeppelin bombing raids had already caused much destruction.

By 1917, Soldwedel had taken over the glazing of Ophir Hall from McKim, Mead and White.\textsuperscript{291} A payment in 1917 for almost $19,000 can be associated with Warwick House’s selling of Thomas and Drake’s stained glass to Reid at this time.\textsuperscript{292} From April 1914 to at least February

\textsuperscript{284} Beaven, “Grosvenor Thomas,” 490.
\textsuperscript{285} Caviness, \textit{Mid-Atlantic}, 140; GMA, acc. no. 03.SG.31.
\textsuperscript{286} GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, “Thomas Sales,” April 20 and May 4, 1916; Drake, \textit{Thomas Collection … Part II}, no. 2; GMA, acc. no. 03.SG.218.
\textsuperscript{287} GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, “Grosvenor Thomas Sales,” 1916.
\textsuperscript{288} Jane Hayward, \textit{Radiance and Reflection: Medieval Art from the Raymond Pitcairn Collection} (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1982), 37; GMA, acc. nos. 03.SG.31, 03.SG.218.
\textsuperscript{289} GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Raymond Pitcairn, letter to Frederick Soldwedel, August 18, 1917; GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Frederick Soldwedel, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, August 21, 1917.
\textsuperscript{290} GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Raymond Pitcairn, letter to Grosvenor Thomas, May 16, 1918.
\textsuperscript{291} Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, \textit{Reid Family Papers}, box 12, \textit{Elizabeth Reid’s Journal}.
\textsuperscript{292} Ibid.
1915, Soldwedel’s architectural firm Soldwedel and Hatton had designed and supervised the construction of Reid’s tennis courts and apartments for her chauffeurs, coinciding with Reid’s settling of the balance of McKim, Mead and White’s final bill. By September 1916, Mrs Reid’s journals record that Soldwedel had been contacted about the rearrangement of the stained glass that had already been installed, suggesting she was dissatisfied with McKim, Mead and White’s displays. By this stage, Soldwedel, as part of Warwick House, had possession of Grosvenor’s collection, and so was best placed to revise and augment her collection of panels.

**The Fine Art Society, London (May 1918)**

In May 1918, Grosvenor again approached the V&A regarding the eleven still unsold Maximilian windows (now back in New York). In early 1918, he had offered them to the MMA for £12,000 and was declined, after having first offered them in 1913 to Morgan for over double the price (see further above). Remarkably, Grosvenor was then willing to accept the substantially reduced figure of £6,000 (still equivalent to just over £260,000 today) from the V&A, which sealed the deal. At the time, the museum stated that if not for Grosvenor’s rush to sell in wartime, they would never have afforded the acquisition of these windows. This coincided with Grosvenor’s return to the Fine Art Society, six years since their first collaboration, where he exhibited 134 panels and windows. Additions to his collection included panels obtained from, or sold on behalf of, the London-based stained glass firm

---
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295 VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Bernard Rackham, May 6, 1918.
296 Ibid.
297 Grosvenor was willing to ship the windows for free from New York so that the curators could inspect them again. However, due to the costs associated, Grosvenor asked that they be bound to make purchases of no less than £2,000 from his upcoming London exhibition if they chose not to buy them; VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Bernard Rackham, May 6, 1918. The museum declined another viewing, anxious to avoid public criticism if space on a wartime ship was taken up by non-essential artworks, but agreed to their purchase nonetheless; VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.411-1918, Cecil Smith, “Minute Paper,” June 5, 1918.
298 VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.411-1918, Cecil Smith, “Minute Paper,” June 5, 1918.
299 Aymer Vallance, “An Exhibition of Glass-Paintings,” *Burlington Magazine*, 33, no. 185 (August 1918): 65. In volume, Grosvenor’s was the largest exhibition that the gallery held at the time; “Pictures and Watercolours by the Late C. Napier Henry, Fine Art Society Galleries” (February 1918), 1–4; “Catalogue of Watercolours by George Elgood, Fine Art Society Galleries” (April 1918), 1–5.
Clayton and Bell. The firm had acquired a number of panels from the church of Sts Mary and Nicholas in Wilton (Wiltshire), an imported Continental collection originally assembled by Lord Sidney Herbert (1810–62) in the nineteenth century. After a late nineteenth-century restoration, some of the panels were removed and kept by Clayton and Bell, including a series of twelfth- and thirteenth-century English and French armorials and figure panels, some of which originally came from Saint-Denis. The V&A purchased a panel from this source for £450, as well as two half-length French fifteenth-century figures for £300. Records show that the museum paid the Fine Art Society rather than Grosvenor, who presumably took his share afterwards. Presumably also at this time, a twelfth-century ‘bearded head’ from Wilton was also sold to William Burrell (fig. 29).

Around this time, Grosvenor also acquired a series of fourteenth- to sixteenth-century English armorial panels from the specially built Gothic folly temple in the grounds of Stowe Park (Buckinghamshire), before the house and its contents went to public auction in mid-1921. This was another example of Grosvenor being able to acquire a Romantic ‘Gothick’ collection originally imported at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The eighteenth-century collector Horace Walpole (1717–1797) had visited the house after the original installation, and stated that many of the panels had been taken from a priory at Warwick. Grosvenor exhibited twenty-five English heraldic shields from this source in London; some were also sent to Warwick House in New York, including eleven roundels depicting the months of the year – although one depicting March had been kept in London, presumably
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300 “Clayton and Bell,” London Gazette, July 30, 1935, 4937; Wells, Figure and Ornamental, 17; Thomas Cocke, Churches of South-East Wiltshire (London: Royal Commission on the Historic Monuments of England, 1987), 42, 58, 70, 238–43.
303 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.275, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, July 18, 1939 (Appendix B, document 284); Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/1.
already reserved by a European buyer.\textsuperscript{307} An English fourteenth-century armorial, depicting the arms of John de Handelow, from the Stowe Park collection was mentioned as the showpiece item in the advertising of the London exhibition, which at some point afterwards entered William Burrell’s collection, and was installed in the drawing room of his home, Hutton Castle, by 1928.\textsuperscript{308} Other newly exhibited pieces included some panels from ‘an alms house’ and church in Northampton,\textsuperscript{309} most likely referring to the Hospital of St John, a medieval almshouse with adjoining chapel.

In 1918, Grosvenor had reportedly sold a large quantity of stained glass to London-based politician George Kemp, Lord Rochdale (1866–1945),\textsuperscript{310} some of which may have come from this exhibition.\textsuperscript{311} Lord Rochdale reportedly furnished many of the window openings of his Georgian house, Highgate Old Hall (London), with Grosvenor’s panels.\textsuperscript{312} Another buyer was Liverpool-born businessman George Eumorfopolous (1863–1939), who at the time lived at neo-Renaissance Clandon Regis House (Surrey), and then from 1922 at 7 Chelsea Embankment (London), which was extended and made into an oriental art museum.\textsuperscript{313} His association with Grosvenor may well have begun with their respective prior connections to the oriental art field. He purchased several panels, including two sixteenth-century French lancet windows, depicting \textit{St Protasius} and \textit{St George}, alongside several small medallions.\textsuperscript{314} Wilfred Drake later made drawings of these panels, showing Eumorfopolous had them leaded together to create large composite windows (fig. 30). \textit{The Times} described a visit to the Eumorfopolous house, which reveals where some of his acquisitions from Grosvenor
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were likely accommodated: ‘an early Renaissance room, containing stained glass and carvings, leads on to the collections of Persian pottery’.  

*The Split from Warwick House (1919)*

By mid-1919, Roy had been discharged from the army, and was back in London. This coincided with the dissolution of relations with Grosvenor’s American representatives Warwick House, presumably in part as Roy was now able to relinquish his role as assistant and American agent. By this time, Hofer had become sole owner of Warwick House, Soldwedel having chosen to retain only Grosvenor’s stained glass stock after the split. Contemporary correspondence indicates that Soldwedel wished to use Grosvenor’s collection for post-war memorial windows, a use for ancient stained glass also encouraged by those responsible for selling William Randolph Hearst’s vast collection of stained glass two decades later. Grosvenor’s glass had been moved from Warwick House’s gallery to Soldwedel’s Manhattan house, without Grosvenor’s permission. Numerous cables and letters were exchanged between Grosvenor and Soldwedel, but Grosvenor finally demanded that his property be returned to England, and the contract with Warwick House be declared void. In a desperate attempt to retain Grosvenor’s panels, Soldwedel applied for an emergency passport in order to travel to London to try and change Grosvenor’s mind. Soldwedel described the fragile situation in his application: ‘I paid a valuable consideration to Warwick House for the contract, but it will be impossible to properly explain the situation to Thomas and obtain permission to continue to sell his goods in the United States unless in person, to explain the reason for selling out interest in Warwick House, and how I expect to display and sell the glass now in New York’. By early May, Soldwedel had sailed for London, staying first at London’s Ritz Hotel. After a month, he returned to New York, having split
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318 Ibid.  
321 Ibid.  
with Grosvenor. The 1920 census shows Soldwedel having returned to his previous occupation as an architect. Perhaps affected by this incident, Grosvenor appears to have withdrawn all major interest in the American market for several years, even though he had now secured his biggest collection to date – Continental and English panels from Costessey Hall (Norfolk), a collection of glass that had totally filled twenty-two Perpendicular windows in the chapel there\(^{323}\) before being broken up into hundreds of smaller panels and windows after Grosvenor’s acquisition of them.

La Société des Beaux-Arts, Glasgow (April–October 1919)

At the same time as the split from their American agents, Grosvenor and Roy were holding an exhibition of stained glass in Glasgow. Unlike in New York, where Grosvenor used the premises of interior designers, in Glasgow Grosvenor selected a paintings specialist, Alexander Reid (1854–1928), a major patron of French Impressionist work and the Glasgow Boys.\(^{324}\) Presumably Grosvenor’s collection was displayed at Reid’s gallery at 227 West George Street, although there is no surviving catalogue to confirm this. What is certain, is that sales of Grosvenor’s stained glass were recorded in Reid’s day books, confirming Reid as host.

Although individual panels cannot be identified from the vague descriptions in Reid’s records, for the first time all of the buyers and the prices they paid are recorded. There were twelve buyers in total across the six-month exhibition, all private collectors. Sales of Grosvenor’s stained glass generated a total sum of £21,800 (the equivalent today of around £500,000), greatly underpinned by regular and large sales to William Burrell, whose purchases alone came to £19,315.\(^{325}\) Burrell had earlier appeared as a buyer at Grosvenor’s London exhibitions, and was a regular purchaser of paintings from Reid.\(^{326}\) In Glasgow Burrell purchased ‘one lot of glass’ for £3,300 in April 1919.\(^{327}\) In July, Burrell made a further five
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purchases of stained glass from the exhibition, most described only as ‘pieces of glass’, and some recorded simply as ‘glass bought from Mr Grosvenor Thomas’. These came to £4,340,\textsuperscript{328} including two English fifteenth-century heraldic panels. In August, Burrell bought another unspecified consignment of Grosvenor’s glass, this time for £6,050,\textsuperscript{329} before making his final purchases in October 1919, which came to £5,625.\textsuperscript{330}

Aside from Burrell, there seemed to be a minimal appetite for stained glass amongst Scottish audiences. Grosvenor’s other customers made relatively low-value purchases. Most collectors at the show were primarily interested in the French paintings patronised by Reid.\textsuperscript{331} Burrell’s brother and business partner George (1858–1927), of Gleniffer Lodge (Paisley), purchased and subsequently cancelled the sale of a ‘large English heraldic panel’ in September 1919.\textsuperscript{332} Burrell’s brother-in-law, merchant James Ralston Mitchell (1866–1952) bought five panels of Dutch and Swiss glass, which came to £280, in October 1919 (equivalent to around £6,000 today).\textsuperscript{333} Engineer Sir John Richmond (1869–1963), purchased a Swiss panel for £85 in August 1919.\textsuperscript{334} In October, Andrew Reid of Auchterarder House (Perthshire), purchased an English heraldic panel, a Flemish grisaille, and a Swiss armorial, all for £235.\textsuperscript{335} His brother, Sir Hugh Reid (1860–1935), had purchased the month before, buying an ‘angel panel’ and an ‘English border panel’, which came to £200.\textsuperscript{336} Industrialist David Cargill (1872–1939)\textsuperscript{337} bought an English window depicting a saint, and two sixteenth-century Swiss panels,
which came to £660. He was a neighbour of Burrell’s: they occupied 6 and 8 Great Western Terrace respectively.

In August, James Hope, of The Knoll (Lenzie) – next door to where Grosvenor and his family had lived until the turn of the century – bought an English medallion for £120. At the same time, Grosvenor had also sold a Swiss heraldic panel and a circular grisaille to one of his current neighbours in London, to ‘John Massey of 10 Kensington Gardens’, which came to a total of £140. Other buyers included politician and shipping magnate Sir William Raeburn (1850–1934), who purchased two Swiss panels and an English roundel totalling £300 in August. Samuel Wylie of merchants Wylie and Lochhead, based on Buchanan Street (Glasgow), obtained two panels for £125 in July 1919, as did James Spiers of George Street. Whisky distiller Peter Mackie (1855–1924) of Glenreasdale House (Argyll and Bute) also purchased during this month, obtaining two panels of eighteenth-century glass for £65, and again in September, when five further panels were sold, costing £200. Mackie’s Arts and Crafts home was used frequently by the Glasgow Boys.

**Private Residence, Glasgow (1920)**

While this first Glasgow show was ongoing, in July 1919 Roy and Grosvenor had secured the large collection of stained glass from Costessey Hall. The glass was originally collected on the Continent in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries by Sir William

---


342 TGA, Reid and Lefevre Archive, Alexander Reid Day Books 1913–1920, 2002/11.279, July 1919, “Sam Wylie” and “Jas Spiers.”

343 TGA, Reid and Lefevre Archive, Alexander Reid Day Books 1913–1920, 2002/11.279, August 1919, “Peter Mackie.”

344 TGA, Reid and Lefevre Archive, Alexander Reid Day Books 1913–1920, 2002/11.279, September 1919, “Peter Mackie.”

345 According to Wells, the chapel was dismantled as early as 1915, and the glass was sold later to Grosvenor, who presumably viewed it in storage; William Wells, “Some Notes on the Stained Glass in the Burrell Collection,” *Journal of the British Society of Master Glass-Painters*, 12, no. 4 (1958–59): 280.
Jerningham (1736–1809). A Roman Catholic, Jerningham built a private chapel at Costessey to house them, and the windows were illustrated in a series of 1820 pen and ink drawings.\textsuperscript{346} This was a wide-ranging collection of Flemish, French, English, German, Dutch and Italian stained glass of thirteenth- to sixteenth-century date.\textsuperscript{347} Grosvenor and the London-based art dealers Durlacher Brothers (of 142 New Bond Street) held joint shares in this glass, presumably because Grosvenor did not have sufficient capital to purchase it outright,\textsuperscript{348} especially since he had acquired a substantial series of sixteenth-century English heraldic panels that decorated the mansion windows at Ashridge Park (Hertfordshire).\textsuperscript{349}

Focusing again on Glasgow, in 1920, seventy-nine Costessey windows and panels were exhibited\textsuperscript{350} at 11 Crown Terrace, a residential property a few streets from Burrell’s own townhouse, perhaps in an attempt to further court his custom. It is unclear if this was in collaboration with any art dealer. As with Grosvenor’s New York catalogues, Aymer Vallance provided the foreword, and Maurice Drake provided the inventory and illustrations.\textsuperscript{351} Although the catalogue is extremely detailed, no sales records survive, and no details of the exhibition itself. Burrell’s purchases included a fifteenth-century Flemish Ascension, as well as an English thirteenth-century donor figure in heraldic dress of the Holy Roman Empress Beatrix von Falkenburg (d.1277) (fig. 31).\textsuperscript{352} Around this time Burrell probably also obtained several French monumental windows, such as a three-light window depicting St John the Divine, and a sixteenth-century two-light Tree of Jesse (figs 32–33).\textsuperscript{353} By this time, Burrell


\textsuperscript{347} Drake, Costessey, 15.


\textsuperscript{349} Frederick Sydney Eden, \textit{Ancient Painted and Stained Glass} (Cambridge: University Press, 1933), 185.

\textsuperscript{350} Drake, Costessey, 2–19.


\textsuperscript{352} Drake, Costessey, nos. 7, 22; Wells, \textit{Figure and Ornamental}, 4; Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/2.

\textsuperscript{353} Drake, Costessey, nos. 56, 59. Companion windows are found at Wells Cathedral; Tim Ayers, \textit{The Medieval Stained Glass of Wells Cathedral}, CVMA Great Britain, IV (Oxford: British Academy, 2004), pt I, cvi–cvii; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/390–94.
also most likely owned a panel depicting *Joachim and Anna*, and two fifteenth-century English heraldic panels.\(^{354}\)

Burrell’s main competition at the exhibition was Lord Rochdale, who also purchased extensively. Of the sixty-seven panels he had acquired from Grosvenor, panels such as a German fifteenth-century *St Cecilia and the Angels* can be attributed to this phase of collecting (fig. 34).\(^{355}\) Eumorfolopolus also acquired Costessey panels, including a set depicting *Solomon and Sheba*.\(^{356}\) Meanwhile Roy, who was in New York, had sold a German fifteenth-century panel depicting the *Flight into Egypt*, and two scenes from the history of a monastic order from Costessey, to repeat purchaser George Pratt,\(^{357}\) as well as a German fifteenth-century *Virgin and Child*, and a sixteenth-century *Knight*.\(^{358}\) A sixteenth-century German kneeling abbot from Costessey was sold to the Worcester Art Museum (MA),\(^{359}\) and a German sixteenth-century four-light window, and French sixteenth-century two-light *Annunciation*, went to financier and arms and armour collector Clarence Hungerford Mackay (1874–1938),\(^{360}\) whose French Gothic-style Harbor Hill retreat on Long Island, had been designed by McKim, Mead and White. In 1920, Chicago timber merchant William Owen Goodman (1848–1936) donated a composite educational panel of thirteenth- to eighteenth-century date to the art school of the Chicago Institute, presumably acquired from Grosvenor also around this time, although it was probably not part of the Costessey stock.\(^{361}\)

**The Durlacher Gallery, New York (1921–22)**

After their American agents had been dismissed in April 1919 (see further above), it was not until March 1921 that Grosvenor and Roy made their return to exhibiting in New York.\(^{362}\) This
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\(^{354}\) Wilfred Drake’s annotated copy of the Costessey catalogue, now in the SMCG Department at the Victoria and Albert Museum, confirms this; Drake, *Costessey*, nos. 62, 77, 78.

\(^{355}\) Now in the Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/377.

\(^{356}\) When Rochdale’s collection was dispersed in 1948, Burrell acquired several of his Costessey panels, including those depicting *Solomon and Sheba*, the *Ascension*, *Mary Magdalene*, the *Coronation of the Virgin* and the *Judgement of Solomon*; Wells, “Notes on ... Stained Glass,” 280.


\(^{358}\) Caviness, *New England*, 116; MMA, acc. nos. 41.140.93, 41.170.100, 41.700.104.


\(^{360}\) Drake, *Costessey*, 14–16, nos. 13, 14, 60; Caviness, *New England*, 208. These panels are now at Portsmouth Abbey, Rhode Island.

\(^{361}\) “Acquisitions,” *Bulletin of the Art Institute of Chicago*, 15, no. 6 (November 1921): 182.

\(^{362}\) TNA, *UK Outward Passenger Lists*, March 16, 1921, “Roy Thomas.”
crossing was documented in a number of photographs showing Roy, his wife Winifred, and Grosvenor, and it was the first time they had travelled together to New York (fig. 35). Roy stated that he intended to stay in the United States for four months, and Grosvenor just two. Continuing their association with the Durlacher firm, the purpose of their visit was an exhibition at the Durlacher’s gallery at 743 Fifth Avenue. No exhibition catalogue survives, but as the firm held joint shares in the Costessey collection, it is likely that many of the panels were from this source. A letter from Grosvenor to Pitcairn reveals the manner in which the collection was presented for sale: ‘I am showing my collection at 743 Fifth Avenue in a small chapel that I have built on the top floor’. Presumably Grosvenor’s appeal to Pitcairn was spurred on by acquisitions Pitcairn had made in July 1920, when an unspecified number of panels was obtained directly from Grosvenor in London for $9,118, which presumably included a French thirteenth-century border fragment originally from Lyon Cathedral, a group of canons originally from Sées Cathedral, and a French fourteenth-century Costessey collection window depicting three bishop saints. Only a handful of Grosvenor’s panels have been identified in subsequent published material on Pitcairn’s collection, but this archival information indicates that he was a far more prolific buyer from Grosvenor than has previously been acknowledged.

For this exhibition Grosvenor had selected several whole and composite windows, alongside single panels and lancets. These included a French thirteenth-century composite medallion window (priced at £3,250), a fragmentary English fourteenth-century window with its original tracery (priced at £4,500), as well as a composite fourteenth-century window; the latter Grosvenor had reportedly sold to an unnamed American buyer by April 1921. The Durlacher firm and Grosvenor also jointly offered the MMA a group of heraldic, figural, and ornamental panels, of which the museum purchased only a French fourteenth-century medallion. This was invoiced to the Durlacher firm, showing that (as was apparently common

364 Ibid.
365 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, March 30, 1921.
366 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Grosvenor Thomas, invoices, April 20 and May 4, 1916; Drake, Thomas Collection ... Part II, nos. 33a–b; GMA, acc. nos. 03.SG. 28–30, 50, 127.
367 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, April 2, 1921.
368 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, April 22, 1921.
for Grosvenor) sales were again put through the books of the host firm. They also jointly sold a German sixteenth-century oil painting of the *Virgin and Child* to the museum, showing that the Durlachers were invested in the selling of some of Grosvenor’s other items.

A blank sheet of headed paper from this period, has as its letterhead ‘Durlacher Brothers and Grosvenor Thomas, Associated in America for Ancient Stained Glass’, suggesting that a formal association may now have existed between them. Its wording implies that the same arrangement was not in place in London, where the Durlachers also had a gallery. Roy and the Durlachers’ New York gallery manager Adam Merriman Paff (1891–1932) visited Pitcairn’s Pennsylvania mansion Glencairn together in March 1922. In June 1922, Roy travelled back to London with Paff and another of the Durlacher staff, Robert Thomas Nichol (b.1858), which was again documented in a family photograph (fig. 36). The Durlachers also published Roy’s book, *Stained Glass: Its Origin and Application*, suggesting Roy’s attempt to assert his authority as a stained-glass specialist. Illustrated with panels from Grosvenor’s collection, the book provided a brief overview of the history of stained glass, a glossary of essential terms, guidance as to the use of stained glass in secular spheres, and information on how to identify forgeries. Producing short books in order to advertise a specific artistic period or medium was common amongst dealers of the time; for example, in 1917 Charles Duveen published *Elizabethan Interiors*, and in 1919 he wrote *Old English Interiors*, areas in which he specialised as a dealer. The latter situated stained glass as a key element of interior decoration, a belief that Charles must already have held in 1913, when he was the first in the United States to host Grosvenor’s exhibitions of the medium.

Around this time, Roy had secured significant sales to New York financier John Davison Rockefeller Jr (1874–1960), for the Park Avenue Baptist Church (New York), which opened in
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372 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Roy Thomas, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, March 1922.
374 Roy Thomas, *Origin and Application*.
April 1922. Twenty-one sixteenth-century Flemish panels from the Dagnam Park collection were chosen, the third instalment of which Grosvenor had just acquired. This stained glass was stored in boxes in the ‘long room’ above the Coach House at Dagnam, revealing that it had already been removed from the windows before Grosvenor acquired it, saving him the costs of its removal. Alternatively, it may be that the Neaves, owners of this collection and of Dagnam Park, had never actually installed these panels after their acquisition in the early nineteenth century. Depicting miracles, parables, and scenes from the life of Christ, these panels were installed in the chancel window of Park Avenue Baptist Church, after Maurice Drake’s brother Wilfred had made the necessary alterations. Small panels and fragments, also from Dagnam, were installed in the tracery lights. Wilfred Drake was now working in collaboration with the Thomases, and may already have been appointed as a partner in their firm Thomas and Drake, formed around this time, as discussed below (fig. 37). These Flemish windows were described and illustrated in a short catalogue of unknown authorship that includes a brief history of imported glazing schemes, and a fully illustrated catalogue. Due to its thorough nature, it is possible that Grosvenor, Roy, Maurice, or even Wilfred compiled this information. Rockefeller paid £3,200 for these panels (the equivalent of well over £80,000 today), the first of several incredibly important purchases of stained glass funded by him (see Chapter Two).

Clayton and Bell’s Studio, London (December 1922)

With Roy busy over in New York, Grosvenor held a very brief nine-day exhibition in London in late December 1922. Clayton and Bell’s 9 Clifford Street gallery was used; Grosvenor
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378 Park Avenue Baptist, 10–30.
379 Ibid., 5–6.
380 Ibid., 5.
382 “An Exhibition of Medieval Stained Glass held at Messrs Clayton and Bell’s Studios, The Grosvenor Thomas Collection” (14–23 December 1922), listed in VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.557-1921. A copy of this catalogue has not been found. “Grosvenor Thomas’s Stained Glass,” Glasgow Herald, 21 December 1922, 3.
383 V&A, acc. no. c.557-1921. Wilfred’s cousin Lucy Beer (1837–1922), and her husband Robert Driffield (1848–1897), had both worked for Clayton and Bell in the late nineteenth century, before setting up their own firm, Beer and Driffield, in Exeter.
had previously obtained a collection of French and English twelfth- and thirteenth-century stained glass from the firm (see further above). Robert Anning Bell (1863–1933), stained-glass designer and relative of the firm’s directors, had a studio neighbouring the workshop of Wilfred Drake, who by this stage is likely to have joined Grosvenor in business. Little is known of this exhibition. Curators from the V&A attended, but made no purchases. The only other mention of this exhibition comes from an article in the Glasgow Herald, which described sixty panels as being on display: ‘starting with eight panels of French thirteenth and fourteenth-century grisaille and strapwork, followed by Flemish, Swiss and Dutch glass of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, much from Costessey and Dagnamy’.385

The Incorporation of the Stained Glass Business (c.1922)

In late September 1922, Grosvenor made further sales to the V&A, sending them three English geometric and foliate panels, of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century date, priced at £100 each (just over £2,000 each today). The museum kept a ‘winged figure’, and an English fourteenth-century roundel depicting a tambourine player. At the same time, Wilfred sold its counterpart to Philip Nelson, the earliest confirmed sale made by Wilfred. Not long after, in October, Roy sailed again for New York, where he had obtained a permanent gallery at 6 West 56th Street (New York), neighbouring Charles Duveen’s gallery, underlining their now more independent status. However, while Roy began trading as part of a new business, it was a stock at least partially well-known, mixing unsold pieces already exhibited as part of Grosvenor’s collection with new acquisitions.

Probably with the new firm in mind, and feeling confident that they had carved out a stable market, Thomas and Drake purchased further country-house collections. Many of these sites again proved to have been richrepositories for stained glass collected from the Continent.

384 VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.557-1921.
385 “Mr Grosvenor Thomas’s Stained Glass,” Glasgow Herald, December 21, 1922, 3.
387 VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, G. Thomas folder, MA/1/7535, Bernard Rackham, letter to Grosvenor Thomas, October 10, 1922.
388 Comments to this end are made in VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.932-1922.
390 The British business records of Thomas and Drake do not survive, and so no official date can be given for its incorporation; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 45, Roy Thomas, letter to Christopher Woodforde, December 22, 1948.
From 1921, stained glass from Belhus Manor (Essex), Cassiobury Park (Hertfordshire), Wroxton Abbey (Oxfordshire), Hale Hall (Lancashire), Hassop Hall (Derbyshire), and Hardwick House (Suffolk) was purchased. Hale Hall aside, all these locations were less than 80 miles from Thomas and Drake’s London base, underlining the volume of glass obtainable in their direct vicinity. None of these collections can be identified as having featured in any of Grosvenor’s previous exhibitions, but were included in Thomas and Drake’s stock books, compiled from mid-1922 at the latest.

The glass from Cassiobury included sixteenth-century English heraldic panels, Dutch seventeenth-century secular scenes, and Flemish fifteenth-century religious windows, which were probably acquired in the early 1920s from New York-born socialite Adela Grant Capell (1867–1922), widow of the 7th earl of Essex. At Cassiobury these panels were housed in a neo-Gothic cloister adjoining the house. Grosvenor may only have seen the glass after it had been taken out of its casements, if the Capells had already opted to install easier and cheaper to maintain clear glazing by the time of this sale. When the contents of Belhus were auctioned in May 1923, mention of its stained glass was not included in the catalogue. Thomas and Drake had likely already acquired these panels much earlier, including fifteenth- and sixteenth-century English heraldry transferred to Belhus from the chapel and tower at Hurstmonceaux Castle (East Sussex). Other panels Grosvenor found at Belhus had been gathered there from various other English manor houses. Presumably around the same time, over twenty-five sixteenth-century English royal armorials from Wroxton were obtained, originally set in the Chinese gallery and great hall windows there, but cut up and dispersed by Thomas and Drake, as well as further English fifteenth- to seventeenth-

392 These panels are shown in situ at Cassiobury in a series of drawings by Joseph Mallord William Turner (1775–1851); TNA, Fonthill Sketchbook, Turner Bequest XLVII, box D02220, “Cassiobury: The Interior of the Great Cloister,” 1807; VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.123-1923.
Devon-born Wilfred Drake was part of an Exeter stained-glass dynasty that spanned several generations, beginning with his great uncle Robert Beer (1799–1849), who established Beer and Son in 1837. Wilfred’s father Frederick Drake (1838–1920) worked for the Beers for many years before founding Drake and Sons in 1866, after the death of his cousin Alfred Beer (1831–1866). Drake and Sons became the official glaziers to Exeter Cathedral. Their workshop, ‘Three Gables’ in Cathedral Yard, was part of a seventeenth-century building where Frederick had installed sixteenth-century architectural salvages from Ham Hall (Somerset), including limestone window frames, oak panelling, and stone fire surrounds, some of which are illustrated in a Drake family photograph (fig. 38). Both Wilfred and Maurice served their apprenticeships there in the 1890s, working at that time on the restoration, between 1884 and 1896, of the cathedral’s fourteenth-century great east window. Wilfred had also illustrated his brother’s 1912 book, *A History of English Glass Painting*, using examples from Grosvenor’s collection. With Aymer Vallance, who contributed the forewords to Grosvenor’s catalogues, the Drakes also co-authored an iconographical dictionary *Saints and their Emblems* (1916). Upon their father’s retirement in 1906, Maurice and Wilfred inherited Drake and Sons, and when Britain was engulfed in
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396 The contents of the house were dispersed in 1926, after its owner George Cullum (1857–1921) died without heir; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book 1, 92–93.
397 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, misc. stock cards marked “Hardwick.”
400 Middle brother, Harry Drake (1877–1954), did not enter the family business, working instead as an organ tuner.
the First World War both enlisted as army officers.\textsuperscript{405} Not long after their return to civilian life, and most likely coinciding with the death of their father in 1920,\textsuperscript{406} Wilfred is said to have left Drake and Sons,\textsuperscript{407} moving to London, where his wife already had numerous family connections.\textsuperscript{408}

It is not known the exact number of shares Wilfred held in Thomas and Drake, how much the business was valued at when he invested, or if there were any external subscribers. However, based on the minimum value accorded to panels in their first New York stock book alone, the stock totalled at least $180,000, which translates to around £1.3 million today.\textsuperscript{409} It seems that the New York stock books were largely compiled from 1922, in preparation for the incorporation of the American branch, a process completed in late November 1924.\textsuperscript{410} Judging by the mixture of handwritings in these books, several people were involved in the initial organisation and division of stock between London and New York.\textsuperscript{411}

Maurice was perhaps the more natural choice as partner, having already collaborated with the Thomases on several earlier occasions. He was a well-known author of fiction and non-

\textsuperscript{405} TNA, \textit{WWI Medal Index Cards}, 1920, “Wilfred Drake, Somerset Light Infantry” and “Frederick Maurice Drake, Somerset Light Infantry.”

\textsuperscript{406} London, \textit{Principal Probate Registry}, High Court of Justice, March 8, 1921, “Drake, Frederick.” The Drake brothers inherited an estate valued at £2,601, equivalent to almost £52,000 today.

\textsuperscript{407} Daphne Drake, Maurice’s daughter and glazier at the firm at this time, confirmed this; shared by Frances Page.


\textsuperscript{409} Amounts are recorded next to each panel in dollars and cents, the minimum value accorded to each panel. The stock books do not record the actual sale prices, which instead were listed in their journals and cash books – cross-referenced in the stock books, but no longer extant. Stock Book I (p. 42, no. 578) reads: ‘the part unsold is valued by Mr Thomas at $1000.00’. Stock Book II was probably compiled slightly later, as the first sales in it date from 1927.

\textsuperscript{410} New York, Department of State, \textit{Records of Incorporation}, November 21, 1924, “Grosvenor Thomas and Drake Inc.”. Although the first sale listed in Thomas and Drake’s New York stock books are to George Booth (1864–1949), on 6 January 1923, this was likely put through the London branch; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 44–45, no. 529.

\textsuperscript{411} As the stock numbers in the books do not run consecutively, it can be assumed that the missing numbers in the sequences represent panels that had already been sold, or remained in London.
fiction books, an advisor to the V&A, a member of several of London’s fashionable gentleman’s clubs, and also held the freedom of the City of London.\textsuperscript{412} From 1921, Maurice was also heavily engaged in founding the British Society of Master Glass-Painters, aimed at promoting and maintaining high standards of craftsmanship.\textsuperscript{413} However, upon Maurice’s death in April 1923, obituaries reported that he had been in poor health for some time.\textsuperscript{414} In addition, there were also intimations that Maurice viewed the actions of art dealers and American buyers with disdain. In his posthumously published novel The Doom Window, written around this time, the narrative centred on a glazing workshop and the ‘lurid’ activities of an art dealer.\textsuperscript{415} Directly after accompanying the Thomas Collection to New York in 1913, Maurice was interviewed by a British magazine, who paraphrased: ‘he does not think much of that hustling country [America], he thinks that all the breathless energy on which the businessmen over there pride themselves is mostly show’.\textsuperscript{416}

Nevertheless, from 1920 Wilfred became increasingly active in London. On either the initiative of Grosvenor or the V&A, the new owners of the Maximilian series, Wilfred had travelled to Belgium in 1920 where he identified their provenance as the Chapel of the Holy Blood (Bruges).\textsuperscript{417} In 1921, he donated a watercolour of a stained-glass panel depicting a sixteenth-century woman, which he had painted, to the National Portrait Gallery (London), and also began exhibiting his designs for stained glass at London’s Royal Academy of Arts (fig. 39).\textsuperscript{418} Correspondence with the V&A in November 1921 reveals Wilfred was also preparing illustrations for some panels of thirteenth-century glass that Grosvenor had just acquired in Paris, although he does not provide further details. Wilfred accompanied Grosvenor on this trip; the pair proceeded to Chartres afterwards, presumably either to

\textsuperscript{412} LMA, \textit{Freedom of the City of London Admission Papers, 1681–1925}, September 8, 1919, “Morris Drake.” Maurice was notably a member of London’s gregarious and bohemian Savage Club; Drake, “Maurice Drake,” 187; “Mr Maurice Drake,” The Times, May 1, 1923, 16.
\textsuperscript{413} Maurice died before the first issue could go to print; Drake, “Maurice Drake,” 37.
\textsuperscript{415} Drake, \textit{Doom Window}.
collect more glass, or to view original stained glass in situ. Wilfred, and perhaps the Thomases, were again in Paris in December 1922, attending the auction of the collection of textiles manufacturer Frédéric Engel-Gros (1843–1918). Annotatons in Wilfred’s hand in their catalogue record the names of the buyers and the prices each lot fetched, showing they were following the bidding closely.

By 1922, or even before, Wilfred had established a workshop at 1 Holland Park Road (Kensington), just around the corner from Roy and Grosvenor’s respective homes. Neighbours included art critic Charles Hind (1862–1927), sculptor Harold Parker (1873–1962), painters George Spencer Watson (1869–1934), Frederick Francis Footet (1850–1935), and stained-glass designer Robert Anning Bell (1863–1933). In later correspondence, Wilfred described his studio as a ‘one-storey lean-to’, with a small entrance vestibule, office, and display area at one end, and workshop at the other. Photographs of the interior of the studio, the only surviving pictures of any of Thomas and Drake’s premises, reveal that there was a series of small windows that Wilfred used for displaying glass (fig. 40).

The fact that Grosvenor and Wilfred’s studios were located in artist’s colonies outside of central London strongly suggests that sales were not their main focus. It demonstrates that they opted to place their workshops in an area of London where rates would not be at a premium. In Britain, they had no permanent presence in the more sales-focused Bond
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419 VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, Wilfred Drake folder, MA/1D1564, Wilfred Drake, letters to Bernard Rackham, November 11 and 19, 1921.
420 Engel-Gros lived at Château de Ripaille near Lake Geneva (Switzerland).
424 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.368, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, October 31, 1940 (Appendix B, document 382).
425 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 45.
426 There is no evidence to suggest Wilfred had any experience as an art dealer prior to joining the firm, despite several other glaziers having been involved in the dispersal of original glazing;
Street art-dealing districts, and so it is likely their primary role was to source and prepare panels for Roy to offer on the American market, and not necessarily to generate sales themselves. In contrast, at the same time Roy had opened premises next door to Charles of London’s gallery, in the heart of Manhattan’s art-dealing district.\textsuperscript{427} In New York City Roy’s only job was to sell. If his American stock required alteration, Roy would either send the panels to London for Wilfred to adapt, or subcontract the work to New York glaziers.\textsuperscript{428} Wilfred had no prior experience as a salesman: it was his experience as a trained restorer that brought him to Thomas and Drake.\textsuperscript{429} Wilfred’s appointment represented the establishment of a permanent technical director, a job previously outsourced to Maurice Drake and Harry Grylls.

The most likely reason why a full-time restorer was now needed was either the worsening condition of the collections Grosvenor was now able to obtain, or, in the previous absence of an in-house restorer, an accumulation of glass in need of attention before resale. The projected volume of the collection at this time – over 1,000 panels and windows alone are recorded in the first c.1922 New York stock book – underlines that the outsourcing of the restoration of this amount of stained glass to another firm would have been extremely costly.\textsuperscript{430} Even with the appointment of Wilfred, and his unnamed assistant, Lowndes and

\textsuperscript{427} New York State Archives, 1925 New York State Census, “Roy Thomas.” Roy’s proximity to other art dealers is shown in the addresses of the other galleries, as seen in contemporary advertising; “Adverts,” American Art News, 21, no. 11 (1922): 8–10.
\textsuperscript{428} Wilfred may have provided Roy with some superficial training in the handling and restoration of stained glass. Wilfred or Roy had also trained an unnamed apprentice in the 1940s, who by the 1950s had purchased some stained glass for churches he was glazing; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, Winifred Thomas, letter to Dennis King, December 1952.
\textsuperscript{429} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.319, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, December 13, 1939 (Appendix B, document 330).
\textsuperscript{430} Now in his mid-sixties, Grosvenor may have looked to his retirement, and the legal transfer of his stock to his son.
Drury, a stained-glass firm based at the ‘Glass House’ in Fulham, were said to have provided him with additional technical support when required.\textsuperscript{431}

Grosvenor’s Death

When Grosvenor died on 5 February 1923 aged 66, Thomas and Drake can only have been trading as a company for about a year. Two months later, in April 1923, Maurice died aged 47. In quick succession, the fledgling company had lost two of its most significant allies. The partners were in all probability aware that Grosvenor was unwell when their partnership was formed, but the seriousness of his situation was perhaps not yet apparent. A correspondent for the \textit{Glasgow Herald} wrote: ‘For a considerable time Mr Thomas had not enjoyed good health, but none of his friends and acquaintances foresaw this swift and fatal issue. It was anticipated that within a week he would be able to quit the hospital. Less than three weeks ago I paid a visit to him at his house. His sudden death leaves a void in the art world’.\textsuperscript{432} The unexpected nature of his death is further underlined by Roy’s absence from the country when it happened.\textsuperscript{433} Roy had already sailed for New York four months before Grosvenor was taken in to hospital, declaring that he intended to remain in America for a period of eight months, taking him to the end of the art season.\textsuperscript{434} However, when Grosvenor died, Roy took the first available ship back to London the following morning, leaving his wife alone in a foreign city, and closing the business right in the middle of their first full American art season,\textsuperscript{435} underlining the urgency with which he left. Although Grosvenor’s death came twenty-one months before the New York branch was officially incorporated in the United States in November 1924, the firm traded under the name ‘Grosvenor Thomas and Drake

\textsuperscript{431} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, Winifred Thomas, letter to Dennis King, May 1, 1953.
\textsuperscript{432} “Mr Grosvenor Thomas’s Death,” \textit{Glasgow Herald}, February 7, 1923, 10.
\textsuperscript{433} Grosvenor’s death certificate records that he died at a hospital in Manchester Street in Marylebone, London, from complications after surgery for colon cancer; GRO, \textit{Certificate of Deaths}, February 1923, “George Grosvenor Thomas.”
Inc.’ until at least 1928, presumably part of a deliberate move to ensure continuity between the newly formed company and its late figurehead.

When Grosvenor’s estate was released from probate in mid-1923, it was valued at £15,380, the equivalent of over £320,000 today, all of which passed to his widow. While his collection of paintings was mentioned, in his last will dated 1909, no reference was made to his stained glass or alabaster collections, despite Grosvenor’s having already begun to buy and sell these by this date. A contract covering the ownership of the Costessey collection seems to have been in place, which became the joint property of Grosvenor’s wife and the Durlacher Brothers, who had already invested in the collection (see further above). Presumably, as this series was only ever half owned by Grosvenor, it could not be incorporated as part of Thomas and Drake’s stock, accounting for this special arrangement. Thomas and Drake sold this glass for Matilda Thomas and the Durlachers on a commission basis only. At some stage later, the Spanish art dealer Tomás Harris (1908–1964) bought, or was given in exchange for a debt, the Durlacher’s shares in this glass, and presumably Roy and his younger sister Dorothy inherited their mother’s portion of the contract on her death in 1936.

After Grosvenor’s death, Matilda donated six Flemish seventeenth-century panels depicting scenes from the Old Testament from Dagnam Park, to Chelsea Old Church (London). Old Church contains several other examples of Continental stained glass, perhaps supplied by Grosvenor, and it is possible that Matilda’s gift to them was in some way associated with

436 “Thomas Grosvenor and Drake Inc.”, filed on 21 November 1924, and dissolved 11 January 1928; New York, Department of State, Records of Incorporation, folder, for businesses filed in November 1924.
437 The British branch, begun earlier, in c.1922, presumably already traded under this name, although records of the British branch do not survive to confirm this.
438 London, High Court of Justice, Principal Probate Registry, April 4, 1923, “George Grosvenor Thomas.”
439 GRO, Copies of Grants and Wills, April 9, 1909, “George Grosvenor Thomas.”
440 Ibid.
441 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, Winifred Thomas, letter to Dennis King, February 5, 1953.
442 London, High Court of Justice, Principal Probate Registry, February 9, 1937, “Matilda Jane Thomas.”
443 Private Collection, Wilfred Drake, letter to the Revd Stewart, March 1923, shared by David Ockleshaw. While the church was badly bombed during World War Two, the stained glass was fortunately removed and safely stored, before being reinstated when the church was rebuilt.
444 Cole, Netherlandish, 65.
a previous association with Grosvenor, or was an acknowledgement by her of their interest in collecting continental glazing. In 1922, Drake and Sons had also restored a fourteenth-century vestry window there.\textsuperscript{445} In a similar manner, receipts show that Grosvenor Thomas had supplied King’s College (Cambridge) with two panels depicting French kings of Judah in February 1922;\textsuperscript{446} a series of sixteenth-century royal quarries were also subsequently donated by him, and after his death Matilda continued these donations.\textsuperscript{447}

Immediately after Grosvenor’s death, Roy, acting as co-executor of his father’s estate, completed a sale of four Dutch seventeenth-century panels representing the four seasons, at a price of £60, to Pitcairn, which presumably had been a deal pending at the time of Grosvenor’s death.\textsuperscript{448} Pitcairn made his last purchases from the firm in April 1923, when probate on Grosvenor’s possessions was granted. He purchased three French fifteenth-century panels in London, at £100 each, and a ‘square thirteenth-century’ panel for £150.\textsuperscript{449} Just months before Grosvenor’s death, Pitcairn had been in London, and presumably used the opportunity to view and reserve this stained glass.\textsuperscript{450} Roy requested that the balance be paid in sterling to the executors of his father’s estate – suggesting these were also panels that had passed to Grosvenor’s widow, rather than being incorporated into the stock of the new firm. This was the last recorded sale made to Pitcairn, despite Roy’s having made repeated successive approaches.\textsuperscript{452} Pitcairn’s reluctance to deal with certain art dealers, and his pursuit of a bargain, is revealed in letters of the period. To Paris-based art dealer Henri Daguerre (b.1859) he wrote: ‘I very much prefer dealing with you than doing business with

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{446} Cambridge, King’s College Library, Milner-White Papers, Grosvenor Thomas, invoice, February 12, 1922.
\item \textsuperscript{447} Wayment, \textit{King’s College}, 25.
\item \textsuperscript{448} VAA, SMCG Department, object files for acc. nos. c.123-1923, c.396-97-1923, c.928-1923, “NACF Acquisitions,” 1923.
\item \textsuperscript{449} GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, “Thomas, Invoice,” April 5, 1923.
\item \textsuperscript{450} NARA, \textit{New York Passenger Lists}, January 5, 1923, “Raymond Pitcairn.”
\item \textsuperscript{451} GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Roy Thomas, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, March 20, 1923, and Raymond Pitcairn, letter to Roy Thomas, May 5, 1923.
\item \textsuperscript{452} ‘I should like to show you some very early English stone sculpture’: GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Roy Thomas, letter to Raymond Pitcairn, May 5, 1923. ‘Since you were here last, eight stained glass panels from the side windows at Hampton Court have arrived’: GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Roy Thomas, letter to Raymond Pitcairn’, March 19, 1925. ‘Fine as the glass in question is, it is not the sort that particularly appeals to me. I have seen glass of this period with a stronger appeal to me. Under the circumstances you had better consider me out […]’: GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 5, Raymond Pitcairn, letter to Roy Thomas, March 25, 1925.
\end{itemize}
the art dealers who are obliged to have establishments in the large cities, with all the expenses of administration which they involve'. 453 A year later, in 1921, in a letter to the Parisian Demotte firm, he expanded: ‘I desire to avoid dealings with the Hebrew dealers, and those who do a high price business in antiques’, continuing: ‘I have refrained from dealing with the New York dealers in antiques, as a matter of fact I dislike all of them with whom I have come in contact’. 454 The permanent establishing of Thomas and Drake Inc. must undoubtedly have contributed to Pitcairn’s distancing himself from them.

Conclusion

As the predecessor to Thomas and Drake, Grosvenor’s collection established ancient European stained glass on the art market at a time when there were few large-scale buyers or sellers of the medium. Numerous exhibitions in London, New York, and Glasgow were held in collaboration with period-room importers and interior designers in America, and with picture dealers and stained-glass manufacturers in Britain, showing the different status of the medium in the different countries. This unsurpassed collection, formed by Grosvenor from the 1900s to the 1920s, was so large that when it was transferred to the newly incorporated Thomas and Drake business, the firm rarely had to make further purchases, and could focus for the following decades almost entirely on repairing and selling Grosvenor’s acquisitions. Grosvenor showed great foresight in specialising in this type of stock, in aligning himself with the right people, and carefully marketing and financing this collection, creating a well-established brand.

453 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 2, Raymond Pitcairn, letter to Henri Daguerre, March 24, 1920.
454 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 2, Raymond Pitcairn, letter to Lucien Demotte, March 22, 1921.
CHAPTER TWO: 
Thomas and Drake Incorporated (New York), Roy Thomas, and the American Elite (1924–1947)

From its official incorporation in New York in November 1924 (and for some time before), until its closure in February 1947, Roy Thomas (1885–1952) led Thomas and Drake’s American branch. In 1948, keeper of ceramics and stained glass at the V&A (1950–1963), Edward Arthur Lane (1909–1963), penned an apt summary of his activities, stating: ‘About 25 years ago Roy Grosvenor Thomas went to America to live by selling old glass to beef barons and museums’. After America’s late nineteenth-century ‘Gilded Age’, the subsequent and sustained prosperity in industrial and financial sectors during the ‘roaring twenties’ sustained a wave of vastly wealthy millionaire and billionaire industrialists, financiers, and businessmen. Many built sprawling European Revival-style mansions, for which they sought to recreate authentic medieval and Renaissance interiors, often by furnishing them with original European imports. One contemporary American journalist described this climate: ‘there is a bull market in stocks, a bull market in real estate, a bull market in antiques, in works of art; millionaires are multiplying so rapidly that the income-tax collectors can hardly keep track’. In 1925, British newspaper The Times even appealed for glass-painters able to work in the medieval manner to go to America, an advertisement

---

455 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 31, Edward Arthur Lane, letter to Christopher Woodforde, December 9, 1948.
456 This was a period of extreme wealth for the select few, satirised in the novel The Gilded Age: A Tale of Today (New York: Sun Times, 1873) by Mark Twain (1835–1910) and Charles Warner (1829–1900).
458 On occasion, entire properties were dismantled and transplanted, such as at Agecroft Hall (Virginia), where in 1925 a Tudor manor house was transported from its original location in Lancashire (England) and rebuilt in America; “International Vandalism,” New York Times, February 14, 1926, 10.
460 “Medievalism in Church Art,” The Times, October 10, 1925, 8.
repeated a year later in the *Journal of the British Society of Master Glass-Painters*, underlining the increasing popularity of the period and of the medium.

Thomas and Drake’s medieval and Renaissance stained-glass dealership was just one of a whole network of house-furnishing businesses that orbited around the mansion-building boom, from architects, interior designers and importers of period rooms, to craftsmen and art dealers. As Thomas and Drake’s stock was unsurpassed in volume, and largely assembled from English manor houses, Roy’s studio was a natural port of call for Americans looking to furnish their European-style manor houses with appropriate examples of genuine ancient glazing. Many of these wealthy citizens extended their interest in the arts not just to the embellishment of their own houses, but to the patronage of public institutions. Many of Roy’s customers shared the same interior designers and architects, and a substantial number were members of prominent Jewish families. Some were connected professionally, having associations with a particular occupation or firm. Others likely shared social links through members’ clubs and committees, although it has not been within the scope of this research to fully examine all of these complex relationships. Many served as trustees and patrons of museums and art galleries, coming into close contact with curators who had either initially encouraged, or further cultivated, their interest in stained glass. The ‘period rooms’ displayed by these museums often resembling the sorts of genuine, but frequently only loosely accurate, interiors these wealthy patrons created in their own homes.  

Roy provided just one element in the creation of these manorial settings that involved whole teams of specialist architects, interior designers, art dealers, and landscape gardeners. Thomas and Drake’s full-page advertisement for the New York branch, published in *Country Life in America* in May 1929, confirms stained glass’s role as part of an overall scheme, stating: ‘if you would make your windows not only beautiful units in themselves, but the media for imparting exquisite nuances of colour over the entire room ensemble, your inspection of this rare collection of ancient stained glass should prove most interesting’.  

---

added that copies of Roy’s book could be obtained through their architect, further underlining that he was directing his advert to those participating in the mansion building and decorating boom. On the page adjacent to Roy’s is an advert for Schmitt Brothers of New York, specialists in ‘Old English furniture’. Aside from Roy’s only known advertisement, published in *Country Life Magazine* in May 1929, Thomas and Drake seemed never to have advertised through any of the usual channels, suggesting that Roy’s aim was to integrate with those in the trade rather than the general public. This chapter will explore the types and networks of American buyers, and the firm’s importance to interior design.

**American Sales by City**

Although panels previously in Thomas and Drake’s stock are now widely dispersed, and feature in a great number of collections worldwide, Roy dealt directly with a relatively smaller number of buyers: 39 were private customers, 10 were museums, 9 were interior designers, 4 were glaziers or architects, and 2 were churches; a further 10 of their customers remain as yet unidentified, as references to them are too vague to pinpoint. Each art season, Roy’s customers comprised of a handful of people, an average of three to four; repeat or long-standing buyers were the exception. Only six North-American purchasers acquired stained glass across a period of three or more art seasons, the most long-standing of which was steel and abrasives manufacturer Aldus Higgins (1872–1948), who steadily acquired stained glass across an eight-year span (see further below).

Roy’s North-American sales records reveal that Thomas and Drake’s customers were distributed across well-defined geographic areas, suggesting that his networks of influence spread amongst several prominent buyers and institutions in specific cities. After establishing a permanent presence in America, Roy was especially successful in key industrial, commercial, and financial centres in the rapidly growing manufacturing regions of the mid-Atlantic, south-east, and mid-west, which contained significant populations of newly, and vastly wealthy, citizens. This included New York (NY), Philadelphia (PA), Detroit (MI), Chicago...
(IL), Cleveland and Toledo (OH), Boston and Worcester (MA), New Haven (CT), and Winona (MN), as well as into north-eastern Canada, in Montreal (Quebec). However, the clustering of multiple buyers in these cities did not mean that Roy was automatically successful in these types of places, as his total or minimal lack of sales in Baltimore (MD), Pittsburgh (PA), and the nation’s capital itself, Washington DC, attests. In Quebec the same can be said. While Roy made sales in Montreal, he did not make any deals in neighbouring and equally wealthy cities such as Toronto or Ottawa (Ontario). In these cities there was no major taste amongst the wealthy for art and architecture of the medieval periods, and instead more classical and modern modes prevailed, which automatically ruled out much of Roy’s stock.

Only minimal sales were witnessed in Chicago, despite the presence of many of the wealthy American set, famed from the 1920s for its highly developed meat-packing, lumber, steel, clothing, and tobacco industries – and America’s second city in terms of population. However, only a single buyer in a city of 3,000,000 people can be identified as having bought from Roy after the incorporation of Thomas and Drake. In all likelihood this was because the city was central to the American Arts and Crafts movement, where contemporary European and American glass, such as those made by British firm Morris and Co., dominated. It was not until 1949, at a relatively late stage, that the Art Institute of Chicago, through its curator of decorative and industrial arts, British-born Meyric Reynold Rogers (1893–1972), purchased a German sixteenth-century panel depicting the Hanging of Judas from Roy (fig.

---

466 Like Grosvenor, Roy had also sold stained glass to residents of Euclid Avenue, including industrialist and oriental art collector Edward Whittemore (1861–1930), who purchased a panel of English fifteenth-century ornamental glass in mid-1926; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book 1, 228–29, no. 1341. Likewise, in February 1926, Trinity Cathedral made further purchases – tracery panels depicting angels, and main-light windows showing Christological subjects; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 284, 288, nos. Cos[jesey]. 16, 96, 120; Caviness, Mid-Atlantic, 200.

467 As an exception, Wallace Brown Rogers (1870–1943), owner of a sawmill in Laurel (Mississippi), also purchased a sixteenth-century English armorial from Roy in November 1924; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 184–85, no. 1129. Stock cards also show that Portsmouth Abbey, a Benedictine monastery in Rhode Island, founded in 1918, made a purchase. The abbey also contains notable stained glass originally from Mariawald Abbey (Germany); SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50.


While Chicagoans showed no interest in Roy’s stock, Rogers’s earlier professional appointments show a long-standing previous association with Thomas and Drake. Rogers was a former assistant curator at the MMA, where he worked under its director of medieval holdings, Joseph Breck (1885–1933), whose tenure oversaw many of the Grosvenor Thomas acquisitions. Moreover, Rogers had taken up his position in Chicago straight after his stint as director (1929–1939) of the City Art Museum of St Louis (MO), renamed the St Louis Art Museum in 1972. During his time in St Louis, Rogers made several significant purchases from Roy, in 1929, including an English fifteenth-century saint panel from Hunworth Hall (Norwich), probably depicting St Thomas or Matthias (fig. 42).

Pittsburgh was second only to New York for sheer volume of corporate headquarters; a manufacturing hub for the glass, coal, and steel industries. Notable art collectors such as financier Henry Clay Frick (1849–1919), banker and secretary of state Andrew Mellon (1855–1937), and steel magnate Duncan Phillips (1886–1966) all hailed from the city; in the early 1920s the latter two moved to Washington DC, where they founded respectively the government-funded National Gallery of Art (opened in 1941), and the Phillips Collection (opened in 1921). Unfortunately for Roy, the former, modelled on London’s National Gallery, excluded the decorative arts, while the latter included only nineteenth- and twentieth-century modern and contemporary art in its remit. Correspondence from

---


471 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 29.55.1-2, James Rorimer, letter to Joseph Breck, January 18, 1929.


November 1939 reveals that Roy offered Washington National Cathedral—two French fourteenth-century panels depicting saints Clement and Nicasius, and while many of the windows in the cathedral were modelled on French fourteenth-century styles, representatives from the cathedral declined their purchase, instead opting to showcase the work of contemporary glaziers (fig. 43).

In the case of Baltimore (MD), an omission from Roy’s records was long-time New York-resident, but Baltimore-born, railroad executive and collector of ancient and modern stained glass Henry Walters (1848–1931); his now advanced age may have played a part, however. Since 1903, he had served on the MMA’s executive board, becoming its second vice-president from 1913 until his death, so he remained active on the arts scene. After inheriting his father’s substantial art collection, Walters opened his own gallery in Baltimore in 1909, formally bequeathing it to the city in 1931. However, his interest in stained glass seems to have started before Thomas and Drake’s incorporation. Included in his public bequest were five French thirteenth-century religious windows depicting Standing Apostles and Christ’s Ancestry, acquired directly from the Parisian art dealers Heilbronner and Seligmann in 1910 and 1918 respectively.

The American House Building Boom

The very big estates have become numerous enough to make this city comparable to London in the matter of what may be called the application of the country gentleman idea without journeying inconveniently far from town [...]

English example frankly has been followed in this notable movement to create American country life on a manorial scale.

480 These windows were eventually purchased by Burrell, see Chapter Three; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 373–74.
482 Caviness, Mid-Atlantic, 56–57.
In selling items that are architectonic in nature, Roy’s business was very much connected to mansion-building campaigns initiated by wealthy Americans in the 1920s and 1930s, for which money was often no object. The families of relatively newly wealthy industrialists and financiers created retreats to which they could escape the summertime heat of the cities, commonly modelled on English baronial examples. Such was the strength of this exodus of the wealthy from the cities in the summer months, that Roy only remained in America and opened the New York branch during the peak months of the American art season (from September to the following June or July), returning to London each summer.484

Thomas and Drake carried a stock almost entirely composed of medieval and Renaissance glass stripped from the sorts of English country estates their customers wished to emulate, in contrast to their main competitors, who primarily sold French stained glass, mostly taken from ecclesiastical settings, as discussed in the first chapter. Especially strong in examples of English armorials, and unsurpassed in volume, Roy’s studio was a natural choice for those wishing to create an English-Revival aesthetic, particularly those favouring the so-called ‘Jacobethan’ interiors.485 While some projects strictly adhered to a stylistic period, others were not interested in complete historical accuracy, and presumably used certain panels to create a particular lighting effect or statement. Some would be seemingly unconcerned with the country of origin or iconography, but others probably bought mixes of glass in order to create more antiquarian displays.

Many of the already established quasi-aristocratic American families who flourished in the nineteenth-century Gilded Age, such as the Astors, Roosevelts, Forbes, Lowells or Vanderbilts, did not make purchases from Roy, presumably because their country estates had been furnished in the previous decades, or because they favoured contemporary stained glass. These longer-established families also largely sought to disassociate themselves with

484 Roy employed a Norwegian-born secretary, Alice Olsen (b.1900), from at least mid-1930; MMA, Central Archive, Dealer Correspondence, G. Thomas folder, G4638, Alice Olsen, letter to the MMA’s Secretary, May 31, 1935.
485 This was a term coined by John Betjeman, Ghastly Good Taste: Or, a Depressing Story of the Rise and Fall of English Architecture (London: Chapman and Hall, 1933), 53–56.
newer waves of the super-rich, who were thought to lack pedigree.\textsuperscript{486} \textit{American Vogue} indicated that there was friction between those of old and new moneyed classes, describing attempts by those of new wealth to manufacture status: ‘it is all very well to talk about the vulgarity of the nouveaux riches, but all those who have fortunes can in a short time make for themselves a position in society’.\textsuperscript{487} Others commented that the newly wealthy, ‘tended to invest in articles meant to establish claims to ancestry […] they built houses from the material of ancient European castles and manors’,\textsuperscript{488} and in doing so, literally possessed the outward trappings of history, wealth, and aristocracy. Strictly speaking, these buyers were not collectors of stained glass, but merely people who sought to decorate their homes in a historic idiom. In much the same way, they presumably viewed stained glass along similar lines as Bashford Dean (1867–1928), curator of arms and armour at the MMA, who termed stained glass as a ‘collateral document’,\textsuperscript{489} providing an appropriate and genuine setting for historical displays.\textsuperscript{490} To Roy’s wealthy customers, the purchase of stained glass was presumably also viewed as surety, as an accessory through which, in combination with other objects, their newly built Revival-style mansions could be made authentic.

Although largely employed as furnishing, significant sums were still paid for stained glass by Roy’s American buyers – it was neither cheap, nor easy to accommodate. Stained glass was roughly comparable in price to other architectonic elements, such as pillars and staircases, and fire and door surrounds – ranging from a few hundred to a few thousand dollars.\textsuperscript{491} Generally, it cost significantly more than most items of antique furniture, and other house furnishings. However, relative to paintings, sculpture, and tapestries (normally the highest-

\textsuperscript{487} “As Seen by Him,” \textit{American Vogue}, November 30, 1905, 7–15.
\textsuperscript{488} Stephanie Foote, \textit{The Parvenu’s Plot: Gender, Culture and Class in the Age of Realism} (Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2014), 20.
\textsuperscript{490} Ibid. Dean displayed tapestries depicting figures in military dress alongside his armour. He used the same technique again when he exhibited his armour collections, stating that stained glass and tapestries provided historical visual evidence of ‘how armour looked and was worn’. Depictions of armour in stained glass were of great value to Dean, as this provided a means through which genuine objects could be separated from forgeries; Hayward, \textit{English and French}, 18, 24.
\textsuperscript{491} For example, stone capitals from Saint-Denis (France) were obtained for $1,300 each by Raymond Pitcairn from Demotte Fils; GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 2, “Demotte, Invoice,” January 24, 1923.
priced items on the art market, costing tens of thousands), stained glass was affordable, although costs for its specialist installation and adaption still needed to be added. Yet prices for stained glass could vary greatly, and some key panels and windows ranked amongst the most costly purchases of the time. In 1921, Pitcairn paid $70,000 for an English panel taken from a Jesse Tree window from the Henry Lawrence sale, where astronomical prices were reached; and in 1930, he purchased a French twelfth-century window from the prestigious royal abbey of Saint-Denis depicting the Flight into Egypt at a price of $65,000. Roy was sometimes able to command similarly high figures, such as in the case of an English Apostle’s Creed window that he sold to the Boston Museum of Art (MA) for $94,000, equivalent to almost $1.25 million today (fig. 44).

Vastly wealthy Americans formed the largest of Roy’s customer groups. At least thirty-five American mansions were extensively furnished with Thomas and Drake’s stained glass, mainly during the art and interior-design market’s 1920s heyday. According to annotations in Roy’s stock books, during the 1927–28 art season the second New York stock book was begun, signalling that Wilfred and Roy needed to reinvigorate or replenish their American stock after many panels in the first stock book, begun in 1922–23, had been sold. Many of Wilfred’s stock cards are also annotated, ‘sent to R.G. Thomas N.Y 1927’. Presumably their best pieces had already gone by this date, and so as the years went by, the quality of Thomas and Drake’s stock presumably diminished, as they rarely made new purchases. After the 1929 stock market crash, building projects and art collecting largely ceased, and tastes were already likely moving away from overtly historic modes. With the decline in construction, those orbiting this industry suffered, underlining the fragility of their businesses and heavy reliance on a select few.

**Interior Designers and Period Room Importers**

Traditionally, it had been the role of the architect to oversee the furnishing of a house, but by the twentieth century the interior-design profession had gradually begun to be
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492 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 1, “American Art Association, Invoice,” January 23, 1921.
493 GMA, Dealer Correspondence, box 2, “Demotte Fils Invoice,” January 14, 1930.
494 BMFA, Art of Europe Department, object file for acc. no. 25.213.1-21, “Apostles Creed.”
495 For example, SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, stock cards nos. 1591–96.
established. Sometimes they were called ‘society decorators’, to signify the type of rich clientele that they catered for, or even ‘interior architects’, in an attempt to elevate the profession to the same level of importance as the construction of the building itself.\textsuperscript{496} Interior designers who specialised in the adaption and installation of entire period rooms – who supplied original architectonic European architectural salvage such as panelling, staircases, doorways, and furniture – were at the forefront of the servicing of the mansion building boom.\textsuperscript{497} Thomas and Drake’s stained glass was essentially another salvage of this type. As such, Roy made substantial sales to those connected to the interior-design trade, and was closely aligned with several important British companies operating in the United States.

**Roberson of London**

Transatlantic firm Roberson of London used Thomas and Drake’s stained glass on several of their American house furnishings.\textsuperscript{498} British-born Charles Lockhart Roberson (1878–1957) formed Roberson of London in 1906, first with a studio and workshop at Knightsbridge Halls (west London), where stock could be altered and adapted before being shipped to America.\textsuperscript{499} By 1914, Roberson had also become a partner in Hadsley and Co., auctioneers and estate agents based on Mayfair’s exclusive Grosvenor Square in central London,\textsuperscript{500} which likely gave him prior knowledge of the country estates in the area that were due to be sold.

Detroit-based industrial architect Albert Kahn (1869–1942) designed the home of Toronto-born, but Detroit-based, George Gough Booth (1864–1949), husband of Ellen Scripps Booth (1863–1948).\textsuperscript{501} George’s brother Ralph (b.1873) was said to have been an investor in Roberson’s company, and so it is perhaps not a surprise that in 1923 Ralph’s own house at

\begin{footnotes}
\item[497] Files for interior designers Roberson, Charles of London and Partridge do not survive.
\item[498] While Roberson was a major customer of Roy’s, his firm also selected panels from Wilfred’s London stock. At an unrecorded date or dates, his company bought an English sixteenth-century armorial, a Dutch or Flemish oval, and a Dutch sixteenth- or seventeenth-century, roundel; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 962, 1157, 1470.
\item[499] Harris, *Moving Rooms*, 252.
\item[501] Ellen was the daughter of British-born James Edmund Scripps (1835–1906), founder of *The Detroit News*, and co-founder of the Detroit Museum of Art (established in 1885); “James Scripps,” *Rushville Times*, May 31, 1906, 13. The Booths were themselves longstanding trustees of the Detroit Institute of Arts.
\end{footnotes}
Grosse Pointe (MI) was furnished extensively with Roberson’s stock,\(^{502}\) which incidentally coincided with George’s stained-glass purchases from Roy. In 1904, George Booth purchased land 20 miles north of Detroit, in Bloomfield Hills, where he built the English-style Arts and Crafts mansion Cranbrook House. During the 1920s, the Booths undertook a major improvement campaign at the property, commissioning decorative items from leading contemporary American and European workshops.\(^{503}\) They also incorporated acquisitions of Gothic art, including a series of small sixteenth-century medallions and small panels from Roy; the latter included a Flemish mythological scene, a French head, and some English heraldry (fig. 45).\(^{504}\) While some of these remain *in situ* at Cranbrook and have been included in published surveys of the house,\(^{505}\) Thomas and Drake’s stock cards illustrate other hitherto unrecognised Booth acquisitions from Roy (fig. 46). After 1923, Booth ceased purchasing from Roy, despite continued purchases of stained glass from other sources—including a pair of seventeenth-century Dutch armorials in 1927 from Roberson (fig. 47).\(^{506}\)

Another Grosse Pointe resident, Edsel Ford (1893–1943), president of Ford Motors and major patron of the Detroit Institute of Art, also used both Roberson, Kahn and Roy.\(^{507}\) At least seven rooms were furnished with Roberson’s stock, which included oak panelling, staircases, and a barrel-vaulted ceiling, originally from Boughton Malherbe (Kent).\(^{508}\) In 1927, Ford began building the English Cotswold-style estate Gaulker House.\(^{509}\) In keeping with Kahn’s designs, and Roberson’s furnishings, Roy supplied fifteen panels of fourteenth- to sixteenth-century English ornamental and heraldic stained glass, in June and July 1928;\(^{510}\) and also supplied a couple of French fourteenth-century ornamental panels.\(^{511}\) These were
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\(^{502}\) Harris, *Moving Rooms*, 210–11.


\(^{506}\) The latter was in fact from Grosvenor Thomas’s ex-collection, which he sold to Elizabeth Mills Reid, but when the contents of Ophir Hall were auctioned in 1931, it was purchased by French and Co; Caviness, *Midwestern*, 153–55; Harris, *Moving Rooms*, 209; CAAM, acc. nos. 1927.100–01, 1939.56.

\(^{507}\) Kahn had also designed many of Ford’s car factories.

\(^{508}\) Harris, *Moving Rooms*, 213, 255.


installed in the stairwell, and in the north gallery window, where these panels remain in situ (fig. 48). At the same time as entries for Ford appear in the stock books, his interior designer Roberson emerges in Roy’s records, in October 1928. However the firm cannot have been acting as agents for Ford, despite the timings of the relevant purchases, as none of their acquisitions accord with panels known to have been in Ford’s possession. All were composite quatrefoils, suggesting that they were purchased for a unified scheme, but it is not known where these Dutch and Swiss seventeenth-century panels are now (fig. 49).

Ford revised some of his interiors in the 1940s, a rare example of a stained-glass buyer of Roy’s acquiring items during two separate waves of decorating. At this time, British-born decorator Frank Partridge (1875–1953) had taken over as Ford’s designer, Roberson having gone out of business.

Partridge made purchases of ten English fifteenth- and sixteenth-century armorials from Roy, which were likely used in the redecoration of Ford’s drawing room, and in the alcove window in the gallery, indicating that the Fords were expanding their glazing programmes (fig. 50). Partridge purchased a further twenty-nine panels from Roy in 1923, 1925, 1927, 1929 and 1940 respectively, from Dutch seventeenth-century ovals, to English eighteenth-century panels, to composite lanterns made from sixteenth-century Flemish panels, and fifteenth-century English armorials, for other now unknown clients.

Other Roberson and Roy collaborations were the interiors created for German-born banker Walter Tower Rosen (1875–1951), husband of musician Lucie Bigelow Dodge (1890–1968).

---

513 By at least 1933, Roberson of London was declared bankrupt, and their stock taken over by London art dealer Crowther’s; Harris, Moving Rooms, 253.
515 This panel was first sold by Roy to Vernon Mann in 1923. When Mann sold it at auction in 1932, it was reacquired by Roy, who then resold it to Partridge in 1940; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 130–31, M.34; Detroit, Benson Ford Research Center, Edsel Ford Papers 1903–45, boxes 136, 155, accession 6, “Decorating Plans for Grosse Pointe,” 1920–40.
Lucy’s uncle, William Bigelow (b.1855), was an architect at McKim, Mead and White, and her aunt Annie Bigelow McKim (b.1850) was briefly married to founding partner Charles McKim (1847–1909).\textsuperscript{517} In 1927, the Rosens bought a mixed selection of glass from Roy, either for their Manhattan townhouse neighbouring John Rockefeller Jr.’s on West 54\textsuperscript{th} Street, or in anticipation of the building of their Italianate country residence Caramoor (NY), which was begun in 1929. Roberson was employed as their interior designer.\textsuperscript{518} The Rosens made further acquisitions from Roy in 1929, acquiring twenty-three seventeenth-century Dutch secular panels, some German and Dutch eighteenth-century panels, sixteenth-century Flemish roundels, and English fifteenth-century armorials, illustrated in the American Corpus Vitrearum checklists (fig. 51).\textsuperscript{519} Architectural fittings supplied by Roberson were equally eclectic, including eighteenth-century Corinthian pilasters, and door surrounds taken from Spettisbury House (Dorset), all mixing with French, Spanish and Italian fittings, such as a coffered ceiling imported from a palazzo in Lecce.\textsuperscript{520}

Roberson was also involved in the decoration of the Long Island mansion, designed by architects Walker and Gillette, belonging to coffee-broker Jacob Aron (1872–1964). Amongst other things, Roberson supplied Aron with an Elizabethan dining room originally from Hamptworth House (Wiltshire).\textsuperscript{521} In May 1928, entries in Roy’s books show that the Arons envisaged incorporating stained glass at their house. Records show that fourteen panels of Swiss and English heraldic glass, ranging from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries, had been sold to ‘Mrs Aaron’,\textsuperscript{522} Hortense Israel Aron (1879–1944). For whatever reason, she changed her mind, and Roy’s annotations reveal that all of these panels were returned. Roy was only able subsequently to resell a handful of these, suggesting they may have been of

\textsuperscript{517} Charles Moore, The Life and Times of Charles Follen McKim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1929), 204–41.
\textsuperscript{518} Several of the period rooms from their city residence were transferred to Caramoor; Harris, Moving Rooms, 237.
\textsuperscript{520} Harris, Moving Rooms, 216–17.
poor quality or condition; some were even later listed as ‘missing’ and charged to Roy’s profit and loss account.523

Working in collaboration with French and Co., Roberson also furnished the Georgian-style country estate Sunken Orchard on Long Island belonging to Helena Woolworth McCann (1878–1938).524 From 1927, it was substantially altered by New York architect James O’Connor (1876–1972) with salvage from Stanwick Park (North Yorkshire).525 Contemporary pictures show that the bay window of her oak-vaulted music room contained at least twelve medallions set in the upper lights (fig. 52).526 This was part of a consignment of thirty French, Swiss, Flemish, English, and Dutch armorials, ranging in date from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, which McCann had selected from Roy.527 Surviving stock cards illustrate almost all of her collection of stained glass for the first time (fig. 53). Annotations record that $2,000, equivalent to $27,300 today, was paid for one Flemish Angel, underlining her substantial investment in the glazing.528 It is possible that further panels were installed at her French-Gothic-style Manhattan townhouse, on 80th Street (New York), and some may even have been transferred to her Arts and Crafts country retreat Beauport in Gloucester (MA), former home of American interior designer Henry Sleeper (1878–1934), which she obtained in the 1930s.529

Other Interior Designers

Other British-born interior designers purchasing from Roy’s American branch include Arthur Todhunter (1887–1959). From 1925, Todhunter had begun redeveloping a New York

523 Ibid.
525 Harris, Moving Rooms, 215. O’Connor later made a single purchase of stained glass directly from Roy in 1939, but it is not known where this panel is now.
529 Nancy Curtis, Beauport: The Sleeper-McCann House (Boston: Godine, 1990), 11–16.
brownstone building at 119 East 57th Street, in the art dealers’ district in midtown Manhattan. Presumably to make his gallery more eye-catching to prospective customers, he converted the façade of the building to an English medieval style, complete with leaded windows and carved English sixteenth-century beams (fig. 54). Acquisitions of Roy’s stained glass came in two waves, in November 1927, and July 1929, comprising a series of mixed European panels, including sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Swiss, Dutch and English secular medallions, and Flemish and English armorials.530 Due to the survival of some of Roy’s stock cards, some of these panels are for the first time again able to be seen (fig. 55). Much later, in 1942, Roy actually moved Thomas and Drake’s studio into this building, becoming one of Todhunter’s tenants, along with several other dealers (mentioned below).531

One of the only two interior decorators Roy supplied, who was not British by birth, was Syrian Edmond Ballora (1888–1965), owner of Decoration Artistique, 516 Fifth Avenue (New York), neighbouring both Roy and Charles’s premises. In 1925, he purchased a Swiss sixteenth-century Madonna, in addition to a selection of Flemish sixteenth-century medallions and armorials.532 It is not known for whom Ballora procured these panels, as records of this firm no longer exist. However, some of Ballora’s known customers included Della Forker Chrysler (d.1938), wife of automobile executive Walter Chrysler (1875–1940), of Forker House (New York), and Hannah Bensel Nichols (d.1929),533 wife of chemist and businessman William Henry Nichols (1852–1930), of 290 Park Avenue (New York) and Fishers Island (NY).534

Minnesota-born Alphonso Vale Barto (1887–1967) was the only other non-British interior decorator, based at 250 Park Avenue (New York), and former representative for the American decorators and period-room importers French and Co. in Minneapolis (MN).535 He


531 The stock books show that Roy had given an English fifteenth-century ‘head of a Madonna’ to ‘Mrs Jackson Higgs’, that is, Harriet Delancey Higgs (b.1885), wife of British-born interior designer and English period room importer Percy Jackson Higgs (1886–1964); SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 94–95, no. 1020.


533 “Mrs Nichols Dies,” Brooklyn Daily Eagle, June 20, 1929, 1.


535 Earl Hostetter, Sigma Chi Fraternity Manual and Directory (Chicago: Sigma Chi Press, 1912), 188.
later formed his own interior-design business, trading as Robertson, Waring and Barto. From Roy he purchased six seventeenth-century Flemish and French panels in December 1936, although it is uncertain for whom he was working. Paul Emmanuel Watkins (1864–1931) of Winona (MN) marked the only other significant sale in that area, but his purchases came much earlier. Watkins’s Tudor-style home was designed in 1924 by Boston-based architect Ralph Adams Cram (1863–1942), who had previously worked for one of Grosvenor’s customers, Raymond Pitcairn. While favouring armorial glass, Watkins purchased a very mixed consignment, including fifteenth-century French full-length figural panels, French sixteenth-century shields, English shields ranging from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, Dutch sixteenth-century medallions, seventeenth-century Flemish shields, and sixteenth-century Spanish shields. Stock cards exist for a handful of these panels, and show stained glass in Watkins’s collection that was not published in the checklist survey of his home, and have presumably since been lost (fig. 56). Those pictured on Roy’s stock cards, which represent only a fraction of Watkins’s purchases from Roy, may have been placed in storage or damaged. Roy’s annotations document that $1,500 was paid by Watkins for two of these panels. An enamel-painted medallion, selected from Wilfred’s London stock, was also purchased by Watkins, as well as four bird quarries, and two eighteenth-century angel roundels (fig. 57). His stained glass was reportedly installed in the staircase, landing, ladies’ washroom, great hall, breakfast room, parlour, dining room, and in both Watkins’s and his daughter’s suites.

536 NARA, 1930 New York State Census, “Alphonso Barto.”
538 The only other known sale Roy had made in the area was to the Minneapolis Institute of Art (Minnesota), which purchased two English sixteenth-century heraldic panels in 1923, “Acquisitions,” Bulletin of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts (December 1923): 5–6; Caviness, Midwestern, 187; MIA, acc. nos. 23.52.1–2.
539 Photographs dated 1928 show some of this stained glass in situ; Dennis Gardner, Minnesota Treasures: Stories behind the State’s Historic Places (Saint Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 2004), 200.
541 Caviness, Midwestern, 189–94.
542 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 33, nos. 619, 664.
543 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, no. 870.
544 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 416, 867, Cas[sisbury].89–90.
545 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 1477–78, Cas[sisbury].100.
546 Caviness, Midwestern, 191.
Charles of London, and the Standard Oil Heirs

As demonstrated in Chapter One, British interior designer Charles Duveen (1871–1940) had been one of the Thomases most longstanding collaborators. It can be safely assumed that Charles knew Roy and his collection well. Although ‘Charles of London’ only appears once in Roy’s stock books, purchasing a Swiss heraldic oval in 1929, many other sales likely have Charles as their source. Several of both Roy’s and Charles’s customers were members of families associated with the multi-national oil-refining and distributing company Standard Oil, which was a link also seen in Grosvenor’s sales associated with the Charles gallery exhibitions in the 1910s. Many of these families were members of dynasties that controlled several industrial sectors, such as oil, copper, coal, and the railroads, and so had presumably been linked as executives and shareholders in multiple companies, not just Standard Oil, although most gained the bulk of their wealth from their oil securities.

Standard Oil heiress Mai Huttleson Rogers Coe (1875–1924), wife of British-born railroad executive William Robertson Coe (1869–1955), employed Charles to furnish her home, Coe Hall (NY), begun in 1913, but rebuilt from 1918 by New York architectural firm Walker and Gillette, who also went on to design Aron’s mansion (see further above) (figs 58–59). Under Mai’s directive, several bulk consignments of stained glass were bought from Roy in 1923 and 1924. Amongst her selections were fifteen English armorials of sixteenth-century date, roughly contemporary with the models for her Elizabethan-style home (figs 60–61).

Annotations on surviving stock cards reveal that at least nine of these armorials were priced at $2,500 each, totalling $22,500 (equivalent to over $310,000 today).

547 In 1926, Roberson and Charles briefly considered forming a partnership; Harris, *Moving Rooms*, 255.
553 Coe Hall is now known as Planting Fields.
555 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 53, nos. 650–58.
century English borders were sold for $600, the equivalent to just over $8,100 today. After Mai’s premature death in December 1924, her husband ceased funding the purchase of stained glass, underlining her fundamental role in its acquisition.

Another member of this set was New Yorker Helen Sherman Pratt (1869–1923), and her husband, George Dupont Pratt (1869–1935), son of former Standard Oil director Charles Pratt (1830–1891). George’s brother Herbert Pratt (1871–1945) had previously bought period rooms from Charles, and both Herbert and George had acquired stained glass from Grosvenor’s New York exhibitions hosted by Charles, as discussed in the previous chapter. Complementing their predominantly heraldic acquisitions from Grosvenor, in 1923 George and Helen Pratt obtained a group of English panels from Roy, including a fifteenth-century Mater Dolorosa, two armorials, and four panels from a Jesse Tree window, for their Long Island mansion Killenworth (fig. 62). Roy’s surviving records also make vague reference in 1934 to ‘work done for Mrs Ladd’. Newspaper reports confirm that this relates to Mary Andrews Ladd (1860–1941), wife of banker William Mead Ladd (1855–1931) of Portland (OR), and East 73rd Street New York. William’s sister Caroline (1861–1946) had married Standard Oil partner Frederick Pratt (1845–1945), of Poplar Hill (NY), making George and Herbert Pratt her brothers-in-law. The Ladds sourced all of their art acquisitions in America, having never travelled to Europe themselves, thus making them especially reliant on art dealers. In the 1910s or 1920s, Mary had made acquisitions of ‘three small panels’ of ex-Salisbury Cathedral stained glass from Grosvenor, likely from his 1913 New York exhibition hosted by Charles. In November 1932, Wilfred Drake had returned a collection of 670 fragments of thirteenth-

\[557\] Barter, “Rotherwas,” 1–8; Harris, Moving Rooms, 196–97.
\[558\] SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book 1, 54–57, 110–11, nos. 725, 732a–b, 1189. It is likely that Pratt, a trustee of the MMA, purchased stained glass under the heavy influence of arms and armour curator Bashford Dean, with the intention that the museum would inherit the panels upon his death; Caviness, New England, 16; Hayward, English and French, 160.
\[559\] SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book 1, 300.
fourteenth-century grisaille to Salisbury Cathedral. By November 1935, Mary followed suit, and gave her panels back to the cathedral; Roy’s vague reference perhaps signalled his involvement in arranging the removal and transportation of these panels back to England.

In November 1940, eight Dutch seventeenth-century panels from Roy were sold to ‘Mrs Kelley’, presumably Mary Tremblay Kelley (d.1955), wife of Cornelius Kelley (1875–1957), president of the Anaconda Copper Mine Corporation (MT), a company with close ties to some of Standard Oil’s senior partners. Her acquisitions were arranged and adapted by Wilfred in London, when in July 1939, Roy began discussing their arrangement with Wilfred: ‘I enclose a sketch of the Kelley window to show how it is divided by mullions, that could be removed if necessary, but it would simplify matters if we could work around them’. For many years, the Kelleys had lived in Butte (MT), before obtaining a townhouse at 907 Fifth Avenue (New York), and a French-style retreat ‘Sunny Skies’ in Manhasset (NY) near the Whitney’s, who had also purchased stained glass from Grosvenor, and Thomas and Drake.

A sixth of Roy’s total sales went to supplying one large glazing scheme, a project supervised by Charles, that of the glazing of Ronaele Manor in Elkins Park (Philadelphia, PA). Their customer, Eleanor Widener Dixon (1891–1953) was, at this time, the wife of Philadelphia banker and sportsman Fitz Eugene Dixon (1888–1982). Her family, including her grandfather Peter Arrell Brown Widener (1834–1915), had been substantial shareholders in Standard Oil. From 1923, the Dixons built Elizabethan-style Ronaele Manor according to the designs of local architect Horace Trumbauer (1868–1938), who in 1897 had also built her

---

565 GMRC, New York and Drury Folder, Roy Thomas, letter to Wilfred Drake, July 21, 1939.
566 All of their children were born in Montana across a twelve-year period; NARA, 1910 Montana Federal State Census, “Cornelius Kelley.”
567 Sunny Skies was described briefly when their daughter’s wedding was held there in June 1938; “Miss Kelley Bride Today,” New York Evening Post, June 10, 1938, 22.
568 They had divorced by 1936, as reported later; “Two Receive Elkin’s Shares,” New York Times, August 11, 1937, 2.
grandfather’s nearby mansion Lynnewood Hall. From 1924 until 1928, Eleanor supervised the furnishing of Ronaele, employing Charles of London as her decorator. The windows of the mansion were glazed with over seventy-five panels and windows, almost all English armorials, selected only from Thomas and Drake. Eleanor entirely cleared Roy’s remaining glass from Wroxton Abbey (Oxfordshire), as well as taking substantially from their Cassiobury (Hertfordshire), Belhus (Essex), Ashridge (Hertfordshire), Costessey (Norfolk) and Dagnam (Hertfordshire) collections. These were bought in bulk instamments every few months, presumably as the building work progressed. At least one of these panels was stored with New York interior designers French and Co., who were perhaps working in collaboration with Charles of London. French and Co. had imported several period rooms, as well as medieval oak doors, staircases, and panelling for the Dixons. Roy’s contract as sole supplier of their stained glass was a major, and presumably very lucrative, undertaking. The stock cards for three sixteenth-century English armorials reveal that $1,500 was paid for just one English armorial, and $1,200 for another. A figure of $1,000 was paid for a single circular royal armorial. If these prices are indicative of the whole of the Dixons’ purchases, the total cost could easily have exceeded $100,000, as a very conservative estimate, a figure equivalent to roughly $1.5 million today. Coinciding with her last purchases from Roy, by 1927 a catalogue of Ronaele Manor’s stained glass had been published in London by the English writer and stained-glass draughtsman Frederick Sydney Eden (1859–1950) (fig. 63). Its introduction paid tribute to Thomas and Drake’s role: ‘to the expert knowledge, artistic discrimination, and zeal displayed by Mr Roy Grosvenor Thomas and Mr Wilfred Drake is primarily due the credit for assembling this remarkable collection of gems of ancient art now set up in the windows’. The Dixons did not commission catalogues for any other aspects

572 These were in 1924 (15 and 30 January, as well as in April, May, June 12, November 8); 1925 (January, March 31, December 10); and 1928 (May 7). There was a two-year gap in their stained glass purchases, with none being recorded in 1926 and 1927, as recorded in the stock books.
573 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 53, no. Cas[siobury].12
575 Eden, Ronaele Manor, vi.
of their extensive art collection, indicating that they viewed the stained glass as exceptional, and not simply as an accessory to their decorative scheme.\textsuperscript{576}

Roy’s records also document sales to Italian-born, Philadelphia-based glass-painter Nicola D’Ascenzo (1871–1954), former student of the Pennsylvania Museum’s School of Industrial Art.\textsuperscript{577} Alongside the running of his own workshop,\textsuperscript{578} from at least 1921 he was stained-glass advisor to the Pennsylvania Museum (renamed the Philadelphia Museum of Art in 1938).\textsuperscript{579} In 1927, he had previously glazed the Tudor-style home Park Gate in Germantown (Philadelphia), belonging to Frances Plumer McIlhenny (1869–1943),\textsuperscript{580} with Flemish sixteenth-century donor panels and seventeenth-century Dutch ovals from Roy’s stock.\textsuperscript{581} Widow of the museum’s former president, industrialist John Dexter McIlhenny (1865–1925),\textsuperscript{582} by 1929 at the latest Frances had been appointed as a trustee, and also sat on the museum’s ‘Associate Committee of Women’, alongside Eleanor Widener Dixon.\textsuperscript{583}

\textsuperscript{576} The only other catalogue, authored by Fitz Eugene Dixon, reflected their love of botany; 
\textit{Catalogue of the Orchid Plants in the Collection of Mr and Mrs Fitz Eugene Dixon at Ronaele Manor, Elkins Park} (New York: privately printed, 1926).


\textsuperscript{579} “Pennsylvania Museum Board,” \textit{Bulletin of the Pennsylvania Museum}, 17, no. 69 (October 1921): 32.


\textsuperscript{581} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 118–19, 250–51, 286–87, nos. Cas[sibury].51, 1455–56, Cos[tessy].118. The price for one of these Flemish panels, depicting \textit{Mary and Joseph at the Inn}, was recorded as $2,500; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 33, no. 382. A series of Swiss panels was repurchased by Roy from Frances, and credit allowed on her account; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 292–93, M[iscellaneous].33. She had also purchased (from another art dealer) sixteenth-century German stained glass, originally from the internationally significant Steinfeld Abbey. Several of these panels are now at Harvard University’s Busch-Reisinger Museum (MA); Busch-Reisinger, acc. nos. 1951.250–53; Caviness, \textit{New England}, 48.


Despite the Pennsylvania museum’s having purchased important panels of fourteenth-century French glass from Grosvenor Thomas in 1919, originally from the Cathedral of Notre-Dame in Évron and depicting St Nicolas, they did not obtain its counterparts, which were purchased instead by Pitcairn in 1916 and 1923. Roy had attempted to stimulate interest in his collection with the Pennsylvania Museum in 1924, when he donated a Dutch seventeenth-century donor panel, but it did nothing to reinvigorate sales. However, by 1930 curators at the museum were preparing for the opening of their new site at Fairmount Hill, to designs by Trumbauer, the architect also responsible for Ronaele Manor. With an expanded display scope that included the decorative arts, and art of the Middle Ages, the new buildings incorporated a reassembled Gothic cloister and chapel. In January 1926, Roy had also supplied the Toledo Museum of Art with a French fourteenth-century window depicting the Virgin and Child for $2,000, along with an ex-Costensey Crucifixion window. They had also added a Gothic hall and cloister to their displays, as had other museums at this time. After protracted negotiations across an eighteen-month period, in 1930 the Pennsylvania Museum bought a French sixteenth-century three-light window depicting scenes from the life of St John the Baptist from Roy.

Francis Henry Taylor (1903–1957), curator of medieval art at this time (1928–1931), oversaw these purchases. However, as the chapel’s stonework was not original to the window, this sixteenth-century French glass had to be made to fit into the fifteenth-century Burgundian almoner’s chapel that was to house it. The Philadelphia museum’s bulletin reported: ‘the

585 Illustrated in Thomas, Origin and Application, 4–5; Hayward, Radiance and Reflection, 240–42.
587 Burnham, Philadelphia, 40–42.
upper lights of the Rouen window are being executed by Wilfred Drake of London, who has been able to secure other fragments of the Rouen glass from Costessey to fill the portions which are missing’. Some of these near contemporary insertions included a small figural panel, and an angel carrying a cross, part of Wilfred’s London stock that he sold directly to the museum. Both of these now occupy the quatrefoil tracery of the French window, but Wilfred’s stock cards show that these panels were rectangular and oval before his alterations (figs 64–65).

The main lights were not changed by Wilfred in London, and had presumably been in America from some time after 1927, as they appear in the second New York stock book that began in that year. Thomas and Drake had acquired these panels sometime after 1926, when they were last pictured in situ at Rouen Cathedral. By January 1929, Roy had offered them to the MMA for $15,000 (equivalent to around $206,000 today). By August 1929, Wilfred and Roy, both in London, confirmed that designs incorporating these panels, enlarged with Dutch panels and quarry surrounds, had been drawn up for the Philadelphia Museum. D’Ascenzo created the composite lower lights, after the museum had rejected the two prior solutions forwarded by Thomas and Drake (fig. 66). The museum’s records detail that fragments ‘valued at $500’ were given by Roy to form the extra panels needed in order to completely fill the window opening. To this end, fragments of quarries of different dates and styles leaded together, consisting largely of English fourteenth- and fifteenth-century pieces, listed as ‘educational panels’ in Roy’s stock books, according to Roy’s annotations were transferred to D’Ascenzo’s workshop on March 12, 1931, and given to the museum on 5 October 1931.

---

593 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 396, 946. Burnham did not refer, and presumably did not have access to, these stock cards, which show the appearance of the panels before their installation at the museum. They are reproduced here for the first time.
594 Many stock cards are annotated ‘sent to RGT, NY, 1927’, suggesting a great number of panels were transferred over in that year, and the earliest sales in the second stock book date from 1927; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book II, 30–31, 1775–77 (a–b).
595 Georges Ritter, Les Vitraux de la Cathédrale de Rouen (Cognac: Charente, 1926), pl. xcvi; Burnham, Philadelphia, 112.
596 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 29.55.1-2, James Rorimer, letter to Joseph Breck, January 18, 1929.
598 Burnham, Philadelphia, 42–44.
599 PMA, Registrars Card Index, acc. no. 1931-1; Burnham, Philadelphia, 110.
Sales of three English fifteenth-century kneeling angels, and a French fifteenth-century religious panel depicting the Holy Ghost, can also be associated with D’Ascenzo’s creation of these composite lower panels.

Collaborations with Museums

Aldus Higgins, and the Worcester Art Museum

Taylor, the Pennsylvania Museum’s curator, may also have had a hand in nurturing other stained-glass sales, including those to the most long-standing of Roy's American clients, steel manufacturer Aldus Chapin Higgins (1872–1948), who was based in Worcester (MA). For many years after the construction of his Tudor-style Worcester mansion, begun in 1921 by McKim, Mead and White trained architect Grosvenor Atterbury (1869–1956), Higgins was uninterested in acquiring stained glass. However, Atterbury had made provision for monumental glazing; the great hall alone had an enormous three-storey arched bay window measuring 36 ft by 22 ft (fig. 67). Surviving contemporary photographs show that eventually the great hall, porch, sun room, and boudoir were all glazed with varying amounts of stained glass. In the 1930s, Higgins had travelled through Europe with Taylor, who in 1931–39 had transferred from the Pennsylvania Museum and now was director of the Worcester Museum, where Higgins had been a trustee since 1928, becoming president from 1946. Taylor’s tenure in Worcester coincided exactly with Higgins’s purchases of panels from

---

601 “Front Matter,” Bulletin of the Pennsylvania Museum, 26, no. 140 (March 1931): 1; “Accessions and Loans Received,” Bulletin of the Pennsylvania Museum, 26, no. 142, pt 1 (May 1931): 17–19; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 44–45, 90–91, nos. 583, 587, 1000; stock book II, 10–11, 26–27, nos. 1624, 1743–46; box 53, stock cards nos. 583, 587, 1624, 1743, 1746, 1876. Other educational panels were donated to Yale University (CT). Further composite educational panels were given to the Toronto Museum in December 1933, suggesting that these were viewed as appropriate gifts for museums; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 53, stock cards nos. 586; stock book II, 80–81, no. 2050.

602 His brother John Woodman Higgins (1874–1961) was an arms and armour collector. He founded the Higgins Armory Museum in Worcester in 1931, which contained some stained glass. This included a series of knights and soldiers executed in 1930 by the Munich (Germany) firm of Franz Xavier Zettler, and a full-length sixteenth-century Flemish figure of St Adrien of Nicomedia, patron saint of arms dealers and soldiers, originally from Stoke Poges Manor (Buckinghamshire); Caviness, New England, 79.


604 Worcester Polytechnic Institute (MA), Higgins Family Papers, Papers of Aldus Higgins, MS.63.02, box 9, folders 6–9, 1930–40, “Higgins House Interior Photographs, Stained Glass Windows.”
Roy (also from 1931 to 1939), suggesting that Taylor may have cultivated Higgins’s taste in the medium.605

Higgins began his purchases from Roy in 1931, acquiring two English seventeenth-century armorials for $1,200 (the equivalent of around $17,500 today).606 Other English panels followed in the succeeding months, including a twelfth-century ‘full-length figure’, a ‘thirteenth-century quatrefoil’, a fifteenth-century figure of St John the Evangelist, in addition to a selection of over fifteen English armorials of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century date.607 The latter were originally taken from Hassop Hall (Derbyshire), and sold to Higgins for $13,000 (the equivalent today of around $190,000).608 A rudimentary sketch of Higgins’s great hall window, where these panels were installed, accompanied this series of stock cards (fig. 68). At the same time, Roy donated a Flemish sixteenth-century wooden panel depicting Christ on the Cross to the Worcester Museum of Art.609

In 1932, the Worcester museum purchased a composite window, made up of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century English glass, as well as three Flemish angels.610 Later, in 1934 and 1935, when Higgins was recorded as the only purchaser from Roy during the deepening recession, he obtained the companion panels for his own house, along with eleven more English armorials, and a fifteenth-century English ‘saint panel’.611 Higgins also purchased a thirteenth-century German panel, and a fourteenth-century roundel depicting Potiphar and his Wife, which had previously been on offer to the MMA in January 1929 for $4,000, a figure

608 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 53, stock cards nos. 1868–75.
approaching $55,000 today. The authenticity of this panel has since been questioned, as the central section contains significant amounts of nineteenth-century stained glass, a rare example of Thomas and Drake having passed on a potential forgery (fig. 69). A full-length Prophet, thought to have originally come from Soissons Cathedral, which Higgins donated to the Worcester Art Museum in 1937, also came to them through Roy’s agency, transferred from Thomas and Drake’s London stock. Its counterpart had been sold to the V&A by Wilfred (see Chapter Three). Other panels brought over from London for Higgins include a panel composed of miscellaneous foliate fragments in August 1934, and English fragments of fifteenth-century date in the December, probably obtained in order for his glaziers to enlarge and repair panels for installation.

By 1938, Higgins’s purchases were even more wide-ranging, including a thirteenth-century Spanish figure panel, and a fourteenth-century French grisaille, perhaps indicating that different rooms were now being decorated, or that he was looking to donate a comprehensive assortment of panels to the museum. Roy and Higgins were part of a select group of 250 guests who attended the opening of The Cloisters in 1938, both recorded as the special guests of its then curator of medieval art James Rorimer (1905–1966). A year later, in May 1939, Higgins made his final purchases from Roy, coinciding with Taylor’s move to New York following his promotion to director of the MMA. He perhaps selected from Roy’s

---


613 A visit to the Worcester Art Museum in April 2016 by members of the American CVMA was reported in the museum’s blog; Katherine Werwie, “Research Sheds New Light on the WAM’s Stained Glass,” May 2016, http://wamupdates.worcesterart.org/2016/06/research-sheds-new-light-on-wams.html (accessed August 2016).


615 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock card no. 1631.

616 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock card no. 709.


only known American exhibition after Grosvenor’s death, held in Springfield (MA), which may have been an attempt by Roy to appeal directly to other wealthy buyers in the Worcester area. Higgins purchased modestly, obtaining a stained-glass lantern of Dutch and English seventeenth-century panels. In all probability, Higgins had now filled all the windows at his home that he wanted to be glazed with stained glass, after purchasing a total of thirty-eight panels and windows from Roy. At the same time, Roy’s New York studio was placing panels in steel frames for Higgins, indicating that Roy had a hand in some of the less complex aspects of preparing panels for installation.

**John Rockefeller Jr., and the Metropolitan Museum of Art**

Perhaps one of the most renowned of the Standard Oil set was John Davison Rockefeller Jr. (1874–1960), whose fortune was estimated at hundreds of billions of dollars, and commonly regarded as the richest man to have ever lived. Despite the Great Depression of 1929, and financial downturn of the 1930s, like Higgins, Rockefeller stood out as part of a minority of still-active American buyers of stained glass during the recession, largely because his own immense personal wealth remained relatively unburdened by the wider financial volatility. Rockefeller never used Roy’s stained glass in his own residences, but instead underwrote its acquisition for museums and churches, suggesting that he viewed the medium as more appropriate for public and ecclesiastical consumption. Although Rockefeller has usually been viewed as a somewhat detached figure whose job was to sign cheques, his interactions with Roy reveal him as having been personally engaged in the selection of the glazing for The Cloisters, and other projects. By Rockefeller’s own admission, Roy was someone he knew

---

619 Grosvenor was considered to have been a better showman than the shyer Roy, according to the reminiscences of his friend William Cole; information shared by Madeline Caviness and Marilyn Beaven.
622 “We are having a devil of a job fitting the conquerors into some steel frames for the Higgins windows. An electric grinding wheel makes the place sound like a machine shop […];” GMRC, Goelet and Hearst box, Roy Thomas, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 23, 1939.
well, with whom he had ‘done business for some years’, beginning in 1922 with the Rockefeller-funded glazing of Park Avenue Baptist Church (New York) (see Chapter One).

In 1925, Rockefeller had financed the purchase of land and buildings in upper Manhattan from artist and art dealer George Grey Bernard (1863–1938), which he donated to the MMA; the site formed the basis of their new branch dedicated to medieval art, The Cloisters. Rockefeller’s ‘Gothic Fund’ was established specifically for the use of the museum’s curators, in order to make acquisitions to furnish the building. This fund had to cover an array of medieval art, and frequently other under-represented media had to take priority, but this did not prevent Rockefeller from selecting and buying panels on his own account from Roy, and sending them directly to the museum. Since Grosvenor’s early sales to the museum in the 1910s and early 1920s, the museum had been absent from Roy’s records, but this changed after Rockefeller’s involvement in the scheme for The Cloisters. With this new site to furnish, the museum purchased in 1929 two panels of fourteenth-century German stained glass representing Christ Giving the Keys to St Peter, acquired for $4,500 (equivalent to around $62,000 today) (fig. 70). These were inspected at Roy’s studio in January 1929 by James Rorimer, and recorded in a report to then curator of medieval art (1917–1932) Joseph Breck (1885–1933). At the same time, the museum also considered a French fifteenth-century window depicting the Life of St John the Baptist, as we have seen, which was instead purchased by the Pennsylvania Museum.

624 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 32.24.1-69, John Rockefeller, letter to Robert De Forest, February 28, 1930.
626 Husband, Creating the Cloisters, 43.
628 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 29.55.1-2, James Rorimer, letter to Joseph Breck, January 18, 1929; MMA, Central Archive, Dealer Correspondence, G. Thomas folder, G4539, invoice, February 9, 1929; MMA, Central Archive, Dealer Correspondence, G. Thomas folder, G4539, Roy Thomas, letter to Joseph Breck, January 2, 1929, also Joseph Breck, letter to Roy Thomas, March 19, 1929, Central Archive, folder G4539.
629 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 29.55.1-2, James Rorimer, letter to Joseph Breck, January 18, 1929.
By October 1930, Rockefeller made his first gift of stained glass to the museum, a series of four fifteenth-century Austrian windows depicting male saints. Initially the museum had agreed to purchase the entire set, part of a group of seven offered by Roy, but in learning that Rockefeller was interested in them, they returned the windows to allow Rockefeller to select and pay for those he favoured (fig. 71). Rockefeller paid $8,500 for the four (equivalent to around $116,000 today). In order to keep Rockefeller’s donation private, Roy was directed to send Rockefeller’s invoice to the museum, who would in turn forward it for settlement. Rockefeller had requested that these purchases be excluded from the museum’s customary new acquisitions exhibition, and also prohibited their mention in the museum’s Bulletin: ‘to avoid publicity, which would call attention to the fact that Mr Rockefeller is making purchases’.

Concurrently, a large collection of Thomas and Drake’s English, French, Dutch and Flemish roundels, ranging from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries had attracted Rockefeller’s attention. They had not yet been shipped from Wilfred’s London workshop, where some are visible in photographs of his studio, but Roy had compiled an album of photographs in order to show them to prospective American buyers. Remarkably, on Roy’s urging, Rockefeller personally wrote to the museum in February 1930 concerning these roundels, underlining that Roy had close access to one of the most powerful men in the country, if not the world:

---

631 MMA, Central Archive, Dealer Correspondence, G. Thomas folder, G4638, “Offer of purchase of seven panels,” October 1930; Hayward, English and French, 42.
634 MMA, Cloisters’ Archive, Joseph Breck Records 1916–51, Joseph Breck, letter to Mr Kent, December 17, 1930.
636 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 45.
637 This album is now deposited in New York: MMA, Watson Library, no. 154, AN2, “Ancient Stained Glass: A Collection of Roundels.”
I saw at Mr Thomas’s studio the other day photographs of the collection [...] and he asked me to write to you about it. I am wondering whether you would care to have someone from the museum visit Mr Thomas [...] I have thought that in the large hall there planned [at The Cloisters], old stained glass, if possible, would be beautiful [...] If you decide to send someone to see Mr Thomas, he could take with him this letter as introduction.638

By the end of 1930, Roy’s negotiations with the curators for this series had begun. One hundred roundels were offered at a price of $15,000,639 reduced to $13,000.640 Rockefeller’s and the MMA’s systematic acquisition of such a large group of northern European roundels was a rarity amongst American buyers,641 and even in Europe, this type of glazing held minimal interest amongst major buyers, as underlined by Burrell’s distaste for examples of this kind (discussed in Chapter Three). In line with Rockefeller’s suggestions for their placement, the curators proposed that if they purchased the panels, seven roundels could be leaded into each of the loggia windows.642 However, they ultimately declined their purchase, arguing that they already possessed similar pieces that could be used to create a similar exhibit of ‘documents of the period’, such as those they had relatively recently inherited from Bashford Dean.643 Despite the museum’s apathy, just over a year later Rockefeller, perhaps guided by Roy or the museum, selected and purchased sixty-nine of the roundels, omitting thirty-one later ones.644 The deal was completed in January 1932, two years after Roy had first introduced Rockefeller to this collection, and as Rockefeller had first

638 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 32.24.1-69, John Rockefeller, letter to Robert De Forest, February 28, 1930.
639 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 32.24.1-69, Roy Thomas, letter to John Rockefeller, February 29, 1930.
640 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 32.24.1-69, James Rorimer, letter to Joseph Breck, December 30, 1930.
641 Husband, Roundels, 27.
642 After Rockefeller arranged for their purchase in 1932, the glass was installed in this location, albeit averaging nine panels to a window instead of seven; the window openings were enlarged to take more glass.
643 ‘Mr Thomas has sent us the two albums that you saw, and Mr Breck and I have studied them carefully [...] Mr Breck has drawn up a report which I enclose [...] for the reasons there given I do not favour recommending their purchase, but thanking you nonetheless in drawing our attention to the opportunity’; MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 32.24.1-69, Edward Robinson, letter to John Rockefeller, December 30, 1930.
suggested, they were fitted into the loggia (fig. 72).  

Rorimer relayed Rockefeller’s warning that Roy must ‘keep this transaction confidential’, as was the case with all of Rockefeller’s personal acquisitions.

Rockefeller was also now looking to the decoration of Riverside Church (New York). As at Park Avenue Church, and The Cloisters, the same team of professionals was used—Charles Collens (1873–1956) as architect, Robert Eidlitz (1864–1935) as building contractor, and Roy for the glazing. Alongside major public works, such as the building of the New York Stock exchange, the Eidlitz firm had also built several grand townhouses, such as those of the Goelets, Morgans, Fricks, and Rockefellers. In April 1929 and February 1930, entries for Rockefeller and Eidlitz appear in Roy’s records. Rockefeller purchased a series of four Flemish seventeenth-century prophet windows, and a further nine all for the narthex at Riverside Church, as well as two English fifteenth-century panels depicting female saints. Surviving stock cards show that these panels did not have borders originally, but that after their purchase, presumably Wilfred or a New York glazier added them in order to make the panels fit their new wider openings (fig. 73). Other panels shown as being sold to the Riverside Church—three half-length figures in native African or Indian costumes, as well as a sixteenth-century Lady of Sorrows—were not included in the Corpus Vitrearum’s survey of the building, but are reproduced here for the first time (fig. 74). It is possible these were never actually installed, or were later removed from the church.

In 1936, two fourteenth-century Austrian panels, and a French thirteenth-century grisaille panel originally from Troyes, were ‘brought to the attention of Mr John Rockefeller Jr. and

---

645 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 32.24.1-69, James Rorimer, letter to Roy Thomas, January 12, 1932.
646 Ibid.
647 Husband, Cloisters, 6.
650 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 32.24.1-69, John Rockefeller, letter to Robert De Forest, February 28, 1930.
[...] were subsequently given by him to the museum’. The grisaille was first offered at $2,500 (equivalent to around $42,500 today), but brought down to $2,200, following Rockefeller’s request for the curators to negotiate the lowest price obtainable. Around this time, seventeen traceries and canopies, as well as an Austrian fifteenth-century angel, were obtained by Thomas and Drake from the Duveen Brothers. Some were in turn sold to the MMA in 1936 by Roy, after they were first sent to Wilfred in London for repairs and adaptations, before arriving back in New York on or before November 1936.

At the same time, in 1936 five sixteenth-century Flemish heraldic windows, originally from the Chapel of the Holy Blood (Bruges), were bought directly by the curators (fig. 75). Grosvenor had sold eleven lancets from this source to the V&A almost two decades before. Roy offered the remaining windows in this series to the MMA for $50,000 (a figure approaching almost $1,000,000 today), revised down to $35,000, until by late 1936 the asking price had halved, and Roy was prepared to take $25,000. The sum of $15,000 was eventually agreed, and released from Rockefeller’s official ‘Gothic Fund’. In what was apparently quite a tough negotiation, Roy was obligated to pay the museum’s costs for altering and installing the panels. To this end, Roy confirmed that ‘the glazing [was] done in our workshop in London’, and the glass shipped to New York glaziers Heinikge and Smith, who installed them at The Cloisters in late 1937. The only part of their display that Roy was not liable for was the material cost of the special ultra-violet-shielding protective glazing. Despite all of the concessions Roy had to make, his completion of this deal was perhaps vital.

---

654 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 36.109, Roy Thomas, letter to James Rorimer, August 5, 1936, also James Rorimer, letter to Herbert Winlock, November 12, 1936.
656 VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.441-1918, Grosvenor Thomas, letter to Bernard Rackham, May 6, 1918, also “Minute Paper,” May 14, 1918, SMCG Department.
657 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 37.147.1–5, “Memorandum for Mr John Rockefeller,” December 9, 1936.
658 Ibid.
659 MMA, Central Archive, Dealer Correspondence, G. Thomas folder, G4638, “Invoice, Five Flemish Panels,” October 18, 1937.
660 MMA, Central Archive, Dealer Correspondence, G. Thomas folder, G4638, Roy Thomas, letter to James Rorimer, June 26, 1937.
661 ‘It is understood that I pay Mr Heinikge’s bill’; MMA, Central Archive, Dealer Correspondence, G. Thomas folder, G4638, Roy Thomas, letter to James Rorimer, October 21, 1937.
662 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 37.147.1–5, Invoice, August 20, 1937.
for him to remain on good terms with the museum during a bad economic climate. The panels were placed in the long gallery that housed Rockefeller’s other major personal donation of the time, a series of six early sixteenth-century Flemish tapestries depicting The Hunt of the Unicorn, given by him to the museum during the previous year. Rockefeller had anonymously purchased these tapestries in 1922 for the phenomenal sum of over $1,000,000 (around $15,000,000 today), from French art dealer Edouard Larcade (1871–1945), who at the time was exhibiting them at the Anderson Galleries (New York).663 They were first hung in two specially designed rooms in Rockefeller’s New York townhouse at 12 West 54th Street, before being transferred to The Cloisters in 1936.664 After this flurry of important purchases, both Rockefeller and the MMA made no further acquisitions of stained glass from Roy. The Cloisters opened to the public in 1938.665

In the 1910s, New York glaziers Heinikge and Smith had also installed Grosvenor Thomas collection stained glass at Elizabeth Mills Reid’s Ophir Hall (NY). Subsequently, industrialist Myron Taylor (1874–1959) employed both Heinikge and Smith and Thomas and Drake to handle the glazing of his home, Killingworth (on Long Island). Altered and enlarged from 1922 by McKim, Mead and White-trained architect Harrie Lindeberg (1879–1959), it incorporated imported late sixteenth-century oak panelling and fire surrounds from Kenilworth Castle (Warwickshire). Twenty panels were supplied by Roy and installed by Heinikge and Smith from mid-1925, including French sixteenth-century ornamental panels, fifteenth-century Flemish armorials, and a fourteenth-century English window containing full-length saints, including two depicting John the Evangelist and Barbara, originally from Hereford Cathedral. By 1927, a Gothic library had been added, with pointed lancet windows, into which English fifteenth-century armorials from Roy were installed.666

663 “Six Rare Tapestries Sold for $1,000,000, Bought by American,” New York Times, November 21, 1922, 2; Husband, Cloisters, 16.
665 Frankfurter, Opening of the Cloisters, 9–14.
Other more modest links between art institutions and prominent local citizens can be seen from the stock books. Following Roy’s customary return to London at the close of the American art season, in September 1925 Roy sailed to North America, but rather than travelling directly to New York, as was usual, he went straight into the Canadian port of Montreal (Quebec). This coincided with purchases being made by Montreal-based newspaper magnate John Wilson McConnell (1877–1963) of six English panels and windows depicting ‘religious figures’, most likely used in the decoration of his English-style retreat Ashburton on the L’île-Dorval, off Montreal’s south-west coast, or his other residence, an Italianate villa in an exclusive area of central Montreal, completed in the same year as these purchases. It is possible that Roy was presenting him with a fresh selection of panels from which to choose, or delivering panels McConnell had already reserved that had been stored or adapted in London first.

A few years later, in March 1929, Roy made sales to McConnell’s friend, department store executive Frederick Cleveland Morgan (1881–1962), and to the Art Association of Montreal (renamed the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts in 1948), where Morgan worked as curator of decorative art from 1916 until 1962. In July 1928, Roy sailed from Montreal to London, repeating this journey in July 1929, confirming Roy’s continued presence in the area. Morgan likely installed a French thirteenth-century window depicting St John the Baptist at his Arts and Crafts home Le Sabot in the Senneville district of Montreal, designed by Scottish-born architect David Shennan (1880–1968). At the same time as this, in February

---

670 In the 1920s, Morgan helped design the rose garden of McConnell’s Ashburton mansion; Fong, *McConnell*, 270.
671 His department stores had an antiques section; Fong, *McConnell*, 629.
and March 1929, Roy’s stock books show entries for the Art Association of Montreal. Three ex-Costessey panels, as well as a full-length fourteenth-century Angel were acquired by Morgan in his capacity as curator.  

**Detroit**

Despite numerous significant buyers in the Detroit area, the Detroit Institute of Arts surprisingly made only one lot of purchases from Thomas and Drake, acquiring a French medallion, a sixteenth-century English secular panel, and two Flemish panels depicting the *Last Supper* and *Flight into Egypt* in December 1936. At the same time, Detroit businessman Standish Backus (1875–1943) also purchased four Flemish panels, sixteenth-century scenes from the lives of *The Prodigal Son* and *Samson*. These were most likely installed in his Tudor-style mansion at Grosse Pointe, built two years earlier by Ralph Adams Cram. His wife Lotta Boyer Backus (b.1886) regularly donated artworks to the Detroit Institute in the 1930s and 1940s, so it is possible (given Roy’s sales of stained glass both to the museum, and to the Backus family), that these acquisitions were somehow connected to her influence.

The Detroit Institute perhaps did not need to make any significant direct acquisitions, as their holdings were greatly augmented by stained-glass donations, such as those from banker Julius Haass (1869–1931) and his wife Lillian Henkel (1879–1960). From Roy, in 1923, Julius and his wife had purchased a German sixteenth-century roundel depicting *St Benedict*, as well as panels depicting *St Nicholas* and the *Ascension* from Roy (fig. 76). During the following art season, a further ten panels and windows were acquired, including English thirteenth-century ornamental panels, seventeenth-century Dutch secular panels, and a

---


sixteenth-century Flemish religious window; stock cards survive for just two of these acquisitions (fig. 77).680 These were installed in their Grand Boulevard mansion, built in 1905 by architect Alpheus Chittenden (1869–1958). In 1931, they moved to Grosse Pointe (MI), donating their art collection to the Detroit Institute, including their stained glass.681 Wilhelm Valentiner (1880–1958) was director of the Detroit Institute of Arts at this time (1924–1944),682 in his previous role as curator of decorative arts at the MMA (1908–1924), he had overseen some of the museum’s key stained-glass acquisitions from Grosvenor.

Female Buyers

A significant portion of Roy’s customers were women; a minimum of fifteen can be directly identified, some of whom have already been mentioned above. The Grosvenor exhibitions of the 1910s had also seen a number of important female buyers, including Elizabeth Mills Reid (1858–1931).683 The appeal of stained glass to women was probably due to its associations with the fields of decorative arts and interior design, which had largely become a household role supervised by women rather than by their husbands. At the beginning of the twentieth century, interior design was one of the few professions suitable for a female. The firm of actress and interior-design pioneer Ella ‘Elsie’ De Wolfe (1865–1950)684 of Madison and Fifth Avenue (New York), even purchased directly from Roy. Her nephew,
British-born interior decorator Jacques De Wolfe (b.1900), appears in Roy’s books in December 1925, purchasing a German fourteenth-century geometric quatrefoil, originally from Altenburg Abbey (Franken).685 From the late nineteenth century onwards, many publications encouraged women to take an active role in the decoration of their homes.686

Female customers of note not already discussed include German-born Frieda Schiff Warburg (1876–1958), sister of banker and art collector Mortimer Schiff (1877–1931), and wife of financier Felix Warburg (1871–1937), all three of whom had links to the banking firm Kuhn, Loeb and Schiff.687 Mortimer Schiff had obtained stained glass from Grosvenor in about 1919,688 and his sister began her purchases from Roy from at least 1923, when several sixteenth-century Flemish saint and donor panels, and Dutch sixteenth-century religious panels went to her.689 These acquisitions can probably be associated with the glazing of her French Renaissance-style mansion on Fifth Avenue (New York), begun in 1906 and designed by New York architect Charles Pierrepoint Henry Gilbert, who had also built Mortimer’s Long Island retreat in 1900.690

Roy obtained panels from the wife of another major partner in the firm, Adelaide Wolff Kahn (d.1949), wife of German-born financier Otto Kahn (1867–1934).691 This included an English fifteenth-century circular panel.692 In 1918, the Kahns built a palatial Italian-Renaissance-style mansion, considered to be the largest private residence ever erected in Manhattan, also designed by Gilbert, who was also responsible for homes for other customer of Roy’s,

689 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 100–01, nos. 1–2, 4, 6. *St Bertha and St James* are now at the Brooklyn Museum; acc. nos. 55.84.1–2.
such as the Sachs, Fletcher and Warburg houses. The Kahns also owned a French-Renaissance-style country retreat, Oheka (Long Island), and another, Oheka Cottage, at Palm Beach (FL). It is unknown where the Kahns originally obtained their glass, but it is possible that they were early buyers from Grosvenor, since Roy was often willing to buy back ex-Thomas collection stock, as witnessed in the repurchase of panels from Reid, McIlhenny, Sachs and Mann (see further below). It is possible that Roy was eager to repurchase panels previously in his or his father’s collections in order to keep a market advantage as supplier of these kinds of high-quality panels.

Others in the banking sector circle include Arthur Sachs (1880–1975), founding partner in rival investment banking company Goldman Sachs, and his half-German wife Alice Goldschmidt Sachs (1884–1930), who made purchases from Roy in 1925 and 1928. These included English sixteenth-century panels depicting saints Lawrence and Stephen, originally from Hampton Court Chapel (Herefordshire) (fig. 78). Alice was a recipient of the Ordre national de la Légion d’honneur for her support of French art and artists, and her first marital home, built in 1909 on Manhattan’s 66th Street, was in a French Renaissance style. Unusually, the Sachs family did not build a country retreat, and instead presumably installed their English fifteenth-century Tudor rose panels, and fourteenth-century ‘saint panel’, in their English-Gothic-style mansion on East 69th Street, designed by Gilbert in

---

696 Another of the New York German-Jewish circle who also did not obtain a country retreat was investment banker Martin Erdmann (1864–1937), who purchased French and Flemish sixteenth-century stained glass from Roy in 1933 for his German-Renaissance-style Manhattan townhouse; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 100–01, 110–11, 188–89, N[eave].9, N[eave].91, 1140; “Martin Erdmann Residence,” Architecture, 20 (October 1909): 147–48. On 20 May 1943, one of these panels was purchased by William Burrell, through Wilfred Drake, when a panel appeared as part of lot 32 in a sale at Christie’s on 20 May 1943. Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/77.
1921. When Alice died in 1930, Roy bought the stained glass back from Arthur, and through Wilfred resold several of these panels to the V&A.  

Sachs’s business partner and brother-in-law, Henry Goldman (1887–1937), also made purchases from Roy in 1924. His townhouse, directly opposite the MMA, was designed by McKim, Mead, and White. However, it was at his country estate, Bull Point, in the Adirondack Mountains (NY) that he chose to install his stained glass, in a specially designed picture gallery. Despite the house’s English Tudor style, the majority of Goldman’s acquisitions of glass were Flemish, including a series of twenty-two Flemish sixteenth-century secular and religious panels, from Dagnam Park. Of these Flemish panels, twelve depicting scenes from the Life of Christ were donated to the MMA in 1944, and two French bearded figures were given to the Brooklyn Museum (New York) in 1955. Seven out of the twelve of Thomas and Drake’s stock cards survive for the Life of Christ panels, illustrating that plain-glass borders had been added, likely in order for them to be accommodated at Goldman’s house (fig. 79). Roy’s annotations record the panels as originally having measured 22 ½ x 17 ¼ in., but they are now 26 x 19½ in. It is not known where the remainder of Goldman’s stained glass is now located, but illustrations exist for four panels, pictured as part of Thomas and Drake’s stock cards (fig. 80).

Between 1923 and 1925, Helen Wagstaff Colgate Mann (1874–1932), the wife of Samuel Vernon Mann (1873–1950) of brokerage firm Mann, Pell and Peake, also bought a selection of stained glass for her country estate, Grove Point (on Long Island). Although the mansion was classical in design, the interior was loosely Gothic, and included English heraldic

---

698 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 92–93, 290–91, nos. 1018–19; now in the collection of the Santa Barbara Museum of Art, acc. nos. 44.11.8 A–D; Caviness, Midwestern, 91.
700 Archives of the Art Institute of Chicago, Dealer Correspondence, Roy Thomas, letter to Oswald Goetz, January 23, 1951; June Fisher, Henry Goldman, Goldman Sachs and the Founding of Wall Street: When Money Was in Fashion (New York: St Martin’s, 2010), 73.
702 MMA, acc. nos. 44.11.1–12. These panels were originally exhibited in Grosvenor’s second sale at the Charles Gallery; Drake, Thomas Collection ... Part II, no. 160; Caviness, New England, 145–46.
703 Brooklyn Museum, acc. nos. 55.84.5–6.
and religious glass ranging from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, acquired from Roy between 1923 and 1925. $150 were paid for six crowned initials, cut from an English fifteenth-century figure panel depicting St Matthew, as recorded in the margins of Roy’s stock book. Stock cards show one panel depicting a kneeling donor cost $400, the equivalent of around $5,500 today. A further two panels, seventeenth-century Dutch panes depicting birds, were acquired by the Manns at some stage, exchanged for a pair of upholstery armchairs in their possession, that Roy placed in his studio. When portions of the collection were sold in 1932, coinciding with Helen’s death, Roy reacquired this stained glass.

In January 1927, Jane Arms Hofer (b.1860), based in Cincinnati (OH), Camden (ME), and New York, and wife of half-French investor Charles Frederick Hofer (1861–1929), purchased five panels of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Flemish and Dutch glass depicting ‘male and female saints’, in addition to several English fifteenth-century armorials. Two years later, her son Phillip Hofer (1898–1984), a librarian at the New York Public Library, and later at Harvard University (MA), also began acquiring glass from Roy. In March 1929, two months after his father had died, he acquired an English fifteenth-century panel depicting the Madonna, as well as a fourteenth-century full-length Angel. Again, on the anniversary of his father’s death, in January 1930, more English stained glass acquisitions followed – seventeenth-century panels depicting the Four Seasons, as well as more fourteenth-century
Given the timing of these acquisitions, it is possible that Hofer intended these as a memorial. Further life events seem to have informed his subsequent purchases. In December 1930, having only ever acquired English glass, he uncharacteristically purchased a pair of small German eighteenth-century commemorative panels, described in the stock books as ‘figures with inscriptions’ (fig. 81). This sudden change in taste came just a month after his marriage to half-German Frances Heckscher (b.1908).

In late December of that same year, the house was host to the much publicised 1,500-guest wedding of her daughter Estelle Manville (1904–1984) to the king of Sweden’s nephew, Count Folke Bernadotte (1895–1948), a lavish event that reportedly cost over $1.5 million. Her acquisitions were perhaps an attempt to demonstrate her family’s European pedigree, and compared to the total reported cost of the wedding, these glazed decorations came to a trivial amount.
Additions to Roy’s Stock, and Other Business Ventures

Aside from a series of sixteenth-century Flemish medallions purchased from Dawson of Charles of London (see further above), Roy also added further panels to Thomas and Drake’s stock. One of the most significant of the later additions was a sixteenth-century English window depicting the Apostles Creed, originally from Hampton Court Chapel (Herefordshire), bought by Wilfred and Roy in England in 1925 (fig. 44). This monumental window went straight to the Boston Museum of Fine Art, in a deal worth $94,000 (equivalent to almost $1.3 million today).\(^{723}\) Further fifteenth-century panels from Hampton Court Chapel were sold to New York businessman John Gellatly (1852–1931).\(^{724}\) Two months after having purchased six panels from Roy, in May 1928, Gellatly began the process of donating his collection to a public institution, suggesting that he made his purchases from Roy with public rather than private display in mind. Despite the Boston Museum’s owning a significant number of panels from this source, Gellatly’s panels eventually went to the Smithsonian Institute of Art (Washington DC), in June 1929, where a Gothic room was created with items from Gellatly’s collection (fig. 83). It is likely that Wilfred had altered some of these panels, such as the leading together of an English fourteenth-century shield depicting the Arms of Mortimer with a quarry grisaille and head panel; all originally had separate stock numbers accorded to them before emerging as a single composite panel after their sale to Gellatly (fig. 84).\(^{725}\) In a similar manner, an English fifteenth-century trefoil head panel from Hampton Court Chapel was added to a panel with an ‘abbot carrying a crozier and a book’, which although undoubtedly from the same series, was unlikely to have originally accompanied this panel in this manner (fig. 85).\(^{726}\)


\(^{726}\) SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 212–13, nos. 1265a–b.
Three sixteenth-century Swiss medallions were also obtained from New York antiques dealer John Alden Lloyd Hyde (1902–1981), who had a gallery at 22 East 60th Street (Manhattan). Although their date of acquisition is not recorded, Roy sold one of these in May 1927 to Maud Seabury (b.1877), wife of New York lawyer and politician, and later judge, Samuel Seabury (1873–1958). This was presumably for her Manhattan townhouse at East 63rd Street, acquired and filled with European furnishings in the same year. Maud had also purchased three Dutch seventeenth-century boating scenes, two Dutch panels with inscriptions, and an oval with flower motif, a fragment of a ‘man walking in the countryside’, an English fifteenth-century medallion depicting a saint with a spear, three enamel flowers, a kneeling donor and angel, and a series of six enamel-painted birds, all selected from Wilfred’s London stock. Through Thomas and Drake’s surviving stock cards, the appearance of Seabury’s acquisitions can be shown for the first time (fig. 86).

Californian newspaper magnate William Randolph Hearst (1863–1951) indirectly provided perhaps one of Thomas and Drake’s most significant subsidiary incomes. In February 1926, Hearst acquired twenty panels from Roy – fifteenth-, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century French, Flemish, and English armorials. It is not known for which of his properties this series of panels was intended, but they were likely first transferred to Hearst’s storage warehouse in The Bronx (New York), a building protected by armed guard, where many of

---

730 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards 74, 284, 843, 1235–37, 1483, 1509–14, 1527, 1537, 1569–70, Miscellaneous.89.
732 His main residence was Hearst Castle in San Simeon (CA), which he built between 1919 and 1947. From 1907 he rented, and then owned, a five-storey townhouse on Riverside Drive in Manhattan (New York), and a Gothic-style retreat at Wyntoon (CA), inherited from his mother. In 1925, he acquired the medieval castle, St Donat’s, in Glamorgan (Wales); David Nasaw, The Chief: The Life of William Randolph Hearst (New York: Mariner, 2000), 425–46.
his acquisitions were first deposited. However, it was Hearst’s subsequent bankruptcy and the dispersal of his collection that proved especially lucrative. The petroleum magnate and art collector Armand Hammer (1898–1990) had initially organised the sale of huge swathes of Hearst’s art collection, part of a recovery of funds ordered by his creditors, Chase Bank. This culminated in 1941 with a mass sale at New York department store Gimbel’s, whose fifth floor was given over entirely to the collection; a move seen rather astutely by Hearst in the months previous as ‘a most fatal mistake’, and a blow for the art trade, devaluing the objects (and the market generally) by selling the collection ‘over the bargain counters’.

However, in March 1938, Thomas and Drake were awarded the contract of inventorising the hundreds of stained-glass windows and panels held at Hearst’s warehouse, necessitating Wilfred’s rare appearance in New York. He sailed in April 1938 with his wife Bessie Winifred May Drake (1880–1959), sister of New York and Connecticut-based accountant George Oliver May, who at various times had supported Thomas and Drake’s business (see below). Wilfred focused especially on a series of thirty-seven panels and windows that Roy had previously appraised as ‘modern, of no antique value’. The cataloguing and private sale of Hearst’s collection was overseen by British-born MacDermid Parish Watson (1879–1941), a dealer whose gallery neighboured Roy’s on East 57th Street, and whose private residence (like Roy’s) was in Fairfield (CT). A five-storey building neighbouring Roy’s and Parish-Watson’s was leased, and Hearst’s collection shown there first. As a result of their work sorting the stained glass, Thomas and Drake were well placed to act as intermediaries in its

733 “Life Shows First Pictures Inside Famous Warehouse,” LIFE, 5, no. 21 (November 21, 1938): 47–50. Stained glass and other items are illustrated inside the warehouse in this article.
735 “Culture Sold Over the Counter,” The Age, March 15, 1941, 10.
736 University of Berkeley (CA), Bancroft Library, Hearst Correspondence, carton 29, William Randolph Hearst, letter to RB, December 29, 1940; Nasaw, The Chief, 556–58.
738 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.137, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, August 8, 1938 (Appendix A, document 149).
740 Nasaw, The Chief, 541.
sale. Wilfred’s involvement as agent on several high-cost deals is known, and discussed in Chapter Three.

The Closure of the New York Business

Medieval and Renaissance stained glass had a short commercial lifespan, and was largely becoming out of fashion by the time Thomas and Drake had been formed in New York in 1924, giving way to more modern modes such as Art Deco. In 1943, art dealer Raphael Stora underlined the low ebb the market had reached: ‘The market for stained glass is extremely small and there is currently very little demand for such things’.

Moreover, as we have seen, Thomas and Drake’s fortunes were inextricably linked to members of the wealthy industrial and financial sectors, whose custom Roy almost exclusively relied on. Many of Roy’s customers increased their wealth by putting their money into the purchasing of stocks and shares, which meant that they were particularly vulnerable to stock-market fluctuations. Consequently, many faced financial ruin after the 1929 stock-market crash. Many art dealers struggled to stay afloat during the 1930s; this was exacerbated by the cautious spending following the outbreak of the Second World War in Europe in 1939, and America’s entry into the conflict in 1941. Few patrons had the financial stability required to continue to fund the arts, and many museums and art galleries, who relied on their patronage, were forced to work with severely limited budgets.

By the 1930s, many great estates were being broken up, as their owners downsized. Mansion-building campaigns ceased, and any collections that did not go to auction entered public institutions as donations. Effectively, this curtailed the need for museums to make purchases of their own. All were now sellers, and very few had the funds necessary to buy. Many of Thomas and Drake’s most important customers and collaborators in the United States had fallen away, with the exception of

741 London, Principal Probate Registry, High Court of Justice, February 9, 1937, “Matilda Jane Thomas.”
742 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.500, Wilfred Drake, extracts copied from a letter between Raphael Stora and William Burrell, November 27, 1943 (Appendix C, document 516).
743 It was first predicted that the war would bring a wave of prosperity to Americans, but for many this did not emerge, as documented by Wilfred Drake; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.295, letter to William Burrell, September 14, 1939 (Appendix B, document 306); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.308, letter to William Burrell, November 10, 1939, (Appendix B, document 319); GMRA, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.383, letter to William Burrell, February 17, 1941 (Appendix B, document 397).
744 ‘They [the V&A] are not allowed to buy stained glass during the war’; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.546, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, July 8, 1944 (Appendix C, document 565).
Higgins and Rockefeller. Charles of London and Roberson both closed by the late 1930s, and Roy had beaten a permanent retreat to London by mid-1947. As quickly as these art dealers had flocked to New York at the turn of the century, many largely disappeared just a few decades later.

Throughout Roy’s time in the United States, stained glass remained a side interest for several of the New York dealers. Perhaps the most significant challenge to his monopoly came in late 1929, when he received unprecedented competition from Demotte Fils, led by Lucien Demotte (1906–1934). In December 1929, on a scale not dissimilar to Grosvenor’s exhibitions of the 1910s, Demotte showed fifty-five panels and windows of medieval and Renaissance European stained glass at 25 East 78th Street, perhaps in an attempt to liquidise stock quickly in the wake of the Great Depression. Demotte’s glass was assembled from several defunct French collections, including those of de Galea, Michel, Taureilles, Marchand, Gaudin, Juraime, de Quirielle, Chappee, Engel-Gros and de Rivarol. Consequently, the glass was almost exclusively French, an area in which Thomas and Drake were weakest, but where artistic prestige and popularity remained high, especially amongst buyers such as Pitcairn. Demotte repeated the process in 1933, when a further seventeen panels and windows were shown. Although Thomas and Drake never repeated the major exhibitions that characterised Grosvenor’s tenure as figurehead – perhaps because they felt their stock was already well known enough – this new competition in a medium they had largely dominated must have been a major concern at a time of financial volatility. Several of Roy’s customers made purchases from these sales. Higgins acquired a French panel from a thirteenth-century Tree of Jesse, Pitcairn purchased a French thirteenth-century Flight
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746 After he was shot and killed by Parisian art dealer Otto Wegener during a hunting trip, his teenage son Lucien inherited the business in 1923; “Demotte Killed in Gun Accident,” New York Times, September 5, 1923, 1.
747 Caviness, Midwestern, 18.
750 “Catalogue ... Demotte,” no. 8; Caviness, New England, 64. Donated to the Worcester Art Museum by 1937; acc. no. 1937.140.
into Egypt (originally from the royal abbey church of Saint-Denis)\textsuperscript{751} and a Christ in Majesty,\textsuperscript{752}
and Hearst purchased two German fifteenth-century windows.\textsuperscript{753}

However, across nineteen art seasons, Roy sold a total of 659 panels, lancets, and whole windows. Half of these sales, 330 panels, were made in just the first six art seasons (during the 1920s). It took a further thirteen art seasons to sell a similar amount (329 panels), revealing a substantial slowing down in volume of sales after the initial 1920s boom. Although Thomas and Drake’s accounts do not survive, the first stock book alone shows that between 1923 and 1947 (representing the time period the New York branch remained open in the United States) the New York branch made sales with minimum values of over $178,000, equivalent to over $3 million today.\textsuperscript{754} This gave Roy a minimum yearly average turnover of around $9,500 (the equivalent of $150,000 today). The average yearly income for Americans during this period ranged from just $1,000 to $1,500. Stock sold during each art season, as recorded by the stock books, show that in the 1920s (beginning with the 1923–24 art season) stock with minimum values of $31,500, $35,000, $16,700, $7,950, $15,750 and $17,500 was sold (marking a point just before the stock-market crash). Beginning with the 1930–31 art season, the total values taper off significantly to $7,000, $12,800, $4,300, $390, $6,700, $2,900, $4,350, $645, $680, $2,900 and $15 (the latter coinciding with the United States’ entry into the Second World War in late 1941, and Roy’s closure of the New York branch). Roy’s only known statement of income is found on the 1940 census, when his annual income for 1939 was recorded as $5,000 (equivalent to around $84,000 today),\textsuperscript{755} although it is not known how honest or accurate his declaration was.

These minimum values were, as the widow of Roy later explained, ‘the lowest figures I [acting on behalf of Thomas and Drake] am supposed to ask’, and so it is likely that the total actual

\textsuperscript{751} Flight into Egypt was declared a fake by French stained-glass historian Louis Grodecki (1910–82), but has since been acknowledged as probably authentic; Les Vitraux de Saint-Denis: Étude sur le Vitrail au Xle siècle (Paris: Arts et Metiers, 1976), 176–80; Hayward, Radiance and Reflection, 84–87.
\textsuperscript{752} It is likely that one of the panels is no. 38 in Demotte’s 1929 catalogue; Caviness, Mid-Atlantic, 103; GMA, acc. nos. 03.SG.06, 114.
\textsuperscript{753} Now in a private collection in Hillsborough (CA); Husband, Roundels, 236.
\textsuperscript{754} The actual sales amounts are very likely to be far higher than this value, as the stock books only record the minimum worth, and not the actual figures that changed hands; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I.
\textsuperscript{755} NARA, 1940 United States Federal State Census, “Roy Thomas.”
turnover of the New York branch far exceeded this figure. Roy’s known sale prices (shown above) reveal this discrepancy, although not enough is known to build a full idea of his average mark-up. For example, in 1925 the stock books accord a value of $12,583 for the English fifteenth-century Apostle’s Creed window acquired by the Boston Museum of Art, but this was actually sold for $94,000, a figure almost eight times higher. Again, in 1927, the Toledo Museum of Art (OH) purchased a small French fourteenth-century window depicting the Madonna and Child for $2,000, but its minimum value was just $452, over four times less.

Prices were equally as inflated with private buyers. For example, annotations on stock cards reveal that in 1925 a fifteenth-century English heraldic panel went for $1,200, despite having a stock value of just $460. Likewise, a sixteenth-century Flemish panel depicting Mary and Joseph at the Inn went for $2,500 in 1927, despite having a minimum asking price of just $460, and in 1930 a sixteenth-century Flemish Angel was sold for $2,000, despite the stock books’ recording a minimum asking price of just $368. However, from the 1930s onwards, the stock book values became more closely aligned with the figures known to have changed hands, indicating that Roy’s profit margins were now far smaller. In 1946, an Austrian fourteenth-century unidentified figure panel with a stated minimum value of $176 was sold for $200, and a fifteenth-century panel depicting St James under a Canopy

756 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, Winifred Thomas, letter to Dennis King, June 29, 1953. As early as 1910, evidence of the undervaluation of stock amongst art dealers can be seen. Benjamin (1876–1946) and Henry (1878–1963) Duveen of transatlantic firm Duveen Brothers were arrested for reportedly ‘defrauding the United States Inland Revenue’, after large discrepancies were discovered between the declared value of their stock upon entry into the United States and their eventual sale prices. The Duveens argued that this practice was widespread; “Henry Duveen’s Arrest,” New York Times, October 14, 1910, 2; “Arrest of Art Dealers,” The Times, October 15, 1910, 7; Duveen, Rise of the House of Duveen, 226–27.
757 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 210–12, no. 1256; BMFA, Art of Europe Department, object file for acc. no. 25.213.1–21.
758 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, stock card no.421.
760 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, stock card no. 664.
762 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, stock card no. 382.
764 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, stock card N.12.
with a minimum value of $1,532 actually went for only $500, a third of its minimum value, which presumably represented a significant loss.\footnote{SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 36–27, nos. 381, 381A; MMA, Watson Library, Brummer Gallery Records, reg. no. b16669009, inv. no. N6665, 1946 stock card, "St James the Great."}

The various business premises used by Roy also illustrate the changing fortunes of the New York branch. The New York branch had five different studios, in contrast to the London firm, which only moved once, largely as a result of wartime damage to their original premises (see Chapter Three).\footnote{GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.368, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, October 31, 1940 (Appendix B, document 382).} After spending a brief period of time at 6 West 57th Street in 1923,\footnote{New York Public Library, Telephone Directories 1910–30, New York City Telephone Book 1923, 2234, “Roy Grosvenor Thomas.”} while the economy was stable in the 1920s the studio remained in one place for the longest amount of time, spending eight years at nearby 6 West 56th Street, in the art dealers’ quarter in mid-town Manhattan.\footnote{"Magnificent Examples,” 26.} The 1930s saw the branch moving several times in quick succession, however, to locations that were presumably cheaper. According to the 1930 federal census, Roy first transferred his studio to 14 East 75th Street, on the Upper East Side, which had a monthly rent of $430 (just under $6,000 a month in today’s money), or $5,160 per annum. At this time, the family also had a Scottish-born housekeeper in their employ.\footnote{NARA, 1930 New York Federal State Census, “Roy Grosvenor Thomas.” The 1925 census did not record rental prices, so it is not possible to make a comparison.} Roy then moved to 217 East 75th Street, before returning to the art dealers’ quarter by the mid-1930s, to 38 East 57th Street.\footnote{GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.322, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, January 5, 1940 (Appendix B, document 333).} Rather than a combined home and studio, Roy rented just a small studio, commuting in from his new home in nearby Connecticut. Wilfred confirmed this move in 1940: ‘Roy Thomas lives in Fairfield, Connecticut, a village about 50 miles along the east from New York, he travels up to the city every day’.\footnote{GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.340, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, April 8, 1940 (Appendix B, document 353).} The 1940 federal census shows that the Thomases had now dispensed with their housekeeper, and paid $65 a month in rent in Fairfield (the equivalent of just $1,000 today), almost seven times cheaper than the rent Roy had paid in Manhattan.\footnote{NARA, 1940 Connecticut Federal State Census, “Roy Thomas.”}
According to city directories, Roy had lived in Fairfield since at least 1933, at 1168 Old Field Road.\(^775\) By 1935, his wife was recorded as being employed as a secretary\(^776\) to George Oliver May (1875–1961), Wilfred’s brother-in-law, who had houses in Manhattan and in Southport (CT). May had proved to be a support for the family, helping underwrite the cost of Roy’s 1922 book, and also purchasing a significant number of panels from Roy’s stock for a composite ‘Flemish window’.\(^777\) When Grosvenor’s widow Matilda Thomas died in December 1936, Roy and his sister Dorothy were her sole heirs, inheriting £14,413 (the equivalent to just over half a million pounds today). Presumably Roy’s share of this also helped to keep the business afloat.\(^778\) In 1941, the Thomas family home address changed again, to 414 Mill Plain Road in Bridgeport (CT),\(^779\) followed in 1942 by the relocation of Roy’s studio to 119 East 57\(^{th}\) Street, onto the third floor of interior decorator Arthur Todhunter’s building (fig. 54).\(^780\) A picture of the interior of this studio from the later 1940s, taken in the period straight after Roy had vacated it, shows four oval panels \textit{in situ} in a six-light window (fig. 87). While at Todhunter’s building, Roy failed to make a single sale, and he closed the business altogether just a year later, in 1943, gaining employment in paid war work at the Remington Arms Factory (CT).\(^781\) Wilfred quoted a letter from Roy, which explained this new development: ‘I have been taken on by a large munitions plant as a quality control engineer and have closed up our office and handed over the Costessey and our glass to Raphael Stora the French dealer, who shared premises with Durlachers here for some time’.\(^782\) Decorative arts dealer, Paris-born Raphael Stora (1888–1963) of 1010 Fifth Avenue and 471 Park Avenue (New York), attempted to sell some of this glass (presumably for a commission).\(^783\) Other stained glass was taken to Hahn Brothers, who ran a ‘Fireproof Storage Warehouse’, located in the art


\(^{777}\) Many of these panels were later donated to the Lyman Allyn Museum in New London (CT); illustrated in Caviness, \textit{New England}, 33–34.

\(^{778}\) London, High Court of Justice, Principal Probate Registry, February 9, 1937, “Matilda Jane Thomas.”


\(^{782}\) Ibid.

\(^{783}\) Ibid.
dealers’ district at 231 East 55th Street. Presumably stock that was too large for Stora to accommodate, or with little market appeal, went there. Other glass was also stored separately with the Neptune Storage Company, and at least some of the panels that had already been sold, but had not yet been shipped, were taken to Roy’s house in Connecticut.

After their final sales in 1941, it is not until 1946–47 that Roy reactivate Thomas and Drake in New York. Having searched for suitable premises in Manhattan to no avail, Roy instead began the process of returning permanently to London. At this time, the Hungarian-born, New York-based art dealing siblings Joseph and Ernest Brummer (1883–1947 and 1891–1964) made several purchases. Opening their New York branch in 1922, the Brummer Gallery was known to have had experience of handling stained glass in America, notably including the sale of four French thirteenth-century Apostles to Wellesley College (MA), and a collection of sixteenth-century Flemish roundels to Hearst in 1927. From Roy they bought a fourteenth-century English grisaille panel (originally from Hildersham Church, Cambridgeshire), a fifteenth-century lancet depicting St James, and an Austrian fourteenth-century figure panel. According to the Brummer Gallery’s own records, the
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784 The monumental fifteenth-century German windows from the Carmelite monastery of Boppard were stored in this way. Originally the property of real-estate magnate and financier Ogden (1851–1897) and then his son Robert Goelet (1880–1941) of Ochre Court (RI). The window was sold (via Thomas and Drake’s agency) to William Burrell (see Chapter Three); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.518, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, February 22, 1944 (Appendix C, document 534).
787 In a letter of March 1947, Burrell noted that Roy was struggling to find suitable premises in New York; by early September of the same year, Wilfred confirmed that Roy had bought a house with combined studio back in London; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.685, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, March 26, 1947 (Appendix C, document 707); GMRA, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.698, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, September 2, 1947 (Appendix C, document 721).
789 Husband, Roundels, 89–91.
790 This panel is now at the Art Museum, Princeton University; Caviness, Mid-Atlantic, 78.
grisaille was purchased in May 1946 for $400, the Austrian panel in July for $200, and the St James in September 1946 for $500.

In February 1947, a large portion of Roy’s stock was transferred to New York architect and interior designer Abraham Adler (1902–1985), annotated by Roy in his stock books ‘still in New York, Adler’, suggesting that Thomas and Drake were attempting to retain commercial interests in the United States. In June 1942, Adler had purchased an English primitive painting from Roy, originally belonging to Grosvenor, but had not otherwise appeared in Roy’s records. Adler kept a large range of Thomas and Drake’s stained-glass stock, fifty-five panels ranging from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries, of Dutch, English, Flemish and Swiss origin. A panel depicting Mary Magdalene was sold to the newly opened Corning Museum of Glass (New York) in 1951 by Adler, as confirmed by the stock books, although no panels matching this description now exist in their holdings. A French thirteenth-century grisaille lancet was also sold to them in this year, as was a German or possibly English fifteenth-century ‘head of Christ’ (figs 88–89). Little else is known of sales made by Adler. By 1953, Adler had founded his own decorative art dealing business, Hirschl and Adler, with dealer Norman Hirschl (1915–2002), first in a suite at the Marguery Hotel at 270 Park Avenue, where presumably this stock was transferred.
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799 Caviness, New England, 74–75; Corning Museum, acc. nos. 51.3.228; 51.2.185.
800 His daughter, also an art dealer, only has a vague recollection of her father’s dealings with Roy; verbal communication with Gregory Hedberg of Hirschl and Adler (New York) and Rachel Adler of Adler and Conkright (NY).
Several panels formerly in the collection of art conservator George Angus Douglass (1913–1995), who was based in Fairfield (CT), had been sold by Roy to New York investor and businessman William Payne Whitney (1876–1927) for his Long Island estate Greentree at Manhasset. A pair of Austrian fifteenth-century panels depicting *Salome Receiving the Head of St John the Baptist*, and one showing *St Ann with the Virgin and Christ Child* are likely to share this provenance. These panels appeared in the sale catalogue of Frederich von Leber's collection in 1925, and so were presumably purchased by Thomas and Drake at this time, and sold to Payne Whitney shortly thereafter; it was noted above that his sister also purchased from the firm. Several other of Douglass’s panels share a Roy Thomas and Abraham Adler provenance, such as a French thirteenth-century *St Mattias*. Roy and Adler possibly sold this panel to Julie Bradley Shipman, wife of bishop of New York Herbert Shipman (1869–1930), or, more likely, they sold it to her father, art collector and distilling magnate Edson Bradley (1852–1935), owner of French-Gothic-style ‘Seaview’ at Newport (RI). This transaction shows that Adler and Roy had been associated previously in the sale of stained glass from at least the 1920s or early 1930s. Edson Bradley’s property was known to have been glazed with German sixteenth-century panels from Boppard depicting *St John and Nicodemus*; these and others remain in situ in the great hall. Julie Shipman sold many medieval and Renaissance artworks in 1936, not long after her father’s death; a catalogue of the sale survives amongst Thomas and Drake’s records, making it likely that Roy attended.

A further twenty panels went to the Plaza Gallery and Auction Rooms at 5 East 59th Street, next door to Manhattan’s French château-style Plaza Hotel (opened in 1907). Although no date is given for Roy having entered this stock at auction, it is most likely that this was around
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802 This collection was last seen in Greenwich, CT, but its location is now unknown.
803 These panels do not appear in Roy’s stock books, and so they probably remained as part of Wilfred’s London holdings; Caviness, *New England*, 114.
808 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 58.
the time Roy was making arrangements to return to London. It is also possible that all or
some of this glass went to auction in 1941, before the wartime closure of Roy’s studio, in
order to save on the costs of having to store and insure the glass while the business was
closed. Many of these panels had relatively low minimum values accorded to them in the
stock books, of $40 or less, suggesting they were of poor quality or condition. The
y were predominantly Flemish and Dutch, ranging from the sixteenth to the seventeenth centuries.
There was also one English fifteenth-century donor panel, which had a higher minimum
asking price of $125, which was perhaps used in order to entice buyers to purchase a mixed
job lot.

Roy and his wife arrived back in England on 25 February 1947. Correspondence of the time
indicates that Roy’s departure was discrete and quick, and he did not even inform previous
major buyers. In a remarkably informal letter suggestive of former close links between the
pair, almost two years after Roy’s return to England, James Rorimer, now the director of The
Cloisters, wrote: ‘Whatcha [sic] got you old tempter, you? We have been doing cartwheels
trying to find you in this country’. In 1949, the Philadelphia Museum also unsuccessfully
attempted to find Roy. Rorimer requested that Roy find him glass, ‘and lots of it’, for a
fourteenth-century chapel that had been recently acquired by the museum, underlining the
key role Roy had fulfilled in supplying the museum with pieces of acceptably high quality in
the past. However, the chapel was not glazed until 1986, showing that Roy was unable to
adequately fulfil Rorimer’s request.

Conclusion

As the sales powerhouse, Roy succeeded in supplying many directly associated with the
burgeoning house-decorating market. His clients were exclusively extremely wealthy
members of society. He sold to them, to their team of interior designers, and to the
institutions that they patronised, showing how interlinked sales of this kind could be.
Commendably, Roy was able to remain in business for some time, even though many of his

---

810 TNA, UK Inward Passenger Lists, February 7, 1947, “Roy Thomas.”
811 MMA, Cloisters’ Archive, James Rorimer Papers, box 1, folder, 16, correspondence T, James
Rorimer, letter to Roy Thomas, December 27, 1948.
812 Burnham, Philadelphia, 48.
813 Hayward, English and French, 32.
colleagues around him had fallen away – the volume of his sales in the 1920s perhaps managing to see him through the financial and political disorder that dogged the 1930s and 1940s.
CHAPTER THREE: Thomas and Drake Limited (London), Wilfred Drake, and his Exceptional Relationship with William Burrell

After Grosvenor’s unexpected death in February 1923 (see Chapter One), and with Roy leading operations in New York (see Chapter Two), glass-painter and restorer Wilfred Drake was very swiftly left as Thomas and Drake’s sole European representative (fig. 90). At this time, the Glasgow Herald reported: ‘the stained glass collection, in the bringing together of which Mr Thomas took such pride, has to a considerable extent been dispersed, what remains now being under the excellent care of Mr Wilfred Drake’. From his small combined London workshop and studio at 1 Holland Park Road (now demolished), Wilfred was not only responsible for the repair, adaption, and supply of stained glass to American audiences, as seen in the previous chapters, but also for the handling of all aspects of the firm’s European sales and practical commissions. Wilfred’s wide range of hands-on and intellectual expertise meant he was able to offer various in-house services to clients, relating to the authentication and interpretation of items, as well as the designing, arranging, alteration, installation and cataloguing of their purchases. He was also proficient in the restoration of original in situ glazing schemes of national importance, all of which will be analysed here. By way of underlining Wilfred’s legacy as a salesman, his obituary noted: ‘most of the painted glass purchased by the V&A in the last 30 years, and most of the collection given by Sir William Burrell to the Glasgow Museum passed through his hands’. Despite this contemporary recognition, Wilfred has largely been neglected in subsequent research. Exploring Wilfred’s role, this chapter aims to reveal his dual contributions as dealer and technician.

While Roy was selling fairly substantial quantities of glass to extremely wealthy Americans, over in Britain Wilfred sold in much smaller volumes, proportionate perhaps to his European customer’s more modest means, and reflecting the fact that his firm mainly sought to sell their stock in the United States. While many of these European sales presumably provided a steady stream of income for the more practically focused London branch, they also serve to illustrate the exceptional custom of Glasgow-born shipping magnate William Burrell (1861–1958), with whom Wilfred shares this chapter. Burrell bought extensively from both the

London and New York branches of Thomas and Drake, and its predecessor the Grosvenor Thomas Collection, across a five-decade period, undeterred by world wars and global financial recessions. By comparison, Aldus Higgins was the firm’s second longest-standing customer, although he only made purchases across a comparatively paltry eight-year period (see Chapter Two). Wilfred’s special relationship with Burrell was central to enabling Thomas and Drake to elevate Burrell’s private collection of stained glass to its now internationally recognised heights. Its stained-glass holdings rank third globally in terms of volume.816

**European Buyers**

Records for Thomas and Drake’s London branch are extremely vague and incomplete. Nonetheless, it has been possible to reconstruct Wilfred’s activities, and to establish a substantial proportion, if not all, of his known European buyers.817 Aside from struggling against a failing British economy – one which had initially allowed Grosvenor to amass so much high-quality stained glass in the first place (see Chapter One) – Wilfred’s task as European salesman was not easy. After the First World War, Britain was in financial recession, with high levels of unemployment, a greatly increased national debt, and cautious spending and investment amongst the financial elites.818 Moreover, surviving stock cards indicate that Wilfred sent the best quality, and presumably more marketable, panels over to the United States to be sold. In contrast with Roy’s extensive holdings of medieval stained glass in New York, what was left behind in London included numerous seventeenth- and eighteenth-century enamel-painted panels and windows, some of which were noted as having ‘modern backgrounds’, and many of which were listed as being ‘broken’ or ‘much damaged’. Although Wilfred’s sales to Burrell (discussed further below) underline that he retained some panels of exceptionally high quality, this was not commonplace, and was perhaps as a result of Roy’s studio not being large enough to accommodate them all at once. To this end, panels such as the one hundred Continental roundels Roy had offered to The Cloisters via Rockefeller (of which they bought sixty-nine) were stored in London. Many other

---

816 The V&A’s stained glass holdings are currently estimated at around 1,500 panels, and the MMA’s at roughly 1,100, while the Burrell Collection currently contains around 700.
817 No stock books survive, so Thomas and Drake’s European holdings and their customers are known mainly through Wilfred’s annotations on a series of the firm’s surviving stock cards, which probably do not represent the London stock in its totality; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, boxes 50, 51, 54.
items in their stock were no doubt entered in Roy’s New York stock books but held back in London in this same manner. Wilfred was perhaps even discouraged from selling any of these higher-quality panels to European buyers, as higher prices could potentially be obtained if sold to an American.

Wilfred’s ability to make sales was further undermined by there being significant opposition during the period to the removal and trafficking of European art to the United States. As a contemporary newspaper report summarised: ‘The accumulation of the grand ornaments of life in painting, sculpture, jewels, architecture, and other arts is the sign and crown of the prosperity and high civilisation of a country. Their dispersion is a sure symptom of its poverty and decay. It is a sound national instinct that urges us to resent the sending away of these treasures’.

Another report blamed this regressive trend on the heavy taxes imposed in Britain at this time, which forced many of the landed gentry to part with their antique possessions. It continued, ‘America has become very wealthy, and [Americans] are serious competitors at all art sales’. In 1932, author and antiquarian Frederick Sydney Eden, who had provided articles for several of Grosvenor’s catalogues in the years earlier (see Chapter One), wrote ominously about the loss of ancient stained glass in Britain, regarding restorers and dealers as ‘esteeming money more than art’, and contributing to the destruction of Britain’s stained glass heritage.

When in 1918 the V&A was considering the purchase of the sixteenth-century Flemish windows from the Chapel of the Holy Blood (Bruges) from Grosvenor (see Chapter One), its director Cecil Harcourt-Smith (1859–1944, director 1909–1924) remarked: ‘the sum he [Grosvenor] proposes to us would be more than doubled in America, so that it is not only a question of saving important things for England, but also at the same time of [obtaining] a real bargain’ (fig. 14). That Grosvenor was willing to take substantially less from British customers in this case may indicate that he preferred objects to remain in Britain where

---

819 “Lost Art Treasures”, The Times, October 20, 1925, 10.
821 Ibid.
823 VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, Murray bequest folder, MA/1/M3230, Cecil Harcourt-Smith, “Minute Paper,” May 18, 1918.
possible,\textsuperscript{824} although it must be noted that he had unsuccessfully attempted to sell this series in America during the five years previous, so his patriotism was a little belated. A later letter, written in 1948 by the V&A’s then assistant keeper of ceramics Edward Arthur Lane (1909–1963),\textsuperscript{825} also reflected a similar preoccupation with safeguarding panels from foreign buyers: ‘I wish we could have had it here! Anyhow, it is safe from America [as it is now in Burrell’s collection in Glasgow].\textsuperscript{826} The transatlantic nature of Thomas and Drake’s business was a factor that on at least one occasion even impeded Wilfred’s ability to acquire panels, and friend of the firm William Cole would even later note that many in the United Kingdom were critical of Thomas and Drake’s role in syphoning art treasures to America.\textsuperscript{827} When attempting to obtain on behalf of Burrell a series of sixteenth-century English armorials from the agents at Fawsley Hall (Northamptonshire), Wilfred suggested that his firm’s reputation may have played a part in the seller’s hesitancy: ‘It is possible of course that they may have thought that I contemplated buying the collection for America, this might account for their previous reluctance’.\textsuperscript{828}

Despite these impediments, Wilfred, an art-dealing novice, was able to make a remarkable range of European sales across his twenty-five years as sole head of the London branch. Although Wilfred was principally tasked with the workshop-based practical aspects associated with the handling of great volumes of ancient stained glass, at least forty-three customers bought directly from Wilfred, comparing relatively favourably with Roy’s entirely sales-focused American branch’s tally of seventy-five. Ten of Wilfred’s buyers were museums, four were art dealers, six were Oxbridge colleges, two were stained-glass artists, and the remaining twenty-one were private customers looking to furnish their homes or local churches.

\textsuperscript{824} Cole, \textit{King’s College}, 25.
\textsuperscript{825} “Mr Arthur Lane,” \textit{The Times}, March 8, 1963, 14.
\textsuperscript{826} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 31, Edward Arthur Lane, letter to Christopher Woodforde, December 9, 1948. This referred to a French sixteenth-century St John the Baptist window acquired from Blithfield Hall (Staffordshire); Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/417–24.
\textsuperscript{827} Cole, \textit{King’s College}, 25.
\textsuperscript{828} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.397, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, June 4, 1941, (Appendix B, document 411).
Museums

Combined with Grosvenor’s early sales, Thomas and Drake supplied the V&A with over a tenth of the stained-glass acquisitions the museum has made to date. Approximately 150 of their panels can be associated with Grosvenor or with Thomas and Drake, more than any other single vendor. The museum’s guide, published in 1936, noted that their holdings of stained glass had doubled in the preceding twenty years, underpinned by two large donations of glass from John Pierpont Morgan in 1919, and travel entrepreneur Ernest Edward Cook (1865–1955) in 1928, but also undoubtedly aided by the curators selecting liberally from Thomas and Drake’s large stocks during this period.

Starting in April 1924, Wilfred presented the museum’s curators with a series of small eighteenth-century panels signed by glass-painters. In communication with the museum, Wilfred revealed that he had been personally building a stock of examples of this kind, revealing the types of panels he had perhaps amassed independently of Grosvenor. Wilfred had reportedly ‘noticed’ the museum’s holdings were under-represented in panels of this type, and sought to rectify this. Confirming his interest in the subject, a significant body of research on the topic of glaziers’ marks and signatures had been compiled by Wilfred, posthumously published in 1955. Wilfred’s first donation of panels of this type was an English eighteenth-century piece depicting Samson, signed by the London glass-painter Eglinton Margaret Pearson (d.1823), followed in July 1924 by a German eighteenth-century signed panel; both were slightly damaged and so probably had minimal commercial value (fig. 91). In December 1925, the museum received three signed Dutch seventeenth-

833 V&A, Blythe House, Nominal Files, Wilfred Drake folder, MA/1/D1564, Wilfred Drake, letter to Bernard Rackham, April 6, 1924; V&A, acc. no. c.102-1924.
century panels from Wilfred, and in March 1927 they accepted a seventeenth-century panel signed by glass-painter Abraham van Linge (fl.1625–41) depicting The Deposition, which had been removed from Hampton Court Chapel (fig. 92).

Wilfred’s first sales to the museum coincided with these donations. In 1924, the museum purchased a German roundel depicting St Peter at the relatively low price of £5, in addition to two Flemish sixteenth-century roundels for £60 (equivalent to around £1,800 today). After an absence of five-years, in 1929 Wilfred sold a French thirteenth-century full-length Prophet to the museum (fig. 93). At £500 (equivalent to almost £17,000 today), this was a significant sale. Its companion panel was donated to the museum in 1983 by the ‘wife of Charles Bird’, given the similarities, it is likely that this panel had at some earlier stage also passed through Thomas and Drake’s business (fig. 94). At the same time, a pair of ‘cracked’ English fifteenth-century medallions was also sold to the museum, for £60, although they have since been deaccessioned, perhaps on account of their poor condition. In July 1930, the museum purchased a fifteenth-century English roundel depicting Mary Magdalene, which was said to have been obtained by Grosvenor in 1922 from Parkhurst House (Kent),

837 VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.1379-1924.
838 VAA, SMCG Department, object files for acc. nos. c.122-1924, c.1380-1924.
839 VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.125-1929.
840 Its counterpart, cut from exactly the same cartoon, was sold by Roy in 1937 to industrialist Aldus Higgins, and later gifted to the Worcester Museum of Art (see Chapter Two); Madeline Caviness, “Another Dispersed Window from Soissons: A Tree of Jesse in the Sainte-Chapelle Style,” Gesta, 20, no. 1 (1981): 191–98; WAM, acc. no. 1937.140.
841 VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.3-1983.
842 On or before 1929, another panel that had indirectly come through Thomas and Drake entered the museum’s holdings: an English sixteenth-century armorial donated by newspaper executive William Coker Iliffe (1874–1942). Iliffe had a townhouse in central London, at 16 Buckingham Street, and also a country estate, Moorcroft, in Surrey. It is not known if Iliffe ever installed this armorial in either of these residences before gifting it to the museum, but he stated he acquired the panel: ‘from a dealer in London, who was said to have picked it up somewhere in Buckinghamshire’, referring to Thomas and Drake and their collection of armorials acquired from Stowe Park (Buckinghamshire). The armorial depicts the bearings of the Piggot family, who lived in nearby Doddershall House (Buckinghamshire). Records at the V&A record a confused provenance for the panel, citing Dodington Hall (Lincolnshire) as the seat of the Pigotts. However, the family had in actuality sold this estate three centuries before the production of this panel, and so this cannot have been its original setting. VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.126-1929; “William Coker Iliffe,” The Times, October 2, 1942, 7.
843 VAA, object file for acc. no. c.213-13-1929.
but thought to have originated elsewhere, which the museum obtained for £50 (equivalent to around £1,700 today).

Coinciding with the global depression, from mid-1930 Wilfred’s sales to the museum ceased, but instead he began to act as middleman in their subsequent acquisitions of stained glass. The museum perhaps felt that they had obtained all they wanted from Wilfred’s stock, which rarely saw any new influxes of panels after Grosvenor’s death. Sending Wilfred to purchase panels on their behalf, rather than sending a member of their own staff, indicates the museum’s trust placed in the quality of Wilfred’s appraisals, and his bidding ability at auction. Beginning in May 1929, Wilfred secured a pair of Flemish sixteenth-century roundels at Christie’s (London) for £27. Around December 1930, Wilfred sold two ‘grisaille roundels’ to the museum on behalf of William Burrell, although it is unclear to which panels this sale relates. In May 1931, both of Thomas and Drake’s branches worked in unison as intermediaries in a transatlantic sale involving an ‘anonymous well-known private American collector’, who, Wilfred stated, was forced to sell his collection as he was ‘feeling the American financial depression’. This related to a pair of lancets representing saints Stephen and Lawrence, originally installed at Hampton Court Chapel (Herefordshire), but sold by Roy in June 1925 to New Yorkers Alice and Arthur Sachs (see Chapter Two, fig. 78). In 1930, Roy had obtained all of the Sachs’s ex-Thomas and Drake panels, and was probably selling them on commission. The saint panels were offered to the V&A for £4,000, but after curator of ceramics and stained glass Bernard Rackham (1876–1964) requested a

844 VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, Wilfred Drake folder, MA/1/D1564, Wilfred Drake, letter to Bernard Rackham, August 28, 1930.
847 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.58 William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, December 8, 1930 (Appendix A, document 64); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.60, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, December 28, 1930 (Appendix A, document 66).
848 VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, Wilfred Drake folder, MA/1/D1564, Wilfred Drake, letter to Bernard Rackham, June 12, 1931.
849 These panels were shown as having been bought but then returned by Arthur Sachs, before being resold to the V&A, according to further annotations; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 212–13, nos. 1257–57a; Caviness, New England, 44–45; Marks, Middle Ages, 59.
reduction,\textsuperscript{850} the deal was settled at £3,500 (equivalent to almost £117,000 today).\textsuperscript{851} Other panels that Thomas and Drake had acquired from Hampton Court Chapel had been cleaned and releded by Wilfred in 1925, and donated to Hereford Cathedral, where they were thought to have had originated.\textsuperscript{852}

Thomas and Drake acted as agents in further transatlantic sales, for example, in July 1935, when they worked on behalf of the executors of the American industrialist Frederick William Bruce (1856–1932), who at some unrecorded stage previously had purchased a composite English fourteenth-century lancet depicting Mary Magdalene from the firm’s Costessey stock (fig. 95).\textsuperscript{853} In correspondence with the museum, Wilfred explained that the panels had recently been placed in a sale at Christie’s, in May 1935, but had failed to meet their reserve.\textsuperscript{854} Through private sale the museum obtained the lancet for the fairly substantial sum of £500 (equivalent to over £18,000 today).\textsuperscript{855} Also from the Bruce collection, but this time acting on Burrell’s behalf, Wilfred secured a late fifteenth-century English panel depicting Princess Cecily, originally from the Royal Window at Canterbury Cathedral (see further below).\textsuperscript{856}

In December 1937, Wilfred’s agency was again central, to the museum’s acquisitions from the sale of the medieval collection of London businessman Frederick Sidney (1856–1932). Wilfred was able to secure four out of the requested six lots for the museum, at a total of

\textsuperscript{850} VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, Wilfred Drake folder, MA/1/D1564, Bernard Rackham, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 10, 1931.

\textsuperscript{851} VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, Wilfred Drake folder, MA/1/D1564, “Objects submitted,” July 10, 1931; V&A, acc. no. c.236-7-1931.

\textsuperscript{852} “Old Glass Found and Restored,” Journal of the British Society of Master Glass-Painters, 2, no. 2 (April 1925): 53; Eden, Restored to Hereford, 115–21; Aylmer, Hereford Cathedral, 315.

\textsuperscript{853} Drake, Costessey, 16, no. 61; VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, Wilfred Drake folder, MA/1/D1564, “Objects submitted c.881-1935,” July 29, 1935. Bruce had also purchased other panels from the Costessey Collection, either from Grosvenor in the early 1920s, or after from Thomas and Drake. According to a copy of the catalogue annotated by Wilfred, Bruce had also acquired a Flemish fifteenth-century Presentation in the Temple; Drake, Costessey, 17, no. 64.

\textsuperscript{854} VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, Wilfred Drake folder, MA/1/D1564, Wilfred Drake, letter to Bernard Rackham, July 25, 1935


\textsuperscript{856} This panel was in Arthur Radford’s collection before being purchased by Bruce; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.245, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, April 29, 1939 (Appendix A, document 254); Wells, Figure and Ornamental, 28.
£48.16.6 (equivalent to around £1,600 today), which afforded Wilfred a modest commission of £2.8.6 (roughly £110 today). Through Wilfred, a further four English fifteenth-century figural panels also entered the museum's collections a week later, presumably further spoils from the Sidney sale, at a cost of £55. Wilfred’s final involvement with the museum came in 1938 as part of another transatlantic deal, when he acted as an intermediary in the sale of a German fifteenth-century armorial, which had once formed part of the collection of newspaper mogul William Randolph Hearst (1863–1951). The museum acquired this medallion for the relatively high price of £280 (equivalent to around £9,000 today). The V&A effectively shut down from 1939 for the duration of the Second World War, and its collections were moved into safe storage. In 1955, after the deaths of both Wilfred and Roy, Roy’s widow Winifred Bartlett Thomas (1890–1970) worked to disperse the firm’s remaining stock. To her credit, she completed the final Thomas and Drake sale to the museum, selling a pair of French sixteenth-century roundels representing the Triumph of Death over the Church, for £200 (equivalent to around £9,000 today) (fig. 96).

A surviving Thomas and Drake advert, dating to either 1947 or 1948, outlined an array of the firm’s other museum customers. As these sales do not appear in Roy’s New York stock books, they are likely to refer to transactions originating in London, and made by either Grosvenor or, if after 1923, by Wilfred. The advert charted that their panels could be found

---

859 This was due in part to the curators’ being barred from making any acquisitions during the Second World War, a factor discussed with Burrell in 1944; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56,546, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, July 8, 1944 (Appendix C, document 565).
860 VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.289-1938.
862 See postscript for other sales made by Winifred.
863 Drake, Costessey, 18, nos. 74–75; VAA, SMCG Department, object file for acc. no. c.75-76-1955.
864 The advertisement lists Roy’s London studio, which he did not obtain until mid-1947, as well as Wilfred’s home address – he had died by September 1948 – placing the production of the advertisement sometime between those two dates. SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 45, “Thomas and Drake,” advertisement, 1947–48.
865 Ibid.
866 It has so far not been possible to trace these panels in the holdings of these collections, indicating that they have most likely been deaccessioned and sold, or that their files do not record Thomas and Drake as part of their provenance.
in the holdings of the Royal Museums of Fine Arts in Brussels (Belgium), as well as in the collections of the Basel and Zurich museums (Switzerland), the Danish Museum of Art and Design in Copenhagen (Denmark), the Karlsruhe and Regensburg museums (Germany), the Fodor Museum and Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam (the Netherlands), as well as the National Gallery of Victoria in Melbourne (Australia).  

Little is known of these sales. Roy’s stock books reveal that Melbourne’s National Gallery purchased a series of English sixteenth-century and Dutch seventeenth-century panels depicting the months of the year, although it is not now known in which year this deal occurred. Stock cards annotated by Wilfred reveal that in April 1936 sales were made to ‘Dr Aetena’, curator at Amsterdam’s Fodor Museum. Sales assigned to him included a Dutch seventeenth-century panel with a glass-painter’s signature (likely also initially sourced by Wilfred rather than Grosvenor), another showing a fish-market scene, a Dutch sixteenth-century roundel, and an English fifteenth-century angel fragment (fig. 97). Another sale was to ‘Dr Nicolaas Beets’ (1878–1963) of Amsterdam, curator at the Rijksmuseum; Beets acquired two Dutch roundels.

Other identifiable sales were brokered in August 1936 by Dr Hans Lehmann (1861–1946), director (1904–1936) of the Swiss National Museum in Zurich. On behalf of the museum he purchased a Swiss sixteenth-century panel, a signed Swiss seventeenth-century medallion depicting the Holy Ghost, and a possibly German sixteenth-century roundel depicting the Madonna and Child, which Wilfred had sold to the museum on behalf of London stained- 

---

867 Another Continental buyer was ‘Martin Lugt’, resident of Maartensdijk in Utrecht (the Netherlands). Three sixteenth-century Flemish panels were sold to him, as well as a Dutch seventeenth-century medallion depicting St John the Baptist; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 1150, 1374, 1383, 1439.  
869 According to Wilfred’s annotations, he removed a later inserted head, and plated one of these panels; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 116, 1193, 1418, 1430.  
871 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 47, nos. 1338, 1366.  
872 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, stock card no. 1546, 1890.  
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glass firm Clayton and Bell (fig. 98). The sale also saw the transfer of a sixteenth-century Flemish roundel from Roy’s New York stock. In late 1939, both Roy and Wilfred brokered a deal between the agents managing the dispersal of Hearst’s collection and the Swiss National Museum, which purchased a Swiss ‘banqueting scene’ at a price of £250. Moreover, in a letter of November 1939, Wilfred confirmed that the panels he had sold to the museums in Brussels and Amsterdam were of a sixteenth-century medallion type, and were sold at prices of ‘£10 or £15 each’.

**Trade Customers**

While Roy’s New York branch collaborated frequently with interior designers and art dealers (see Chapter Two), this type of custom featured less as part of Wilfred’s London operations. Europeans did not witness the same meteoric rise in wealth amongst the financial elite as their American counterparts, and many of their manor houses were in the process of being stripped of their antique furnishings, not embellished. Nevertheless, the London art dealers and decorators Cecil Leitch and Kerin of Bruton Place (New Bond Street) purchased at least twenty panels from Wilfred. Known as specialist sellers of ceramics, furniture, and sculpture, there has been no evidence until this emergence of their dealings with Wilfred of the firm’s having taken an interest in stained glass. Leitch and Kerin were likely acting on behalf of a specific client or clients; ten of their purchases, all dating to 1935, are annotated ‘for Glasgow’. Further information is revealed by the notes written on the stock cards for Leitch and Kerin’s 1936 purchases, listed as being on behalf of ‘Robert Lander’, surely referring to

---

873 Annotations state the panel was ‘submitted by Clayton and Bell’. It was not accorded a stock number, presumably as Wilfred did not own the panel, but was instead acting as a middleman in its sale; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54. These panels seem to have left the museum’s holdings since, as none provides a suitable match.


875 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.295, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, September 14, 1939 (Appendix B, document 306); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.319, Wilfred Drake, letter from Wilfred Drake to William Burrell, 13 December 1939 (Appendix B, document 330). At some stage, Wilfred had also supplied stained glass to the Bodleian Library, Jesus College, and Lincoln College (Oxford), and to Sidney Sussex College (Cambridge), although no further details are known; “Thomas and Drake,” advertisement, 1947–48, SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 47.

the antiques dealer of the same name based at 398 Sauchiehall Street (Glasgow). Twenty-five panels were sold to either Lander or Leitch and Kerin across a three-year period, suggesting that they were collaborating in some manner at this time. It may be that Leitch and Kerin’s 1935 consignments ‘for Glasgow’ were also destined for Lander’s shop, or for a shared client of theirs. Burrell, however, is unlikely to have been the recipient of these particular panels, as none matches with any known to have been in Burrell’s possession.

Leitch and Kerin’s purchases included a German seventeenth-century St Engelbert, as well as several Flemish sixteenth-century and Dutch seventeenth-century panels depicting Christ before Pilate, Christ Speaking the Parable, Christ Carrying the Cross, Christ before Felix, and saints John and Peter (fig. 99). A male saint, which was photographed as rectangular, was marked by Wilfred, ‘could be made square’ (fig. 100). Several of these also had notes on the reverse to suggest the ways in which they could be adapted, such as Wilfred’s recommendation on half of these: ‘could be divided to fill openings [of] 9¼”x 7 ¼ “’, which were presumably the proportions of the relatively modestly sized openings they needed to fill. In 1936, Wilfred (through Leitch and Kerin) supplied Lander with two Flemish sixteenth-century roundels (fig. 101). At an unrecorded stage, Lander also made purchases independently of Leitch and Kerin, although it can be presumed it was on or around the time of the purchases Leitch and Kerin had made on his behalf in the mid-1930s. Lander purchased four Dutch ovals, and a Dutch sixteenth-century panel depicting the Worshipping the Ark of the Covenant (fig. 102). In January 1937, Leitch and Kerin again appeared in Wilfred’s records, which may also have been for a customer or customers in Glasgow. Two sixteenth-century Flemish roundels were sold to them at this time, as well as panels depicting donors, a sixteenth-century Dutch windmill scene, a sixteenth-century English armorial, a Dutch or Flemish oval, a Flemish sixteenth-century panel depicting the Departure of the Prodigal Son, and a French sixteenth-century donor panel (fig. 103).

878 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 130, 465, 1207, 1240, 1247, 1375, 2055.  
879 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock card no. 1781.  
880 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 1364, 1461.  
881 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock card no. 158, 1080, 1102, 1178, 1188.  
Another of Wilfred’s trade customers, who purchased at least nine panels from Wilfred in 1943, was identified only as ‘Crowther’. Coinciding with the date of these stained-glass purchases, brothers Albert (1884–1957) and Alfred Crowther (1898–1978) had established Crowther’s of Syon Lodge in Twickenham (Middlesex, now Greater London), a nine-acre architectural salvage dealership based in an eighteenth-century property, and less than a mile from Wilfred’s Arts and Crafts-style home Casillis, also in Twickenham. It is possible that these panels were incorporated as part of the decoration of their showrooms, or that they were purchased on behalf of one of Crowther’s clients. Crowther purchased a range of panels, including a sixteenth-century Flemish shield, two Dutch seventeenth-century ovals, two Dutch sixteenth-century composite quatrefoils, a French sixteenth-century medallion depicting Moses, some English heraldic insignia, and two French sixteenth-century figure panels, many illustrated here for the first time (fig. 104).

According to Wilfred’s stock cards, at some stage Thomas and Drake were also buying and selling in collaboration with ‘Drury’, presumably referring to Alfred Drury (1868–1940), or his son Victor (1899–1988), of the London stained-glass firm Lowndes and Drury of the Glass House, Fulham. Lowndes and Drury accommodated many independent stained-glass artists and restorers at their studios, and Thomas and Drake were also known to have called upon their services, as already mentioned in Chapter One. Through their connections to the stained-glass community, and their own restoration work, it is likely that Lowndes and Drury came by a certain amount of old stained glass, and were presumably passing this to Wilfred, the only stained-glass dealer on their books. A series of eight English seventeenth-century panels depicting Roman Emperors were listed in Roy’s New York stock books as

884 “Mr Crowther,” The Times, June 18, 1957, 13.
885 This property was acquired in the 1920s, and was initially intended to be Albert’s family home; “A Dealers Life in Architectural Antiques,” New York Times, August 4, 1983, 12.
886 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 1109, 1259, 1299, 1715, 1717, 1850, 1869, 1887, 1920. Sales were also made to art dealer, etcher and sculptor Leon Richeton (1855–1934). His obituary stated: ‘as an art expert in general, Mr Richeton was well known in art dealers’ circles, and his house in St John’s Wood is museum-like’; “Leon Richeton,” The Times, September 4, 1934, 18. Richeton acquired five panels from Wilfred – two Flemish donor panels, a Dutch seventeenth-century oval, and two French seventeenth-century ovals; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 1174, 1242, 1459, 1471, 1475.
887 Notably, Lowndes and Drury undertook restoration work at Salisbury Cathedral during this period; Sarah Brown, Sumptuous and Richly Adorn’d: The Decoration of Salisbury Cathedral, Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (London: Stationary Office, 1999), 80, 110.
having been sold in London ‘per Drake and Drury’. Moreover, three English fifteenth-century composite roundels from Drury were sold to the Philadelphia Museum (see Chapter Two).

Other sales connected to Lowndes and Drury can also be identified. Edinburgh- and London-based glass-painter Herbert Hendrie (1887–1946), who, like Wilfred, used the Glass House’s workshop facilities, had purchased or was given a much-damaged Dutch roundel from Wilfred in 1937 (fig. 105). Another stained-glass artist, Horace Wilkinson (1866–1957) – who had previously been associated with Wilfred’s former Exeter-based family business Drake and Sons, and with some of Thomas and Drake’s former London collaborators (Burlison and Grylls, and Clayton and Bell) – was also noted to have purchased a Dutch roundel depicting ‘a female saint’ from Wilfred at an unknown date (fig. 106). When Winifred was selling the last remaining stock, a Flemish roundel was also obtained by Francis Spear (1902–1979) in February 1955, who from at least 1935 to 1941 had rented a studio at Lowndes and Drury’s premises.

**Wilfred’s Private Commissions, Restorations, and Alterations**

As has been demonstrated throughout, Wilfred Drake had a sound practical pedigree, and this was likely the principal factor that brought him in contact with the Thomases in the first place. However, Wilfred’s handling of Thomas and Drake’s stained glass went beyond simply fixing panels; his alterations were often the result of deliberate aesthetic choices, sometimes drastically changing the shapes and sizes of panels; some of this has already been shown in relation to the firm’s American customers. On occasion, these changes were made in order to attract buyers, but often Wilfred would adapt panels after sale, acting according to the needs of individual customers as part of his arrangements for them. Many of his private customers favoured heraldic displays, and like the Americans, many had just acquired, or

---

889 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 53, stock cards nos. 1743, 1746, 1748.
890 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock card no. 944.
891 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock card no. 1658.
893 Lord Chancellor Viscount Frederick Maugham (1866–1958) of Kensington Park Road (a matter of minutes from Wilfred’s workshop) bought, or was given, a Flemish roundel; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock card no. 1945. Another single sale or gift was a sixteenth-century Swiss
were in the process of redecorating or enlarging, their country retreats, with Wilfred designing and arranging numerous displays for country-house owners and their local churches.

**Making of Composite Panels**

Thomas and Drake’s stock cards show at least 146 composite quatrefoil panels in their collection, most likely created by Wilfred from leftover fragments (fig. 107). Composed using pieces of sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century stained glass, they were cut and reordered to form a central rectangle, with four radiating pointed lobes. Presumably the quatrefoil shape would have given these panels a prettiness or complexity over that of an ordinary rectangular panel, more suggestive of an architectural opening. Most were just 11 x 7 inches, a size easy to accommodate in any standard home. Annotations show that in America at least, Roy sent photographs of these quatrefoils to potential buyers, noting: ‘a number of these quatrefoils are available, ranging in subject, style and size’. Some had $85 written on them, and others $150, equivalent to a relatively affordable £100–£200 today. However, these panels ultimately proved unpopular amongst buyers; they were ultimately scraps of glass leaded together, and did not approach any of the sorts of high-quality pieces Thomas and Drake were known for. Only 32 out of 146 were ever recorded as having been sold, mostly to American buyers, underlining that this was not a completely successful venture.

**Returning Panels to a Uniform Age**

A great number of the panels in the stock of Thomas and Drake, and other dealers, arrived at Wilfred’s workshop exhibiting various stages of earlier repairs and insertions. It was commonplace amongst glaziers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to
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894 Many of these are shown on stock cards, for example, SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, stock card no. 1738.
895 See SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, nos. 929, 1196, and 1722 for examples of these types of annotations.
return panels to a specific style or date by removing these later additions; replacing them with glass that appeared, or was of the same date as, the original pieces. Solutions varied. Wilfred’s technique often aligned with that of the V&A’s former consultant Lewis Day. Day’s 1897 book, *Windows: A Book about Stained and Painted Glass*, argued that modern glass was a pale imitation of old, and stated that the adding of new glass ‘thinned the effect of colour by diluting the old glass with new [...] the merest jumble of old glass, more especially if it be all of one period or quality, is far better’. Adding in ‘glass of the period’ was seen frequently in Wilfred’s restorations for Burrell. For example, a fifteenth-century panel depicting an archbishop acquired in 1928, Wilfred suggested ‘could be improved by putting in some fifteenth-century blue glass’, in replacement of several modern insertions. To this end, two distinct sections of background to the left and right of the archbishop’s robes are by Wilfred’s hand (fig. 108). Moreover, panels depicting ‘angels holding scrolls’, and a ‘female donor panel’, were prepared in this manner before being installed in Burrell’s drawing room in June 1928. The deep-blue background sections, and probably some of the red sections too, were inserted by Wilfred (fig. 109). At the same time, Burrell requested that Wilfred make ‘pairs’ of panels, adding in new backgrounds made from medieval glass, to make ordinarily disparate panels appear as matching sets. This included the pairing of two English fifteenth-century angels, whereby sunburst motifs and blue and red glass were inserted by Wilfred in order to add a level of aesthetic uniformity to the panels (fig. 110). Almost all of the small medallion panels installed in the dining room, hall, and drawing room at Hutton Castle, as well as further panels elsewhere in the property, are actually composite panels made to look aesthetically similar by Wilfred.

In a similar manner, in the 1940s Wilfred restored four fourteenth-century panels, originally part of a *Jesse Tree* window at Selby Abbey (North Yorkshire), for Philip Nelson by removing
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901 Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/55–56.
modern glass and adding in old.\textsuperscript{902} This was a practice viewed largely as problematic by those who thought it more honest to retain later interventions and mix old glass with new.\textsuperscript{903} Nelson has previously argued that a private collector’s home was not, and nor should it be expected to be, an ‘archaeological museum’, and so stringent restoration principles should not apply, thereby sanctioning Wilfred’s approach.\textsuperscript{904} In a similar way, when Burrell acquired a much-damaged English fourteenth-century \textit{Crucifixion} panel (originally from Sutton Courtenay Manor, Berkshire) from Roy in April 1939, glass of a similar period and tone was needed to fill missing sections of background.\textsuperscript{905} Around the same time, Wilfred had attended the London auction of the medieval collection of late American industrialist Frederick William Bruce (1856–1932). On Constance Burrell’s behalf he secured a late fifteenth-century English panel depicting \textit{Princess Cecily}, originally from Canterbury Cathedral.\textsuperscript{906} Burrell proposed: ‘I was thinking, if you consider it suitable, that part of the blue background of the Cecily panel might be used for the ‘kite’ part of the crucifixion panel?’.\textsuperscript{907} As per Burrell’s instructions, days later Wilfred confirmed that Cecily had been ‘cut down’,\textsuperscript{908} and the pieces inserted in an entirely new background in the \textit{Crucifixion} panel (fig. 111).\textsuperscript{909} However, even at the MMA, a French thirteenth-century grisaille lancet, which Roy had sold in 1936, was also subjected to this treatment, underlining that it was not just a practice used in domestic displays. The museum files confirm that Wilfred had substituted ‘poor and

\textsuperscript{903} Wilfred’s technique was also at odds with Arts and Crafts practitioners such as Christopher Whall (1849–1924), who stated that the patching of panels with glass from other windows was ‘sinful’, proposing the use of modern glass instead. It was also at odds with the published works of Charles Winston (1814–1864) and later Hugh Arnold and John Dolbel Le Couteur (1883–1925), which argued that missing sections of stained glass should be filled with clear or green-tinted glass and left unpainted; Whall, \textit{Stained Glass Work}, 180, 238; Arnold, \textit{Glass of the Middle Ages}, 71; Le Couteur, \textit{Winchester}, 143–44.
\textsuperscript{904} Nelson, \textit{Ancient Painted Glass}, 49, 262.
\textsuperscript{905} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box, 44, stock book i, 82–83, no. 2052; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.241, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, April 5, 1939 (Appendix A, document 250); Wells, \textit{Figure and Ornamental}, 19. Burrell had paid Thomas and Drake £35 for the \textit{Crucifixion} in 1939, the equivalent of just over £1,000 today. Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/23.
\textsuperscript{906} This panel was previously in Arthur Radford’s collection; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.245, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, April 29, 1939 (Appendix A, document 254).
\textsuperscript{907} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{908} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.248, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, May 8, 1939 (Appendix A, document 257); Wells, \textit{Figure and Ornamental}, 28.
\textsuperscript{909} Wilfred’s brother Maurice criticised this technique, recounting the case of an unnamed glazier at Exeter Cathedral in the 1870s who had cut up a panel, reusing the pieces to create colourful backgrounds and borders; Drake, \textit{English Glass-Painting}, 3–4.
restored pieces for good ones of the period’, as requested by the curators. On inspection of the grisaille, it is clear that while the borders are also of thirteenth-century date, they are not original to the panel, and so are likely to have been composed by Wilfred (fig. 112).

Wilfred stockpiled coloured fragments of old glass for these sorts of repairs; commonly obtained from his niece, Daphne, who on Maurice’s death ran the Drake and Sons’ firm, becoming the first female workshop leader. Often Burrell requested that Wilfred pair unrelated panels in specific sizes or colours, necessitating a certain amount of adaption. For example, ‘old ruby glass’ from this source was used in 1928 in the creation of a sunburst border that Wilfred added to a panel depicting a Virgin Playing an Instrument. Only the central figure of the angel was left untouched by Wilfred, the background and borders are all his hand (fig. 113). Again, in early 1929 Wilfred added borders of ‘old glass’ to two fifteenth-century panels containing the arms of the bishop of Exeter; the depth of colour of this glass was said to have particularly appealed to Burrell, so Wilfred was acting according to his clients’ needs. In 1944, a fourteenth-century ‘censing angel’ head panel was separated from a fifteenth-century figure of St Protasius, and its modern borders removed. Wilfred had drawn this composite window before he began cutting it up, showing how it had been displayed by George Eumorfopolous, its previous owner (fig. 114). Before Grosvenor had sold St Protasius to Eumorfopolous in 1918, it was photographed and

910 MMA, Medieval Department, object file for acc. no. 36.109, “Memorandum”.
914 William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, February 6, 1929, GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.38 (Appendix A, document 41).
915 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.526, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, May 20, 1944 (Appendix C, document 542); Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/28, 45/387.
published in the *Burlington Magazine*, a record that makes the various changes starkly evident (fig. 115).

**Mixing of Old and New Glass**

Wilfred’s approach differed however depending on the type of client. He executed several works for patrons of churches that mixed ancient and modern glass, such as in his three-light east window at St Mary’s Church in Melbury Sampford (Dorset), a private chapel within the grounds of Melbury House, the country seat of the 6th earl of Ilchester, Giles Fox-Strangways (1874–1959). His main London residence, seventeenth-century Holland House, was very near Wilfred’s Holland Park Road workshop. Wilfred had set twelve English fifteenth-century armorials within modern ornamental glass borders, and designs by him exist for the Melbury Sampford window with accompanying tracery. A vidimus for this window, stamped ‘4 March 1938’, and confirming the Salisbury Diocesan Advisory Committee’s approval of Wilfred’s scheme, gives an indication as to Wilfred’s period of involvement with this project (fig. 116). A similar arrangement was adopted for Riverside Church (New York), where Wilfred set Flemish roundels into modern quarry surrounds.

Again, at St Andrew’s Church (Watford), Wilfred installed nine seventeenth-century Flemish roundels, adding modern strawberry- and hawthorn-leaf borders between lion masks and green-man motifs. Another of Wilfred’s glazing projects relates to acquisitions made by Lady Helen Duncombe Vincent (1866–1954), Viscountess of D’Abernon, who was recorded in contemporary correspondence to have selected several roundels from Wilfred in 1939.
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918 Edward Walford, “Holland House and its History,” in *Old and New London*, 5, ed. Edward Walford and Walter Thornbury (London: Cassell, Petter and Galpin, 1892), 161–77. Holland House was largely destroyed after a bombing raid on the night of 27 September 1940. Wilfred noted in contemporary correspondence: ‘The districts of Kensington have been severely damaged and bombs have fallen on Holland House, Holland Park Road, Holland Road, Melbury Road and Kensington High Street inflicting serious damage and great loss of life’; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.368, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, October 31, 1940 (Appendix B, document 382).
919 Private Collection, Wilfred Drake, “East Window, Melbury Church,” 1938; shared by Frances Page.
920 Ibid.
921 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 37, “Window design, Riverside Church.”
922 ‘Lady D’Abernon is calling here on Thursday afternoon to select another roundel in place of ‘St George with ruby border’ [...] she has kept the annunciation’; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence,
During her visit to Wilfred’s studio, she purchased a panel depicting the Annunciation, as well as several other panels that were not described in detail in this correspondence. She and her husband, politician Edgar Vincent (1857–1941), had settled at his family estate Stoke D’Abernon Manor in Cobham (Surrey) from by 1936 at the latest. Thomas and Drake’s surviving 1940s advertisement reveals that Wilfred designed and executed a window for St Andrew’s Church, adjoining their manor, and it is therefore likely that Lady Helen’s visit to Wilfred’s workshop related to this commission.

Just a year later, in July 1940, as part of wartime safeguarding, Lady Helen had employed Wilfred to remove the valuable stained glass in the church. In an undated letter, likely to be from the mid-1950s, Roy’s wife Winifred confirmed that Thomas and Drake had sold further panels to the church, stating: ‘I can look up the schemes my husband [Roy] made for Stoke D’Abernon, where Costessey panels were used with others’. Roy’s New York stock books record the sale of eleven medallions to ‘Stoke D’Abernon Church’ in 1955, in a deal that can only have been negotiated by Winifred, as both Roy and Wilfred had died by this time. This sale included several English fifteenth-century panels depicting St Edmund, the Crucifixion, and Angels, as well as several Flemish sixteenth-century medallions, and a German trefoil.

Strawberry- or hawthorn-leaf borders can frequently be seen in panels associated with Thomas and Drake. William Cole, collector and friend of the firm, noted: ‘Roy Thomas in fact told me that this type of border was made by Drake’. Wilfred confirms in 1939 that he
had twenty sixteenth-century medallions in his stock with these modern ‘floral’ borders, which he stated were ‘copied from an example at South Kensington Museum’, adding they ‘could be removed if desired’. They bear a striking resemblance to the surround of a sixteenth-century Flemish roundel depicting St John the Baptist Preaching in the V&A’s collection (fig. 117), corroborating Wilfred’s account. The stock card for a roundel in Thomas and Drake’s stock depicting the Execution of St John the Baptist was annotated ‘Flemish 16th Century with modern floral border’, as was another depicting the Crowning with Thorns (fig. 118). Several sixteenth-century Flemish panels previously in Frederick Sidney’s collection were also enclosed in borders of this type, perhaps also made by Wilfred. One of these, a panel depicting Christ in the House of Martha, was purchased by Burrell in February 1940 (fig. 119).

There is a chance that Wilfred supplied or inspired another firm with his distinctive foliate borders. Such surrounds survive on roundels installed at St George’s School in Harpenden (Hertfordshire), by Ernest Heasman (1874–1927), as well as at the Old House in Wisley (Surrey), where four modern roundels depicting the four seasons have these borders (fig. 120). Further strawberry-leaf borders encircle seventeenth-century Flemish roundels in St Mary’s Church in Swardeston (Norfolk), where Heasman had designed a three-light east memorial window in 1917, although this is a variation on the normal template used by Wilfred and Heasman (fig. 121). Heasman received his initial training in the London studio

934 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, nos. 2091, 2155.
935 Potiphar’s Wife was acquired by William Cole on 30 May 1958 from an auction at Sotheby’s, London; University of York, William Cole Papers, William Cole, “William Cole Collection Catalogue.” This panel is now at the Fitzwilliam Museum (Cambridge), acc. no. 36-1985. Another of this set, The Wedding of Tobias and Sara, is found in Durham Cathedral’s Galilee Chapel.
936 Wells, Figure and Ornamental, 48.
938 Strickland, “Heasman,” 33.
939 Nicholas Pevsner, Buildings of England, Norfolk 2: North West and South, 2nd edn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 688. Memorial windows dedicated in 1923 to George Chancellor (d.1922) of Cheshington Hall at St Mary’s Church (Cheshington) also bear stylistic similarities. Winifred Thomas also sold selected panels to St Mary’s in the 1950s, see postscript; University of York, William Cole Papers, William Cole, letter to William Wells, October 25, 1968; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book II, 106–07, nos. 2152, 2180, 3001.
of Charles Eamer Kempe (1837–1907) before joining the London glazier Herbert Bryans (1856–1925), and then establishing his own workshop by 1922. Cole suggested a link between the firms, proposing that Heasman may have been one of their subcontracted workers, or that Heasman was using Wilfred as a source of stained glass, and getting him to make arrangements of ancient glass for his own commissions.

Wilfred had also supplied and arranged medieval and Renaissance panels set in modern painted quarries to ‘Mrs John Dewar of Dutton Homestall’ (West Sussex). Fourteenth-century Homestall Manor was purchased in 1907 by Lord ‘Tommy’ Dewar (d.1930), a Scottish whisky distiller and horse breeder. On his death, the estate, distillery, and a million pounds in cash passed to his nephew ‘Lucky’ John Dewar (1891–1954). By 1932, Lucky had married Paris-based, Johannesburg-born Kathleen McNeill Dewar (1900–1966), and the manor became their main weekend retreat, but was quickly identified as too small for their entertaining needs. By the mid-1930s, the Dewars purchased Dutton Hall (Cheshire), a Tudor mansion, which they had labelled, dismantled, and reassembled adjoining Homestall Manor, creating the composite Dutton Homestall complex. It is not known when the Dewars made their purchases of stained glass, but it is likely to have coincided with this phase of work. In a letter dated September 2, 1938, Wilfred had remarked that he had just returned from ‘East Grinstead’, where the house was located. By 1939, the house had been requisitioned by the British military for wartime use, and so it can be safely assumed that the stained glass was already in place by this time.

943 “Lord Dewar,” The Times, April 12, 1930, 14.
944 “Lucky Dewar to Marry,” Straits Times, April 23, 1932, 11.
945 “Mr Dewar,” The Times, August 17, 1954, 8.
946 Another of Wilfred’s customers had transferred a sixteenth-century Tudor mansion to a new site. Wilfred’s stock cards list ‘W J Payne, of Flowton Priory’ in Harpenden (Hertfordshire), which in 1928 was moved from its original rural location in Flowton (Suffolk) to the town of Harpenden; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 1902, 1234. The house was auctioned on 22 June 1933; it is not currently known if ‘Payne’ was the owner pre- or post-1933; “Auctions,” The Times, June 7, 1933, 24.
Although the contents of the house were later auctioned by Kathleen Dewar in 1957, the stained glass remained in place.\footnote{948} When the private property was last advertised for sale in 2009, images in the sales brochure show circular medieval medallions in the upper sections of the bay windows flanking the main entrance to the house, in addition to heraldic panels set in enamel-painted quarries in the ‘solar’, a large oak-vaulted reception room (fig. 122).\footnote{949} Further photographs show what look to be ten sixteenth-century Dutch or Flemish roundels depicting biblical scenes, as well as scenes from the life of \textit{St Martin and a Madonna and Child}, all with the same matching modern foliate borders added by Wilfred (fig. 123). Stock cards exist for several of these, and show that several of the panels did not have these borders beforehand, but were of the same type as a roundel sold in New York to skyscraper-builder William Aiken Starrett (1877–1932; fig. 124).\footnote{950} Wilfred noted on the reverse of several of these stock cards that the panels had been ‘repaired’, and so it is possible that the numerous mending leads were inserted by him.\footnote{951} Wilfred was also probably responsible for the plain quarry glazing at the property, as a surviving drawing suggests (fig. 125).\footnote{952}

Wilfred also designed heraldic displays for Lady Iva Conway (1895–1953), wife of mountaineer and art critic Sir Martin Conway (1856–1937).\footnote{953} Lady Conway had inherited twelfth-century Saltwood Castle (Kent) from her first husband, businessman Reginald Lawrence Lawson (d.1930), who in December 1930 was found shot dead in the grounds.\footnote{954} Parts of the castle, including the north-western wings,\footnote{955} were restored by London- and

\footnote{950} Starrett was director in Starrett Brothers and Eken, who in 1930 built the Empire State Building. His purchases were made some time after 1930, when construction of the Empire State Building was under way (as the stock cards record Starrett as ‘builder of the Empire State Building’) and before 1932, when Starrett died. Two seventeenth-century Dutch secular roundels, and a Dutch eighteenth-century armorial window went to him from Wilfred’s stock in London; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 1833, 1839.
\footnote{951} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, nos. 28, 39, 43, 47, 149, 798, 1370, 1958.
\footnote{952} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 47, Wilfred Drake, “Designs for Dutton Homestall.”
\footnote{954} Lawson also owned Hurstmonceux Castle (East Sussex). Thomas and Drake’s Belhus collection had been transferred to Belhus from there at some stage in the nineteenth century; ‘Lawson Found Shot’, \textit{The Times}, December 19, 1930, 9.
\footnote{955} “Fire at Saltwood Castle,” \textit{The Times}, November 27, 1937, 9.
Devin-based architect Philip Tilden (1887–1956) between 1936 and 1939; this work reportedly included the alteration of window openings in the great hall and elsewhere. Presumably Wilfred’s proposed glazing schemes corresponded with some of these modifications, although it is not known if they were executed exactly as drawn. Wilfred’s surviving plans show designs for two small windows in a cloak room, as well as a larger three-light window with tracery for the great hall. Wilfred’s designs for the latter included a plain-glazed lower register, with armorial bearings set in the upper tier and traceries (fig. 126). Similarly, a series of Wilfred’s plans survive for windows at seventeenth-century Jacobean mansion Bramshill House (Hampshire), which by 1935 was the home of brewery heir and politician Baron Brocket, Ronald Nall-Cain (1904–1967). Wilfred’s window set armorials in clear quarries in the oriel window in the great hall, where they remain in situ (fig. 127). Wilfred had been working at Bramshill House from at least September 1938, and so his designs presumably relate to that time period.

A minority of Wilfred’s customers did not opt for an overtly heraldic stained-glass display. Amongst these was building contractor and amateur painter James Arundel (1875–1960), owner of sixteenth-century Locksley Hall (Lincolnshire) from 1921. During the 1920s, Arundel had extended the property substantially using architectural salvages from elsewhere, before embarking on a comprehensive redecoration, which included an extensive glazing campaign supervised by the York-based glass-painter John Ward Knowles (1838–1931). Although the hall incorporated some examples of heraldic stained glass, drawn from various sources, none was supplied by Wilfred. Instead, he supplied a series of probably seventeenth-century Dutch or Flemish male and female figural medallions for installation in

958 Private Collection, Wilfred Drake, “Designs for Bramshill House,” shared by Frances Page; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.166, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, September 5, 1938 (Appendix A, document 175). By 1940, the house had been requisitioned by the military, and so it can be assumed Wilfred had finished work there well before this.
the gallery (fig. 128).\textsuperscript{961} Wilfred’s surviving invoice, dated July 1936,\textsuperscript{962} reveals that he also arranged and leaded panels for a composite window, consisting of fragments taken from a French sixteenth-century Doom Window.\textsuperscript{963}

Despite Burrell’s aversion to modern interventions, seen in his stipulation to have new glass removed from many of his panels, new glass seems to have been tolerated in some cases. It was used to fill missing sections in a series of twenty-two seventeenth-century Dutch panels. Burrell did not hold these panels in high regard, as will be later discussed, their low status perhaps explaining why he tolerated the use of modern materials.\textsuperscript{964} Burrell had requested that these small panels be made oval, regardless of whether some were originally square or rectangular. This necessitated much cutting of original glass, as well as the rearrangement and insertion of old and modern fragments to form the oval’s curves. On occasion, Wilfred selected and reused fragments that had some level of stylistic affinity with the surviving original pieces, often flipping stopgaps in order to continue a pattern or line more seamlessly.\textsuperscript{965}

The total reshaping of a panel was something that Wilfred had also done on a fifteenth-century quatrefoil, which he made into a trefoil for Burrell.\textsuperscript{966} At least three English fifteenth-century armorials, acquired by Burrell in 1942, were also subjected to this same style of treatment, suggesting that this may have also been a technique Wilfred used as a solution to wartime shortages.\textsuperscript{967} Cold-painting was a far cheaper alternative to the costs associated with using a kiln. However, many of the modern insertions were crudely cold-painted with opaque oil paints, which stand in contrast to the original translucent glass-paint (fig. 129). Frequently, cold paint can be seen not only on the surface of the new glass, but also coated

\textsuperscript{961} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 623, 1476, 1928, 1940.
\textsuperscript{962} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards no. 201.
\textsuperscript{963} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards no. 222.
\textsuperscript{964} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.398, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 9, 1941 (Appendix B, document 412).
\textsuperscript{965} For example, acc. no. 45/572; information provided by Marie Stumpff.
\textsuperscript{966} This can be seen on stock card GTD.175 (SAL, box 37).
over the surrounding leads,\textsuperscript{968} indicating that Wilfred spent little time on this part of their transformation, or delegated this task to an inexperienced apprentice (fig. 130).

The use of cold paint was not only a feature of Wilfred’s later repairs, but had practical applications, such as when he transported some of the glass he had sold. Often, for example, Wilfred would send panels unaccompanied to Burrell, and doubtless to other customers, by passenger train.\textsuperscript{969} The stained glass was insured against damage caused in transit, and so in order to differentiate between stable cracks he did not want to fix with visually disruptive repair leads, and fresh damage, Wilfred would mark pre-existing breaks with cold paint. He explained: ‘all the old cracks in the glass have been touched in on the back with black colour so that you will know that these have not been caused in transit’.\textsuperscript{970} Several panels still have surviving markings of this kind (fig. 131).\textsuperscript{971}

When Wilfred did have cause to insert new lead repairs to stabilise cracks, he commonly used very narrow 2 mm round-profile lead, surviving for example on panels owned by Burrell, such as one depicting \textit{St John}, restored by Wilfred in 1928, and throughout the Dutch seventeenth-century series.\textsuperscript{972} Thomas and Drake likely milled this lead themselves in their workshop from at least the 1940s.\textsuperscript{973} Use of this lead, so closely aligned with the original, indicates that Wilfred attempted to make his restorations, and his lead insertions, as unobtrusive as possible (fig. 132).\textsuperscript{974} Wilfred also rarely releaded panels,\textsuperscript{975} stating that he valued the lead matrix as a vital part of the history and genuineness of a panel, demonstrating a respect for historic leads that was rare at this time.\textsuperscript{976} Consequently, stained

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{968} Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/244.  \\
\textsuperscript{969} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.19, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 23, 1928 (Appendix A, document 19).  \\
\textsuperscript{970} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.10, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, April 19, 1928 (Appendix A, document 10).  \\
\textsuperscript{971} This was a procedure favoured by the V&A at this time also.  \\
\textsuperscript{972} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.24, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, July 15, 1928 (Appendix A, document 24).  \\
\textsuperscript{973} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, Roy Thomas, letter to Dennis King, November 9, 1952.  \\
\textsuperscript{974} Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/570.  \\
\textsuperscript{975} Many of Wilfred’s leads have a visible surface sheen, probably a varnish or polish used to coat and protect the lead and dull its new appearance. This probably served to enhance the depth of colour, by increasing the contrast and definition between the lead and glass, as discussed by Maurice Drake in \textit{English Glass-Painting}, 13.  \\
\textsuperscript{976} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.217, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, March 2, 1939 (Appendix A, document 226).
\end{flushleft}
glass of the Burrell collection, which Wilfred worked on extensively, contains a remarkable
number of panels still with their medieval lead nets completely intact, immeasurably increasing their historical and technical importance. Wilfred instead favoured stabilising the panels in other ways, such as in 1928, when he added new surrounding leads to a French or German sixteenth-century panel depicting Joachim and Anna (fig. 133).\footnote{Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/389. Many of Thomas and Drake’s leads had a repeating cross at their core, first noted by Linda Cannon, “Lead Milling Marks from a Sixteenth-Century Window,” Glass, Ceramics and Related Material (1986): 985–86. This was probably the mark of a lead supplier, or lead mill manufacturer, as other firms have also used lead of this type, such as the Dublin workshop of Harry Clarke (1889–1931), as revealed by recent conservation of the eighteenth-century east window at Agher Church by the York Glazier’s Trust in 2016; with thanks to Emma Newman. London’s Burlison and Grylls had also used this lead in the late nineteenth century, for example in their restoration of the sixteenth-century Flemish Herkenrode glass at Lichfield Cathedral (Staffordshire); with thanks to Keith Barley, who conserved this cycle between 2009 and 2016.} Again, in February 1939, a French thirteenth-century panel depicting the Marriage at Cana was said to have contained ‘weak’ original lead, but rather than replace it as a matter of course, which was commonplace among many other studios during the period, Wilfred instead carefully strengthened it with putty (fig. 134).\footnote{GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52.56/209, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, February 23, 1939 (Appendix A, document 219); Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/366.}

William Burrell, and the Glazing of his Homes

Glasgow-born millionaire William Burrell was, alongside his older brother George (1858–1927), a partner in their family’s shipbuilding business Burrell and Son (established c. 1850).\footnote{Burrell’s business and early life has been summarised by Marks, Portrait, 27–40.} From around 1916, 55-year-old Burrell was in a position to take early retirement, enabling him to focus more seriously on the acquisition, furnishing, and full-time occupation of a country estate.\footnote{Marks, Portrait, 57.} His tastes were wide ranging, and included Persian and Indian rugs, Chinese porcelains, northern European tapestries, contemporary European paintings and sculpture, and medieval European stained glass, all of which now form the over 8,000 artworks of the Burrell Collection (Glasgow), which opened as a museum in 1983. Reflecting on his collection in 1951, Burrell mused: ‘our collection of stained glass is large, and stained glass, to my mind, is one of the most beautiful of all the arts’;\footnote{GMRC, Andrew Hannah Papers, William Burrell, letter to Andrew Hannah, February 4, 1951.} accordingly his collection is particularly strong in this medium. William Wells (1913–2003), appointed as the second keeper of the Burrell Collection (1956–1978),\footnote{“William Wells”, Glasgow Herald, October 2, 2003, 15.} initially conservatively estimated that
Burrell’s stained glass holdings numbered around 567 panels and windows. This was in fact an extremely modest approximation; its true size easily exceeds 700. At its height, the collection was even larger, as the larger figure excludes at least 107 panels and windows, which by June 1941 had been sorted and placed in boxes, and which Burrell had declared: ‘are not to form part of the collection, but are to be sold’.

Burrell’s collection of stained glass should really be regarded as falling into two distinct groups. From the 1890s to the mid-1930s, Burrell collected with the furnishing of his homes in mind, in much the same way as Thomas and Drake’s other customers. Panels forming part of this group represent around 300 of Burrell’s holdings in the medium, and closely reflect his own personal tastes. His second group of around 400 panels was formed from the mid-1930s to the early 1950s; this coincided with his decision to gift the collection to the Glasgow Corporation (later renamed Glasgow City Council), who would become the owners and custodians of Burrell’s collection, founding the museum that now bears his name. These acquisitions of stained glass were funded by Burrell only to satisfy the need to form a comprehensive museum collection, and did not necessarily accord with what is known of Burrell’s own tastes. Burrell commonly stored these panels unopened in boxes in outhouses in the grounds of his home, or arranged for them to be sent straight to Glasgow, having never seen them in the flesh.

The Church of Scotland’s doctrinal opposition to decoration and imagery largely barred what would ordinarily have been a major source of employment from many in the stained-glass industry there, and so medieval and Renaissance stained glass is a rarity in Scotland. Even at author Sir Walter Scott’s early nineteenth-century home Abbotsford (Scottish Borders), neighbouring Burrell’s estate, modern heraldic shields were glazed into several openings in his armoury. However, Scott had to turn to an amateur stained-glass artist in the creation of these panels, Elizabeth Nasmyth (1793–1862), the Edinburgh-born wife of his friend, William Wells, “Some notes on the Stained Glass in the Burrell Collection in Glasgow Art Gallery,” *Journal of the British Society of Master Glass-Painters*, 12 (1961): 277–80.

GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.401, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 24, 1941 (Appendix B, document 415).

playwright Daniel Terry (1780–1829). However, the Scottish stained-glass industry showed sufficient development in the nineteenth-century for Edinburgh-based glaziers Ballantine and Allan to receive the commission to glaze the Houses of Parliament (London) in the 1840s. Although Aberdeen-born Douglas Strachan (1875–1950) maintained a heavy presence in Scotland after returning there in the early 1900s, following Scotland’s partial Renaissance in the medium, other successful Scottish artists, such as Daniel Cottier (1837–1891) and Charles Rennie Mackintosh (1868–1928), had quickly established their main bases in New York and London. Due in part to a general Scottish skill shortage, many high-profile glazing projects in Scotland passed to foreign firms. Most notably, a rare Church of Scotland commission, the glazing of Glasgow Cathedral’s transepts, choir, and nave, was designed and executed by the Munich-based Königliche Glasmalereianstalt between 1859 and 1864. This scheme proved to be both unpopular and a technical failure, prompting even Burrell to later lament: ‘that awful Munich glass […] largely ruined that Cathedral, it makes one sick’.

Despite Burrell’s condemnation of this modern glazing, his own first involvement with the medium also concerned the commissioning of a modern window. From 1891 to 1901, Burrell lived with his mother Isabella Guthrie Burrell (1834–1912) at the classical-style townhouse 4 Devonshire Gardens in the Hyndland area of west Glasgow. An obituary written by the first keeper of the Burrell Collection (1947–1956), Andrew Hannah (1907–1978), describes Burrell’s mother as a leading influence in his interest in the arts, and her guiding hand may have been at play here. In 1892, Burrell, or possibly his mother, commissioned Glasgow-based architect and interior designer George Walton (1867–1933) to design and execute a highly stylised window for their staircase (fig. 135). Entitled ‘Gather Ye Rosebuds While Ye

---


990 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.38, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, February 6, 1929 (Appendix A, document 41).

991 Marks, Portrait, 50.

992 “Sir William Burrell,” Scotsman, 2; Marks, Portrait, 41.

993 Marks, Portrait, 71–73; Cannon, Glass in the Burrell, 5.
May’, the window was based on a seventeenth-century *carpe diem* poem written by Robert Herrick (1591–1674). It is not known whether the selection of this unusual subject matter originated with Walton or the Burrells. After Burrell had left this property in 1901, following his marriage to Constance Lockhart Mitchell Burrell (1876–1961), daughter of Glasgow merchant James McNair Mitchell (1835–1893), his mother remained at the house until her death in February 1912. At no stage did Burrell arrange for the transfer of the window to his new home, perhaps further indicating that the commission was more likely to have been made at his mother’s instigation, or that Burrell’s own tastes had changed. The aesthetic and theme of this window certainly did not accord with the Gothic interiors that dominated his marital home, 8 Great Western Terrace. While the window remains *in situ* at Devonshire Gardens, parts of the lower panels have at some stage been lost. A photograph of the window taken by Glasgow photographers A. & R. Annan a year after its installation now provides the only record of the window in its original format (fig. 136).

A connection between Walton and Burrell had probably already been established through their mutual associations with the Scottish artists’ collective the Glasgow Boys. George Walton’s brother, Edward Arthur Walton (1860–1922), was a painter and active member of this circle, and through the encouragement of art dealer Alexander Reid (1854–1928), Burrell had become a major patron of their work. However, the commissioning of Walton was perhaps unusual. He was a relative novice in stained glass, and was instead more experienced as an interior decorator. The Devonshire Gardens commission was perhaps a preamble for further decorating work at Burrell’s home, which for whatever reason was never fulfilled. Walton’s former projects had included the 1886 furnishing of a smoking room at Kate Cranston’s (1849–1934) highly popular tearooms on Ingram Street (Glasgow), known
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994 ‘To the Virgins to Make Much of Time’ was first published by Robert Herrick in his collection of poems *Hesperides* (London: John Williams, 1648), 208.
995 In early 1901, Constance’s merchant brother James Ralston Mitchell (b.1866) married Burrell’s youngest sister Mary (1873–1964); Marks, *Portrait*, 54, 78.
997 It remains *in situ* at the property.
1001 Fowle, *Van Gogh’s Twin*, 91.
to have incorporated some small ornamental panels of stained glass, which Walton likely designed in conjunction with Charles Rennie Mackintosh.1002 In 1891, Glasgow Boy James Whitelaw Hamilton (1860–1932) had employed Walton to redecorate his home, Thornton Lodge, in Helensburgh (Argyll and Bute), a scheme that is also said to have included stained glass.1003

Despite an abundance of acclaimed contemporary British stained-glass artists available to Burrell during this period, Burrell’s subsequent distaste for modern stained glass remained a constant throughout his subsequent collecting career, except when it came to work by Wilfred Drake. By late 1929, Wilfred had designed an armorial window to commemorate the stay of King George V (1865–1936) and Queen Mary (1867–1953) at Craigwell House in Aldwick (West Sussex), for politician and co-founder of the Dunlop Rubber Company Sir Arthur Du Cros (1871–1955).1004 The window, executed entirely in modern glass, was installed in the western rose window of the church of St Thomas a Becket at Pagham (West Sussex) (fig. 137).1005 Burrell visited the area in 1947, and gave a generous endorsement of Wilfred’s handiwork: ‘[...] it showed that a modern window can be fine instead of being a blot on a church, which it usually is. Why you are not constantly getting orders [for new commissions] I don’t understand – I suppose it is because so many people are colour blind and have so little sense of what is beautiful’.1006

First evidence of Burrell’s having obtained ancient stained glass is provided by Burrell’s loans of around 160 objects to Glasgow’s 1901 International Exhibition, when he was around 40

1003 Donnelly, Glasgow Stained Glass, 21.
1004 Hugh Murray has claimed that this window was designed by Frederick Sydney Eden; “F. Sydney Eden – a man with no past,” Journal of Stained Glass, 24 (2010): 108–17. However, Wilfred’s own involvement is confirmed in correspondence with Burrell, so it is probable that Wilfred had executed the window according to Eden’s designs; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.692, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 10, 1947 (Appendix C, document 714). Eden had designed several other windows; these drawings are now deposited at the V&A; VAA, Department of Engraving, Illustration and Design & Department of Paintings, Eden Drawings, “Designs for Stained Glass Windows,” 1947.
1005 Due to Craigwell House’s secluded coastal position, from December 1928 it was used as a place of convalescence by the royals. Despite its royal connections, the house was demolished in 1939.
years old. Although the catalogue entries for this exhibition lack detail, they describe at least twenty-three medallions of German sixteenth-century and Dutch seventeenth-century stained glass, which were displayed split across two cases in gallery three in the exhibition’s Fine Art Building.\(^{1007}\) Other ancient stained glass was lent by ‘Mrs Mitchell’,\(^{1008}\) probably referring to Burrell’s soon-to-be mother-in-law, or perhaps one of his sisters-in-law, suggesting that a guiding or mutual interest in ancient stained glass was held by Burrell’s wife’s family, who had lived next door to the Burrells at 10 Great Western Terrace.\(^{1009}\)

The majority of Burrell’s panels were secular in subject matter, including one depicting a group of fishermen, and another showing dockworkers, as well as several examples of heraldry.\(^ {1010}\) Much later, in 1941, Burrell had stated: ‘[as part of wartime safeguarding] I have received from my house in Glasgow a good deal of glass – Dutch and inferior in quality’.\(^{1011}\) Burrell’s turn of the century acquisitions predated the emergence of Grosvenor’s, and then Thomas and Drake’s, vast and high-quality stocks.\(^ {1012}\) Included in Burrell’s transfer of panels from his Glasgow home was a series of at least thirty-four Dutch seventeenth-century floral and heraldic ovals, some of which were presumably part of Burrell’s 1901 loan. Wilfred advised that twenty-two be kept, underlining that almost a third of them were of relatively poor quality.\(^ {1013}\) In July 1941, while Burrell was revising his stained-glass acquisitions, he sent a further thirty-three panels to Wilfred, which he noted were all ‘very unimportant and bought about fifty years ago’,\(^ {1014}\) placing their acquisition roughly around the glazing of his Devonshire Gardens and Great Western Terrace homes. This collection included Dutch, Swiss, German, and English stained glass of varying date and condition. Wilfred could only recommend the retention of just four of these—a Swiss seventeenth-century heraldic panel,

\(^{1007}\) *Glasgow International Exhibition 1901, Official Catalogue of the Fine Art Section* (Glasgow: Charles Watson, 1901), 182–83.
\(^{1008}\) Ibid..
\(^{1009}\) Other panels were presented by the wife of Glasgow merchant Donald Graham (d.1901), who lived at sixteenth-century Airthrey Castle (Stirlingshire); ibid. See also “Donald Graham,” *Edinburgh Evening News*, January 23, 1901, 5.
\(^{1013}\) Ibid.
a panel depicting *St Notker Balbulus*, a Swiss seventeenth-century roundel, and a medallion showing the *Virgin Mary* (fig. 138).\textsuperscript{1015}

After Burrell’s marriage in June 1901, and coinciding with the International Exhibition, he moved to 8 Great Western Terrace, an eighteen-room townhouse minutes from his previous home.\textsuperscript{1016} Although classical in style on the exterior—designed c.1869 by Alexander ‘Greek’ Thomson (1817–1875) — the Gothic-style interiors were arranged by Edinburgh architect Robert Stodart Lorimer (1864–1929). Contemporary photographs, some of which were reproduced in a 1982 publication by the third keeper of the Burrell collection (1979–1985) Richard Marks (b.1945), illustrate that stained glass was incorporated into selected window openings at the property (fig. 139).\textsuperscript{1017} Presumably this included all or part of the consignment loaned to the International Exhibition. In addition, at least six other panels can be identified, such as an English sixteenth-century armorial depicting the bearings of the Stringer family, and two Swiss sixteenth-century shields (fig. 140).\textsuperscript{1018} Taking these consignments together, at the turn of the century Burrell likely had a very mixed-quality collection of around seventy small medallions.

The low status accorded to these early acquisitions continued in 1941, when the Dutch panels previously in Burrell’s Glasgow townhouse were transferred to Hutton for belated, and it seems reluctant, wartime safeguarding.\textsuperscript{1019} In contrast, Burrell’s hundreds of stained-glass panels installed at Hutton Castle had been removed within weeks of war’s being declared, in November 1939, despite its rural location.\textsuperscript{1020} Not only were the Dutch panels relegated to an outbuilding, a small summerhouse in the grounds of Hutton Castle, but Burrell apparently took care to mount them high enough so that they did not impede the

\textsuperscript{1015} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.410, Wilfred Drake, “List of some of William Burrell’s stained glass,” July 1941 (Appendix B, document 424); Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/506, 45/529–30, 45/557.

\textsuperscript{1016} Marks, *Portrait*, 82.

\textsuperscript{1017} Marks, *Portrait*, 87.

\textsuperscript{1018} Six panels have so far been identified; Cannon, *Glass in the Burrell*, 88; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/217, 45/503, 45/537, 45/551, 45/613, 45/627.

\textsuperscript{1019} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.398, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 9, 1941 (Appendix B, document 412).

\textsuperscript{1020} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.490, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, March 18, 1943 (Appendix B, document 506).
views of the surrounding trees. Minimal respect was shown in the treatment of these objects, as Burrell requested that all of the panels be made oval, whatever their original shape (see Chapter One). Burrell’s reluctance to incorporate any of his early acquisitions of stained glass in any sort of prominent position at Hutton Castle serves to illustrate the progression of his taste, and his greater experience as a collector of stained glass.

The Glazing of Hutton Castle (1928–32)

While Burrell had incorporated stained glass in each of his previous main residences, it was not until his 1916 acquisition of his Scots baronial estate Hutton Castle (Scottish Borders) that he became a significant player in the purchase and display of stained glass (fig. 141). Coinciding with his retirement from business, Burrell’s acquisition of a country estate was said to have been a preoccupation for a number of years, not realised until the 3rd Lord Tweedmouth, Dudley Marjoribanks (1874–1935), sold his estate and its sixteenth-century castle to Burrell. Tweedmouth had already made significant alterations to the property from 1896, including the construction of the servants’ quarters and stables, and making good the previously uninhabitable tower (fig. 141). By 1908 the latest, Tweedmouth had modified the irregularly sized and spaced medieval window openings, making them more uniform, presumably in line with the Georgian or Victorian sash windows illustrated in the c.1880 photograph (fig. 142). Hutton’s recent modernisations, which presumably served to make the house considerably more comfortable, together with its proximity to the railway station at Berwick-upon-Tweed (Northumberland) just across the English border, affording direct and quick connections to London, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, must all have increased its appeal to Burrell.

1022 While Hutton Castle was being refurbished, the Burrell’s rented several nearby country estates: Kilduff House (East Lothian), from 1917, and then Broxmouth Park in Dunbar (East Lothian) from 1924, while retaining townhouses in Glasgow and Edinburgh; Marks, Portrait, 102.
1023 Burrell had first considered the purchase of Newark Castle (Fife), for which Robert Lorimer had submitted plans, in the latenineteenth century; Marks, Portrait, 81, 92, 96–97.
1024 Marks, Portrait, 92–95.
1026 Marks, Portrait, 101.
Despite these relatively recent alterations, Burrell also made his own changes. As surviving plans illustrate, Burrell again commissioned Lorimer to make the necessary adjustments, which included plans for a much-enlarged eastern wing, although his schemes for the castle were never executed (fig. 143). In part this was due to Lorimer’s viewing the property as wholly inadequate for Burrell’s needs. The expenditure needed to convert the castle appropriately was far beyond the sum with which Burrell was willing to part. The disagreement ultimately acrimoniously ended a twenty-year personal and professional association between them. Burrell replaced Lorimer with his former apprentice, Edinburgh-based Reginald Francis Fairlie (1883–1952), who began making interior and exterior alterations to Hutton Castle from around 1918. Although the employment of Lorimer’s protégé may seem strange, by this date Fairlie was practising on his own account, after also growing dissatisfied with Lorimer.

From 1928, Fairlie obtained further work in the area, at eighteenth-century Floors Castle (Scottish Borders), home of the 8th duke of Roxburghe, Henry Innes-Ker (1876–1932), and his American wife, May Goelet Innes-Ker (1878–1937), daughter of exceptionally wealthy New York businessman Ogden Goelet (1851–1897). Before her marriage, May had already amassed a substantial art collection at her Rhode Island home, ranging from contemporary works by Matisse to seventeenth-century Gobelins tapestries, all of which she had transferred to specially adapted rooms at Floors Castle. In December 1919, the
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1029 RCAHMS, Lorimer and Matthew Collection, LOR H/7/1-12, “Proposed alterations for William Burrell, Esq.,” 1916.
1030 Marks, Portrait, 102–11.
1033 In another collaboration with an American expatriate, in 1933 Wilfred supplied a composite memorial window, commissioned by Michigan-born, but New York- and Paris-resident Impressionist artist William Samuel Horton (1865–1936). This was in memory of his wife, New York socialite Carlotta Gray Horton (1865–1931). The window incorporated a sixteenth-century Adoration of the Magi set on a modern clear glass geometric background, and was installed in a north aisle window at St Margaret’s Church in Angmering (West Sussex); “Recently Added Memorial Window,” Littlehampton Gazette, December 8, 1933, 2.
Roxburghes had gifted the ruins of Kelso Abbey to the nation, but retained the adjacent site, which after the death of the duke in 1933, May used to create a memorial, again to Fairlie’s designs. In mid-1934, Wilfred supplied the stained glass for this memorial, which included a fifteenth-century ex-Costessey Flemish panel depicting Christ’s Descent from the Cross (fig. 144). His proximity to Floors led Burrell to speculate: ‘She is about the first person in Scotland who has had the good sense to go in for old glass [...] I wonder if seeing mine here [at Hutton Castle] inspired her’. However, May’s interest in stained glass was confined to her memorial cloister, and she did not acquire or install any at Floors Castle itself.

Although the general location and appearance of the ‘Hutton Rooms’—the three rooms that were selected for reconstruction and redisplay in the Burrell Collection’s museum—have been relatively well documented, their exact location, and their relationship to the decoration of the rest of the house in Burrell’s day has remained largely obscure. Floor-plans exist for three out of four of the storeys of the castle, drawn in 1984 as part of a survey of the site, and surviving photographs also show limited views of some of Burrell’s interiors. Others were taken only after the house was emptied following the deaths of the Burrells. However, given its importance, the house has been very poorly documented. The castle has been much altered internally and externally since Burrell’s occupation, and due to its still being in private ownership, access is restricted.

New analysis of Wilfred’s catalogue ‘List of Ancient Stained Glass at Hutton Castle’ provides the number and orientation of windows in each room containing stained glass, which, when matched to the surviving floor-plans, allows for the first time an almost complete mapping of the distribution and function of the rooms at the castle, fully illustrated here in the order in which Wilfred catalogued them (figs 145–240). From this, it can be seen

1036 Drake, Costessey, 10, no. 42; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 42, stock card no. Costessey 42.
1038 Her father Ogden Goelet, however, had installed a monumental sixteenth-century German window, originally from Boppard, at his mansion, and stored further panels from this source in his attic (see further below and Chapter Two).
1039 Drake, “Hutton Castle.”
that the main entertaining spaces were located in the western wing of the castle, beginning with the great hall on the ground floor, which was directly below a double-height drawing room, the two spaces connected by the ‘western staircase’ (fig. 241). Other entertaining spaces could be found in the middle range of the property on the first floor, such as the billiard and dining rooms (fig. 242). Also in the middle range were the Burrells more private and functional rooms, such as the business room on the ground floor, and the family and guest bedrooms occupying the second and third floors. The servants’ quarters were spread across the late-century eastern sections, which Burrell termed the ‘new block’ (fig. 243).

Although Burrell did not confine his purchases of stained glass to one dealer only, he most frequently used Thomas and Drake. Burrell’s reliance on Wilfred was expressed in the first surviving letter between the pair, when Burrell had stated by way of a closing remark: ‘no one can help me as much as you can’. Even when making purchases from other sources, Burrell frequently requested that Wilfred appraise, repair, pack, and transport these panels. According to Burrell’s own purchase books, which he began compiling in 1911, and information in exhibition catalogues of the Burrell Collection’s stained glass (1962 and 1967), at around 170 panels, lancets, and whole windows came through Grosvenor, or Thomas and Drake at the very least. Burrell’s next-largest supplier of the medium was his London-based interior designers Acton Surgey, who contributed just twenty-eight panels. The firm was formed in 1926 by Frank Surgey (1893–1980), and architect Gladstone Murray Adams-Acton (1886–1971), described as a ‘flamboyant extrovert’. The partners were former employees of the transatlantic interior-design company White Allom, whose former projects had included King George V’s redecorations of Buckingham Palace (London), as well as industrialist Henry Clay Frick’s Fifth Avenue mansion in New York. Another former White
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1040 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.1, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, March 7, 1925 (Appendix A, document 1). Burrell’s close relationship with Wilfred proved to be a defining factor in his loyalty to the firm, as underlined in the over 700 letters that survive between the pair across a period of 23 years (see the Appendices).
1041 TNA, 1911 England and Wales Household Census, “Gladstone Murray Adams-Acton.”
1042 Marks, Portrait, 108.
Allom employee, John Hunt (1900–1976), became their principal buyer, sourcing the original fixtures and fittings needed for their projects.

From around 1927, coinciding with his knighthood for his public work and services to art, and confirming his now significant focus on the arts, Burrell began to concentrate on the furnishing of Hutton Castle, employing the relatively newly formed Acton Surgey as his decorators. Like Thomas and Drake, who enjoyed Burrell’s custom over a period of almost fifty years, Acton Surgey’s association with Burrell was also of long-standing, lasting almost thirty years, underlining that Burrell preferred to deal with a small trusted group. It is probable that some of Acton Surgey’s glass had been selected from Thomas and Drake’s stores, as the provenances of several pieces are unknown. Other panels of theirs were obtained at auction at Sotheby’s, including two sixteenth-century English armorials, and further glass was purchased by them in Berlin, but only approved by Burrell after Wilfred had first inspected the glass and given his evaluation. Wilfred appraised further glass in October 1932, when Burrell remarked: ‘what are the 3 panels like which Mr Surgey is showing you? Could I utilise them?’

Of the 250 panels noted as having been in Burrell’s windows at Hutton Castle by 1932, only forty-one of these panels actually appear in his purchase books. Although Burrell began to collect stained glass from at least 1901, for some reason he did not begin to record his stained-glass acquisitions until April 1923, the year in which he acquired a French fourteenth-century St Mary of Egypt (later installed in the female lavatory), from Syrian-born but Paris-
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1045 Ibid.
1046 Marks, Portrait, 109–10.
1047 Roy’s New York stock books also make reference to sales to Acton Surgey. A German fifteenth-century St John the Evangelist panel, a figure of Christ, as well as an English sixteenth-century quatrefoil went to them; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, stock book I, 34–37, 50–51, no. 1371, 1380, 1682.
1048 GMRC, Purchase Books, 4 April 1932, 222; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/205, 45/222.
1050 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.91, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, October 13, 1932 (Appendix A, document 99).
based dealer Nicolas Brimo (b.1874), partner in the firm Galerie Brimo de Laroussilhe (established 1908) (fig. 181).\textsuperscript{1051} As there is no evidence of any lost record books, it is not known if so many of these acquisitions were intentionally left unrecorded for tax, insurance, or security purposes, or if Burrell inadvertently left his records incomplete, although the latter explanation seems unlikely given Burrell’s meticulous business acumen. After its initial emergence in the purchase books 1923, stained glass was absent from Burrell’s records until 1928, coinciding with the glazing of the castle. Some of the documented acquisitions at this time included panels that were purchased for the dining room, western staircase, Burrell’s daughter’s sitting room, the tower bedroom, female servants’ stair, and ‘bedroom no.4’, a showpiece guest bedroom (figs 174, 188, 208, 211, 219–20, 234).\textsuperscript{1052} The latter room’s windows included two English sixteenth-century medallions depicting the bearings of the diocese of Exeter, and two English fourteenth-century quarries, purchased by Wilfred in November 1928 from the Sotheby’s sale of the private collection of former curator of medieval antiquities at the British Museum, Charles Hercules Read (1857–1929) (fig. 211).\textsuperscript{1053} Burrell had acquired these panels from Wilfred in February and December 1929, at a total cost of £74 (equivalent to almost £2,500 today).\textsuperscript{1054} Although these were substantial figures, they were nothing at all like the types of high prices known to have changed hands between Roy and his American clients (see Chapter Two).

Hutton Castle’s double-height drawing room was the first room to have been glazed with stained glass, or at least the first that required Wilfred’s assistance (figs 154–58). References to the glazing of the windows there begin in April 1928, twelve years after Burrell’s purchase of the property – highlighting perhaps the scale of structural changes necessary before the

\textsuperscript{1051}GMRC, Purchase Books, April 11, 1923, 16; Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/369. Burrell omitted some significant purchases from his records, such as the monumental Costessey collection windows, which went on to form part of the rich decoration of several of his grandest rooms; Marks, Portrait, 31–45. This was likely a deliberate attempt to obscure the true value of the collection for either security or insurance purposes.

\textsuperscript{1052}GMRC, Purchase Books, August 20 and November 16, 1928, and February 11, 1929, 9, 14; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/475–76, 45/398–99, 45/63–64, 45/219–221, 45/124, 45/213.


\textsuperscript{1054}GMRC, Purchase Books, February 11, 1929, 9; Drake, “Hutton Castle,” 69–70; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/211–14.
castle’s decoration could be considered. In around 1920, Fairlie had designed new monumental window openings in the western wing of the castle, coinciding with Burrell’s purchases of large, primarily French, sixteenth-century windows from Grosvenor’s Costessey exhibition (see Chapter One). Burrell drew heavily on the Costessey collection during his glazing of the castle – at least fourteen windows installed during this period contained panels with a Costessey provenance. Other recorded purchases of stained glass at this time (after the purchase of Hutton Castle in 1916, and before the 1928 glazing of the property) were listed in Burrell’s purchase books as having been cancelled and returned, suggesting that this was a period of experimentation, with panels from various sources being considered.

According to Wilfred’s catalogue, the drawing room at Hutton Castle contained three large two-light windows, and one large three-light window. Rather than enclosing medallions in clear glass quarries, as was a normal display technique amongst Wilfred’s other customers (see above), many of the drawing room windows were filled entirely with monumental ancient stained glass (figs 154–58). This included two large French early sixteenth-century windows, one depicting the Life of St John the Divine and one a Tree of Jesse. Due to the ongoing building work at the castle, after its acquisition in 1920 (see Chapter One) the Life of St John was first loaned by Burrell to the V&A, but recalled at the beginning of April 1928 so that it could be installed at the castle (fig. 155). On Burrell’s instigation, in June 1928 Wilfred visited the castle for the first time, in order to discuss the best way to arrange and fill the sections around the Tree of Jesse window (fig. 157).

1055 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52.56.11, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, April 21, 1928 (Appendix A, document 11).
1056 Marks, Portrait, 107.
1057 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.11, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, April 21, 1928 (Appendix A, document 11).
1058 Burrell also later added a further seven panels and windows with a Costessey provenance; five were acquired from Lord Rochdale’s collection in 1948, and two were acquired from the Bruce and Eumorfopolous collections respectively, in 1939 and 1945. A useful appendix sorted via collection is given by Cannon, Glass in the Burrell, 89.
1060 Drake, Costessey, no. 56, 59; Wells, Figure and Ornamental, 61–63, nos. 211, 225; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/390–394.
1061 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.8, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, April 3, 1928 (Appendix A, document 8); Marks, Portrait, 110.
1062 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.17, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 17, 1928 (Appendix A, document 17).
confirms that the glaziers took about three months to complete the drawing room windows, finishing by July 1928.\textsuperscript{1063}

Although Wilfred was a consultant to the glazing project, the actual process of installation was undertaken by a ‘Mr MacDougall’ and his unnamed assistant. While it is possible MacDougall was a local craftsman, it is far more likely, given the scale and ambition of Burrell’s glazing scheme, that Burrell had employed Glasgow-based Norman McLeod MacDougall (1852–1939), former chief glass-painter at the London studio of Daniel Cottier (1837–1891).\textsuperscript{1064} After his return to Glasgow in the 1890s, MacDougall taught at the newly opened Glasgow School of Art (from 1896), as well as doing freelance design work for the Glasgow-based stained-glass manufacturers and interior decorators J&W Guthrie (established c.1872), who also produced stained glass with Glasgow Boy James Guthrie (1859–1930).\textsuperscript{1065}

From the outset however Burrell’s letters reveal that his relationship with MacDougall and his team was sometimes strained. In one instance, Burrell frustratedly reported to Wilfred: ‘MacDougall has gone home and I am left with one man who always appears to be working hard, but who nevertheless is getting on very slowly’,\textsuperscript{1066} often only referring him as ‘the little man’.\textsuperscript{1067} Later, one of the glaziers was even arrested, requiring Burrell’s attendance at the local police station in an attempt to negotiate his release so that work at the house could continue.\textsuperscript{1068} Burrell’s relationship with MacDougall’s team was also less than ideal in other ways. In one example of many, in July 1928 Burrell wrote to obtain Wilfred’s technical assistance, stating that the glaziers at Hutton Castle were ‘in difficulty’, and were struggling to adapt panels appropriately for installation.\textsuperscript{1069} As a craftsman more used to producing and

\textsuperscript{1063} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.25, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, July 21, 1928 (Appendix A, document 25).
\textsuperscript{1064} Donnelly, Glasgow Stained Glass, 17.
\textsuperscript{1065} Donnelly, Glasgow Stained Glass, 31; Donnelly, Scotland’s Stained Glass, 45–46.
\textsuperscript{1066} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.27, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, September 3, 1928 (Appendix A, document 27).
\textsuperscript{1067} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.31, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, November 20, 1928 (Appendix A, document 34).
\textsuperscript{1068} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.21, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 27, 1928 (Appendix A, document 21).
\textsuperscript{1069} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.18, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, July 15, 1928 (Appendix A, document 18).
handling modern work, MacDougall was probably ill-equipped for the various challenges presented by the ancient glass; aside from his work at Hutton Castle, there is no evidence of MacDougall having had any experience as a restorer. Consequently, the panels had to be sent down to Wilfred’s London workshop, where they were specially adapted, before being returned to Hutton Castle in cases via passenger train from London’s King’s Cross Station, a round-trip of almost 700 miles.\textsuperscript{1070}

The glazing progressed from the drawing room to the ground floor vestibule, before spreading into the great hall on the ground floor (directly below the drawing room), and its connecting western staircase (figs 145, 148–53, 169–74).\textsuperscript{1071} Panels installed in the great hall were also heavily selected from Thomas and Drake’s Costessey stock and were largely figural in subject matter, including a French fifteenth-century panel depicting \textit{St Cecilia and the Angels}, mounted in the same window as a French sixteenth-century \textit{Joachim and Anna Meeting at the Golden Gate}, and a Flemish fifteenth-century \textit{Adoration of the Magi} (fig. 153).\textsuperscript{1072} There was also a more overt display of English heraldry, with four out of five windows in this room containing only armorials (figs 149–152). Rather unusually, panels destined for the upper servants’ hall and servants’ staircase were also prepared for installation during this phase of work (see further below), as well as the panels for Burrell’s daughter’s suite of rooms (figs 205–09, 228–29, 234–235).\textsuperscript{1073}

By September 1928, 85 of the 188 panels intended to be installed had been set in the windows.\textsuperscript{1074} At some stage thereafter, the ambition of Burrell’s glazing project grew significantly, as the total number of panels to be installed had increased from 188 to 250. By November 1928, 128 panels had been installed throughout the property.\textsuperscript{1075} The lancet


\textsuperscript{1071} GMRC, \textit{Burrell/Drake Correspondence}, reg. no. 52/56.18, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, July 15, 1928 (Appendix A, document 18); Drake, \textit{“Hutton Castle,”} 1, 7, 37, 82, 87.

\textsuperscript{1072} Drake, \textit{Hutton Castle}, 7–8; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/377, 45/389, 45/427.

\textsuperscript{1073} GMRC, \textit{Burrell/Drake Correspondence}, reg. no. 52/56.18, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, July 15, 1928 (Appendix A, document 18).

\textsuperscript{1074} GMRC, \textit{Burrell/Drake Correspondence}, reg. no. 52/56.27, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, September 3, 1928 (Appendix A, document 27).

windows of the square-shaped medieval tower, which included the business and billiard rooms, were confirmed to have been filled in January 1929, and a twelfth-century panel depicting the Prophet Jeremiah (from St Denis) was set in a narrow window in the adjoining circular tower staircase, initiating the glazing of that area of the castle (figs 213–27).  

Eighteen months after the first glass is reported to have gone in, by November 1929, a total of 222 panels had been installed. Rooms glazed by this date must have included the several cloakrooms, lavatories, corridors, landings, and bedrooms, and various other rooms in the servants’ quarters (figs 146–47, 166, 168, 175–78, 180–86, 193–202, 210–212, 235–40). One of the final areas to have received its stained glass was the first-floor dining room, which was almost entirely glazed with armorials (figs 187–92). Several of the other small panels for this room, including a German fourteenth-century panel depicting St John the Baptist, were not purchased until at least May 1930, showing that by this stage Burrell was buying and installing in quick succession, unlike in the great hall which was seemingly over a decade in the planning (fig. 188). It is possible that the dining room was never initially intended to have been glazed, a change of plan that may account for the increase in the total number of panels planned for installation by this time. Just over a year later, by the beginning of 1931, by his own estimations Burrell had 233 panels and windows on display at the castle, a figure that grew to at least 250 (according to Wilfred’s 1932-dated catalogue), bringing to an end a two-year glazing campaign.

---

**The Decoration of the Servants’ Quarters**

The exhibition of Burrell’s collection of stained glass was not confined to the main house, but, in a move without precedent, also extended to the servants’ quarters, which accounted for around a third of Hutton Castle, situated in the eastern wing of the property (figs 228–40, 243). In the western and central range of the house, occupied by the Burrells and their guests, several other purely functional rooms also contained stained glass, such as the

---

1076 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.35, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, January 28, 1929 (Appendix A, document 38); Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/364.  
1078 GMRC, Purchase Books, May 23, 1930, 22; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/475–76.  
1079 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.61, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, January 2, 1931 (Appendix A, document 67).  
1080 At both of Burrell’s Glasgow townhouses he employed a serving staff of around five, but at the significantly larger Hutton Castle his servants numbered around twenty; "Lexie Lessenger,” Scotsman, January 5, 2012, 15.
servants’ pantries and cleaning cupboards (figs 167, 179). By 1932, forty-seven panels – a fifth of Burrell’s entire stained-glass collection at the time – had been installed throughout the upper and lower servants’ halls, butler’s staircase, servants’ corridor, maids’ staircase, and the bedrooms occupied by the cooks, lady’s maid, and first, second, and third housemaids.1081

Descriptions of servants’ quarters of the period suggest that these were normally only sparsely and practically furnished, and were not the sorts of places where extensive displays of medieval and Renaissance stained glass might ordinarily be found. A rare description of windows in these servants’ spaces illustrates that they were typically small, and plain-glazed, with a bedroom being described by its occupant: ‘two windows about a foot square let in the light’.1082 It was therefore not a requirement for Burrell to have decorated his staff quarters in this way, and so far he stands as the only country-house owner ever to have done so. What prompted such an extensive glazing campaign in areas normally off limits to the Burrells and their guests remains largely a mystery. The installation of stained glass in these places was not some sort of overspill, or simply an answer to a lack of available space in the house proper after those windows had all reached capacity. The panels installed in the female servants’ staircase and upper servants’ hall, including a fourteenth-century English armorial, were purchased as early as November 1928 (figs 228–29, 234–35). They were recorded to have been repaired and altered by Wilfred just seven months into the initial two-year glazing campaign, and set in place in the servants’ rooms well before many of the main rooms had received their glass.1083 Furthermore, by April 1930, several high-quality panels had been installed in the housemaids’ pantries and cleaning cupboards, including a Flemish sixteenth-century lancet depicting St Peter,1084 and an English fifteenth-century panel depicting an archbishop saint (figs 167, 179).1085 Panels that eventually found their home in the showpiece dining room were not purchased for another month, in May 1930.

1082 Pamela Sambrook, Keeping Their Place: Domestic Service in the Country House (Stroud: The History Press, 2005), 86.
1083 GMRC, Purchase Books, November 16, 1928, 15; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.18, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, July 15, 1928 (Appendix A, document 18); Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/65, 45/124, 45/451.
1084 Drake, “Hutton Castle,” 34; Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/437.
1085 Drake, “Hutton Castle,” 36; Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/52.
It is possible that the panels that were installed in the servants’ quarters were first trialled in windows in the central and western ranges of the house, but for whatever reason were found to be unsuitable. However, they may have been better suited to the lighting and orientation of windows in the eastern wing of the house. There is evidence for this approach: on one occasion, Burrell had commented that a panel depicting a ‘lay king’ looked ‘much better’ in its new position in the servants’ quarters, after it had been transferred from a window in the main house.\footnote{GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.60, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, December 28, 1930 (Appendix A, document 66).} The ‘lay king’ was either later broken or sold, as it disappeared from Hutton Castle altogether, to be replaced by a French fifteenth-century Madonna (fig. 232).\footnote{GMRC; Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/380.} In another instance, after an English sixteenth-century quarry depicting the device of John Islip, abbot (1500–32) of London’s Westminster Abbey, had been found to darken the room in which it had initially been installed, Burrell was able to report: ‘I have just found to my great joy the perfect place for the little diamond, in the tower bedroom’, although it actually ended up just outside the tower bedroom, in the tower staircase (fig. 223).\footnote{GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.93, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, October 23, 1932 (Appendix A, document 101).} In other ways Burrell was sensitive to the correct lighting and display of his stained glass, and was not simply leaving these decisions to his interior designers and glaziers: in January 1929, Burrell sought to address the visual effect of a series of medallions that he had installed in plain quarries in the hall: ‘I feel that some of the windows, for example the hall windows, look a little ‘cut and dried’ each with its one roundel. I think it would be a good idea to introduce in an irregular manner an English XV cent quarry [...]’.\footnote{GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.35, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, January 28, 1929 (Appendix A, document 38).} To make his point explicit, Burrell enclosed diagrams that he himself had roughly sketched (fig. 244).

There is also evidence that Burrell and his glaziers were struggling to source enough panels of sufficient quality in order to sustain this massive and unprecedented glazing campaign. For the first time, in January 1929, Burrell began to lament this fact: ‘the level of glass we have been obliged to put in is rather a drop in quality from the other windows.’\footnote{Ibid.} On the eve of another of Wilfred’s visits, in October 1930, Burrell made further comments that indicated that finding quality panels was an issue: ‘we are in better order now, and although
the glass is not all what it ought to be, I hope you may like it’. It is possible that Burrell chose to relegate panels to the servants’ quarters, as he was unwilling to include them in the glazing of the main house, but was reluctant to sell them, as he was having such issues sourcing panels. Placing the stained glass in the servants’ areas was perhaps envisioned as a contingency, in case Burrell needed to resort to installing some of it in the main house, if more suitable glass could not be obtained.

However, the installation of so many panels of stained glass in the servants’ wing represented an expense which, for an individual known (certainly in his later life) for his frugality, was surprising. Burrell could just as easily have arranged to have had these panels sold, as he did a decade later with over 100 panels that he no longer wished to retain (see further below). The servants’ stained glass occupied some sort of middle ground – not thought of as good enough to incorporate into the glazing of the main house, but not of sufficiently low quality to warrant resale. The fact that he kept such a high volume of panels, and placed them in areas of the house that would have been wholly inappropriate for him, his family, and his guests, to inhabit is extraordinary. The expenses associated with the glazing of the servants’ areas were significant, not just the probable costs connected with its specialist repair and installation, but also its initial acquisition. For example, a French fifteenth-century Madonna installed in the butler’s staircase was one of Burrell’s most expensive purchases of stained glass during the period, at £140 (equivalent to around £4,700 today) (fig. 232). Despite the servants’ stained glass not being of sufficient quality or appearance for the main house, Burrell installed protective glazing to guard them against damage, as he had done with all of the glass in the house proper. In 1938, Burrell wrote to Wilfred requesting that he repair some of the Dutch glass that had been broken at the end of the ‘servants’ passage’, indicating that these panels were not only protected, but maintained and repaired where necessary by Burrell’s specialist London-based restorer.

1092 Marks, Portrait, 119.
1093 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.60, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, December 28, 1930 (Appendix A, document 66); Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/380.
1094 ‘The English Gothic panel for the servants’ pantry will require a plain sheet inside to protect it from the servants […]’; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.58, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, December 8, 1930 (Appendix A, document 64).
1095 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.180, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, October 20, 1938 (Appendix A, document 189).
Most likely this referred to the east-facing window at the end of the ground floor servants’ corridor, where four Dutch seventeenth-century armorials had been installed, which now have numerous mending leads, most likely inserted by Wilfred (fig. 233).

It might be speculated that Burrell deployed stained glass to educational or instructional ends, although evidence for this is ambivalent. The decorative floral medallions found in the lady’s maid’s bedroom, for example, held limited instructional value (fig. 239). The armorials in the first, second and third housemaid’s bedrooms, as well as the cook’s bedroom, could only have served to remind the servants’ of their place (figs 237–38). Further armorials were set into the windows of the servants’ communal areas, such as in the corridors and staircases, and the cook’s bedroom (figs 228, 233–36, 240). Arguably the most appropriate selection of panels could be found in the servants’ hall where there was a pair of fifteenth-century roundels depicting the Labours of the Months (fig. 231). Perhaps the servants could relate more easily to representations of the agricultural life of peasants than to some of the other figural panels in the house, such as the donor figures of rich noblewomen found in the drawing room (figs 155, 157). The presence of a series of virgin martyrs, such as saints Catherine of Alexandria and Barbara, in the upper servants’ hall, may have served as models of chaste and virtuous behaviour (fig. 229), but the same two saints are found again in the passage connecting William and Constance Burrell’s bedrooms (fig. 198). Constance’s boudoir contained other stories associated with the loss of female virtue, such as Eve’s Temptation, and the Expulsion from the Garden of Eden, as did the servants’ hall, where there was a panel showing the story of Susanna Bathing, which may suggest that Burrell was interested in providing the females of the household with righteous models and reminders of the perils of sin, although the same moralising display was not in evidence in his only daughter Marion’s rooms (figs 204, 230).

1098 Drake, “Hutton Castle,” 84.
1099 Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/428–429.
1100 Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/440–41.
1101 Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/444–45.
The Refinement of Burrell’s Glazing Schemes (1932–1935)

Although Acton Surgey’s decoration of the castle had ceased by 1932,\(^ {1102} \) almost straightaway Burrell began carefully modifying his displays of stained glass.\(^ {1103} \) This was perhaps fuelled by his desire to increase the quality of panels on display, after previously lamenting that some were inferior (see above). By September 1932, Burrell had outlined his new vision: ‘I am now fired with the idea of having only English and French glass – as much English as possible – everywhere but the servants’ quarters’.\(^ {1104} \) In the months before, Burrell had already apparently begun to make changes to this end. As early as August 1932 he was already remarking: ‘if the servants’ quarters are excluded, what we have is nearly all English and French’.\(^ {1105} \) The gentlemen’s cloakroom still retained its Flemish fifteenth-century window depicting the Marriage at Cana, and Flemish and German panels could also still be found in the drawing and dining rooms, bedrooms, boudoir, passages, and tower staircase (figs 146, 155, 157, 168, 188, 195, 198, 201, 203–07, 221).\(^ {1106} \)

Nonetheless, by the time of Wilfred’s catalogue, almost 60% of the glass in the property was English. The stained glass of the servants’ quarters skewed this total, as it contained high volumes of Continental glazing. Accordingly, the next highest national total was Flemish glass, at a comparatively meagre 12%, followed closely by Swiss at 10%, French at 9%, Dutch at 8%, and German at just 2%. Although Burrell had a strict ‘as much English as possible’ criterion for the stained glass in the main house, he held that the country of origin of the glazing in the servants’ quarters ‘did not matter much’.\(^ {1107} \) Consequently, these areas contained the highest concentrations of Continental glazing, with 70% of Burrell’s holdings in Dutch glass alone. In comparison, only 7% of Burrell’s favoured English stained glass was installed in any of the servants’ rooms.

---

\(^ {1102} \) Marks, Portrait, 111.

\(^ {1103} \) GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.68, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, May 11, 1932 (Appendix A, document 75). It is not known which house in Glasgow this letter refers to, but it suggests that Burrell was now willing to expand his stained-glass displays to other properties.

\(^ {1104} \) GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.82, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, September 17, 1932 (Appendix A, document 90).

\(^ {1105} \) GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.76, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, August 26, 1932 (Appendix A, document 83).

\(^ {1106} \) Drake, “Hutton Castle,” 2, 8–22, 64–64, 76, 80.

\(^ {1107} \) GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.84, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, September 26, 1932 (Appendix A, document 92).
In Burrell’s and Lady Burrell’s bedrooms, as well as in their bathrooms, Dutch panels were installed originally. However, by September 1932, Burrell instructed Wilfred to substitute them with English stained glass, although not all of these ever received replacements (figs 193–95, 199–202). Just two weeks later, Burrell stated that two Flemish panels in the billiard room required English replacements (figs 213–14). Moving around the castle a few weeks later, Burrell again identified more ‘improvements’, when the Continental glass in the western staircase was no longer to be tolerated (figs 170, 172, 174). Guest bedrooms ‘No.1’ and ‘No.2’ were glazed or reglazed during this phase of work; the Continental glass in the windows there was swapped with English fifteenth- and sixteenth-century armorials (figs 159–64). An existing contemporary photograph of one of the windows there does not accord with the catalogue, revealing that the Arms of Upsale were moved from the left light to the right, and the Arms of Arundel removed and replaced by another armorial (fig. 161). Four heraldic panels in their adjacent dressing rooms were also recorded as having been supplied by Wilfred in May 1932 (fig. 162). Burrell did not employ MacDougall as glazier again, and instead requested that Wilfred send an assistant from Thomas and Drake’s workshop to install this glass, showing that Burrell was now relying exclusively on Wilfred’s services.

**Criteria for Collecting**

The incorporation of around 250 panels and windows into a private residence was a feat without precedent, amongst Thomas and Drake’s many other buyers. While American

---

1108 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.81, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, September 6, 1932 (Appendix A, document 88).
1109 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.82, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, September 17, 1932 (Appendix A, document 90).
1110 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.91, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, October 13, 1932 (Appendix A, document 99).
1111 These panels were previously installed in the chapel at Compton Verney House (Warwickshire), but were sold at Christie’s in July 1931 and bought by Thomas and Drake. Burrell acquired them in May 1932; Wells, Heraldic, 52, nos. 220–23; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/193–96.
1112 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.92, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, October 19, 1932 (Appendix A, document 100). One of the final known substitutions Burrell made to the glazing of Hutton Castle was in June 1938, when he acquired a composite window from John Hunt, now working independently of Acton Surney. One of these panels, an English fourteenth-century shield, was installed in the easternmost north window of Burrell’s wife’s bedroom. The other, a fourteenth-century Flemish Censing Angel was not installed in the house, but kept for his museum collection; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/22, 45/152.
businessman William Randolph Hearst’s collection of stained glass was at one time comparable in scale to Burrell’s—almost 200 lots alone were entered at auction in New York when a portion of his assets was liquidated in the late 1930s and early 1940s—very little was incorporated into any of his numerous residences, and most remained unseen by him in storage facilities, as discussed in Chapter Two.1113 Another comparable collector was Pennsylvania-based Raymond Pitcairn, whose collection of stained glass numbered around 250 panels. He helped found, and supervised the creation of, a Swedenborgian cathedral and museum at Bryn Athyn, using his acquisitions as exemplars for the craftsmen, but his collection was extremely narrow in scope, containing many pieces of French thirteenth-century stained glass.

During this period, such an extensive domestic display can only have borne comparison with Thomas and Drake’s near-contemporary glazing of the English Revival-style Ronaele Manor in Pennsylvania (USA) belonging to Eleanor Widener Dixon (1891–1953), where over seventy-five English medieval armorials and a handful of Dutch secular panels were purchased between 1924 and 1927 (see Chapter Two).1114 Sixteen rooms at Ronaele Manor incorporated ancient stained glass supplied exclusively by Thomas and Drake, including the main reception rooms, stairwells, and bedrooms, and very unusually also their various pantries, a space Burrell also opted to glaze with stained glass.1115 In comparison, at least thirty-four rooms at the much smaller Hutton Castle contained stained glass, showing that Burrell’s was a far more concentrated display. In volume, the Dixon collection of stained glass was less than half that of Burrell’s, and far more narrow in its scope. Nonetheless, in later correspondence with Burrell, Wilfred had used the Dixon glass as a benchmark of quality when describing potential heraldic stained-glass acquisitions to Burrell. In 1939, for example, Wilfred noted: ‘the collection [at Fawsley Hall in Northamptonshire] contains 40 armorial Tudor period medallions of fine quality [...] and is similar in type to the best armorial glass in the Dixon collection’.1116

1113 Caviness, *Midwestern*, 16.
1114 Burrell had even mistaken drawings of panels in the Dixon collection as having been of some of his. He also lamented the fact he could not travel and view Dixon’s collection during wartime: ‘Mr Dixon, whose collection I should like very much to see, but never shall’; GMRC, *Burrell/Drake Correspondence*, reg. no. 52/56.447, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, February 20, 1942 (Appendix B, document 463).
1115 Eden, *Ronaele Manor*.
The Dions’ catalogue of their stained glass, published in London in 1927, was released just a year before Burrell’s glazing of Hutton Castle, and in it Thomas and Drake’s role was made explicit, as they were thanked in the opening remarks (see Chapter Two). Given the timing and similarities between their collections and the placements of panels, it is possible Burrell intentionally employed the services of Thomas and Drake more frequently from this point onwards as a result of his wish to emulate Dixon. Before the formation of Thomas and Drake, stained glass was largely only available from Paris-based art dealers, who sold principally French stained glass. However, Thomas and Drake had a stock of hundreds and hundreds of English panels, so the Dions’ fully illustrated catalogue may have revealed to Burrell that, through Thomas and Drake’s agency, an extremely high-quality, but entirely English display was possible.

There is no evidence to suggest that Burrell was aware of the technical proficiency of some of the panels in his collection, and Wilfred never explicitly sold a panel to Burrell on that understanding. Nor did Burrell ever discuss an interest in iconography, or express a wish to source or acquire panels because of their specific subject matter. Perhaps the most appropriate iconographic choices can be seen in the series of panels installed in his daughter Marion’s rooms. Biblical stories well known to young audiences were installed in her suite, such as a medallion depicting the story of *Jonah and the Whale*, and one depicting *Jacob’s Ladder*; although Marion was in fact over 30 years old at this time, she was only 15 when the castle was acquired and plans begun (fig. 206). Marion’s difficult relationship with her parents has been well documented, and it is not known what input, if any, she had in the decoration of her rooms, which occupied the top floor of the castle above her parents’ bedrooms. Aside from Burrell and Wilfred, there is only evidence to corroborate that Burrell’s wife Constance had a hand in the selection and purchase of certain panels, such as the fifteenth-century English panel depicting *Princess Cecily*, originally from the Royal Window in the north transept at Canterbury Cathedral (Kent), which was not installed at the castle (fig. 111). Much later, in 1945, Burrell had stated: ‘my daughter is now taking an

---

1117 Drake, “Hutton Castle,” 64–64; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/515–516.
interest in art and I am giving her little examples to start and encourage her’, requesting that Wilfred repair four panels for her, depicting a Christ Child, Angel, the Via Dolorosa and St George. However, these were not retained by Marion and entered the Burrell Collection.\(^{1120}\)

Although there have been suggestions that some collectors were drawn to specific national styles, on account of their own social or political leanings,\(^ {1121}\) there is no evidence that Burrell regarded his collection in these terms. In all the major areas of his collecting, he had specimens from around the world, which he acquired with apparent ease. ‘Only English’ was not a consideration in his acquisition of Chinese ceramics, Dutch, Flemish and German tapestries or nineteenth-century French paintings, for example. However, this criterion did align best with the English Gothic theme of his interiors, which also incorporated purchases of medieval furniture, stone fire surrounds, oak panelling, and other architectural salvages (figs 145, 148, 154, 161, 163, 188, 199–200).

In a letter to Wilfred, in August 1938, Burrell confirmed that he valued colour and ‘genuineness’ above all else,\(^ {1122}\) and so it can be assumed that his idea of quality encompassed these two considerations. Richly coloured panels particularly appealed,\(^ {1123}\) and in October 1932 Burrell even rejected an English panel Wilfred had sourced as a replacement for a poor condition Dutch window in one of the bathrooms, as it lacked sufficient depth of colour (fig. 197).\(^ {1124}\) Burrell said: ‘the little panel in the bathroom, although Dutch and made up of several pieces, is very brilliant in colour and I find the little [English] piece you so kindly

\(^{1120}\) GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no 52/56.594, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, July 24, 1945 (Appendix C, document 613); Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/32, 45/85–86, 45/431.

\(^{1121}\) In order to evade anti-German reactions during wartime, the German origin of several panels in Hearst’s collection were labelled vaguely. Glass originally from Boppard, which Burrell acquired from Hearst’s collection, was erroneously (but likely deliberately) listed as ‘probably Austrian’, even though files predating the catalogue had accurately identified their German origin; Madeline Caviness, “The Germanophilia of William Randolph Hearst and the Fate of his Collection”, in Collections of Stained Glass and their Histories: Transactions of the 25th International Colloquium of the Corpus Vitrearum in Saint Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, 2010 (Bern: Peter Lang, 2012), 189. This same deception was not employed by Wilfred when discussing their purchase with Burrell, however.

\(^{1122}\) GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no 52/56.154, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, August 26, 1938 (Appendix A, document 163).

\(^{1123}\) Ibid.

\(^{1124}\) GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no 52/56.90, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, October 11, 1932 (Appendix A, document 98).
offer me is much less colourful and I know you won’t mind if I leave it as it is until we come across a more colourful panel’. A general lack of colour also automatically led Burrell away from certain national styles, helping also to account for his ‘only English’ inclination. In February 1941, Wilfred made remarks to that effect: ‘I know that being a connoisseur of Gothic glass, the thin colouring of the [sixteenth and seventeenth century] Dutch School does not impress you’. This traditional lack of colour seen across many of Burrell’s Dutch enamel-painted panels was presumably a major reason why such a large proportion of the servants’ stained glass was Dutch.

English armorials – appropriate accessories in the creation of an English manorial setting, which Burrell referred to as creating ‘an effect’ – began to be collected by Burrell in greater numbers from the 1920s onwards. Although Burrell did not shy away from incorporating monumental religious windows into his home – despite there being no evidence that he held any particularly strong religious beliefs himself – like many of Wilfred’s other customers, especially Dixon, Burrell’s displays at Hutton Castle incorporated significant amounts of heraldry. Of the 250 panels recorded as having been installed at the castle by 1932, no less than 150 were armorial. Burrell explained his passion for this type of glass: ‘It has not only colour, but is English, and being armorial is intensely interesting’, suggesting he perhaps had a more intellectual appreciation of heraldic glass. As Burrell continued to augment his

1125 Ibid.
1126 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no 52/56.383, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, February 17, 1941 (Appendix B, document 397). Although Burrell’s leaning towards richly coloured glass was never qualified, it may have been partly as a consequence of his gradually failing eyesight. By the late 1930s, his daughter Marion penned many of his letters (see the Appendices); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no 52/56.122, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 4 1938 (Appendix A, document 131). Richly coloured glass was also more likely to create the much coveted ‘gothic gloom’; Wilhelm Valentiner, “Arrangement,” MMA Bulletin, 5, no. 3 (March 1910): 16. This gloom may have had the further benefit of offering a degree of protection to Burrell’s tapestries. When Burrell gifted his collection to the Glasgow Corporation in 1944, several clauses related to the care and protection of his tapestries. It may be that their light-sensitive nature, as well as their vulnerability to pollution, was known to Burrell. Wilfred’s glazing of windows for The Cloisters made provision of this kind. In July 1937, its curator James Rorimer wrote: ‘we are planning to use ‘document glass’ instead of ordinary glass in the leading of these windows [...] We have every reason to believe that this newly developed glass will keep the deleterious ultra-violet rays from fading the Unicorn tapestries’; MMA, Cloisters’ Archive, Papers Relating to the Construction of the Cloisters, letter to John Rockefeller, July 30, 1937.
collections, after his decision to gift his art to the Glasgow Corporation, he began to acquire armorials far more resolutely, purchasing entire collections of heraldry from English country estates through Wilfred’s agency. From Vale Royal Abbey (Cheshire) Burrell acquired thirty-seven armorials from Sotheby’s in 1947 for just £55. Wilfred had at some stage earlier sold at least eight sixteenth-century English armorials to the politician Hilton Philipson (1892–1941), owner of Vale Royal Abbey, a sixteenth-century country house with surviving medieval Cistercian cloister. Burrell also acquired thirty-nine shields directly from Fawsley Hall (Northamptonshire) in 1950 for £2,000. Consequently, the Burrell Collection’s holdings in heraldic stained glass today are particularly strong and number over 300 pieces, representing almost half of the museum’s total holdings in this medium.

The Creation of a Museum (1935–)

Although Burrell’s formal agreement to gift his collection to the Glasgow Corporation was not officially ratified until 1944, Burrell’s decision to form an art collection of museum quality had already begun to be discussed by the mid- to late 1930s. Almost two thirds of the over 700 panels and windows that now comprise the Burrell Collection’s stained-glass holdings were collected by Burrell from the mid-1930s onwards expressly for his museum. This started off tentatively with only a handful of purchases, and from mid-1935 to 1938 stained glass was then largely absent from Burrell’s purchase books, suggesting his attention had shifted to other areas of his collection. The first recorded purchases which can be attributed to his collecting for the museum included a French fourteenth-century Madonna and Child, followed closely by a German fourteenth-century panel depicting Mary Magdalene, in May and July 1935 respectively (fig. 245). The fact that he was no longer constrained by the available space at his home, or his own personal taste that dictated a
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1129 This low figure was presumably enabled by a lack of competition in the sale rooms during and directly after the Second World War; “Catalogue of Armour and Weapons, Stained Glass, Musical Instruments, and Important Tapestries” (February 14, 1947): 7, lot. 71A.
1130 “Captain Hilton Philipson,” The Times, April 17, 1941, 9. Coincidentally, his actress wife, Mabel Russell Philipson (1887–1951), was a member of parliament for Berwick-on-Tweed from 1922 to 1929; Frederick Craig, British Parliamentary Election Results 1918–1949, 3rd edn (Chichester: Parliamentary Research Services, 1983), 102; Penny Hebgin-Barnes, The Medieval Stained Glass of Cheshire, CVMA Great Britain, Summary Catalogue 9 (Oxford: British Academy, 2010), 243–47.
1131 Wells, Heraldic, 5–6.
1132 1936, when he spent almost £80,000 on art, marked a peak in Burrell’s expenditure on his collection; “Glasgow Acclaims Burrell Architects,” Glasgow Herald, March 16, 1972, 24.
1133 Wells, Figure and Ornamental, 24, no. 58; Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/381.
1134 Wells, Figure and Ornamental, 14, no. 17; Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/479.
largely ‘only English’ theme, threw the range of his collecting wide open. This caused second keeper of the Burrell Collection, William Wells, to remark: ‘A home several times larger than Hutton Castle would have been required to accommodate the ever-increasing number of treasures [...]’.\textsuperscript{1135} For the first time in Burrell’s collecting career, stained glass was purchased for its own sake, as a core component of the museum Burrell and his advisors envisaged, and not simply as house decoration. While significant in terms of the quality and breadth of panels acquired, this vast swathe of Burrell’s stained glass collection did not share the same level of personal connection with Burrell himself as those selected for the glazing of his homes, and included the high proportion of foreign stained glass that Burrell would not have tolerated at Hutton Castle.

Burrell was almost 80 years old when he began purchasing for the museum. Due to his now advanced age, he rarely left the confines of his country estate, and consequently relied more heavily on his network of art dealers to make acquisitions on his behalf. Most of these purchases were sent directly to the Glasgow Corporation, or were packed in boxes in London before being transferred to Hutton Castle, where they would be deposited unopened in the various outhouses on Burrell’s estate. In large part, much of this late phase of Burrell’s collecting of stained glass was funded by Burrell, but the process of selecting and purchasing was conducted by Wilfred. Numerous letters reveal that Wilfred was now instructing Burrell specifically as to which windows to purchase, and which to reject. Burrell did not view these windows himself, but relied solely on Wilfred’s recommendations, which time and again he followed exactly.\textsuperscript{1136} For example, in August 1938 Burrell sent Wilfred photographs of some windows that had formed part of the collection of William Randolph Hearst (1863–1951), and requested that they be ranked in order of ‘beauty’.\textsuperscript{1137} In response, Wilfred instead placed them in order of ‘merit’, favouring panels that contained the most original pieces.\textsuperscript{1138} Wilfred was, therefore, suggesting the purchase of unrestored panels for Burrell’s museum collection, indicating that he valued historicity of materials.

\textsuperscript{1135} Wells, “Glasgow Art Gallery,” 277.
\textsuperscript{1136} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.135, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, August 4, 1938 (Appendix A, document 145); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.140, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, August 9, 1938 (Appendix A, document 150).
\textsuperscript{1137} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.134, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, August 3, 1938 (Appendix A, document 144).
\textsuperscript{1138} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.135, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, August 4, 1938 (Appendix A, document 145).
Burrell had also called upon Wilfred numerous times to provide heraldic, iconographic, and provenance research for items in his collection, noting: ‘I turn to you when I am in historical difficulty’. This effectively made Wilfred one of the earliest, if not the first, researcher and compiler of art-historical information on Burrell’s collection, information that has so far proved to be remarkably free of major error. This extended not just to the stained glass, but to needlework, clocks, wooden panelling, and other items that Burrell had found to contain previously unidentified heraldic devices.

During this period, Burrell positioned himself in direct competition with major museums, much to their chagrin. With Wilfred’s assistance, Burrell was now competing on a higher level, with curators looking to obtain museum-quality examples. Without the bureaucracy to which curators were subject however, Burrell was able to close deals far more quickly, which proved to be to his advantage. On one occasion, in 1946 William Bowyer Honey (1889–1956), keeper of ceramics and stained glass at the V&A (1938–1950), missed out on an acquisition of a sixteenth-century French window depicting the Life of St John the Baptist, taken from the long gallery at Blithfield Hall (Staffordshire) (fig. 246). This was a companion to Burrell’s three-light St John the Divine window, installed at Hutton Castle, both having originally come from the Church of St John at Rouen (fig. 155). In frustration, Honey
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1139 Some examples are discussed in the following: GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.420, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, September 19, 1941 (Appendix B, document 434); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.430, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, December 10, 1941 (Appendix B, document 446); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.488, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, January 17, 1943 (Appendix C, document 504); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.676, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, January 29, 1947 (Appendix C, document 697).

1140 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.75, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, August 21, 1932 (Appendix A, document 82).


1142 Burrell first contemplated donating this glass to Glasgow Cathedral, rather than keep it for his museum; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.689, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, May 13, 1947 (Appendix C, document 711). However, a few months later and without explanation, Burrell abandons this plan; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.699, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, September 3, 1947 (Appendix C, document 720); Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/417–424.
remarked: ‘I am sick to death of Burrell, this is the third time lately that he has interfered [and purchased stained glass that the museum wanted].’\textsuperscript{1143}

With Burrell’s collection ever increasing, his closest European counterpart was perhaps Liverpool-based medical doctor and antiquarian Dr Philip Nelson (1872–1953), who at a young age was heir to a significant fortune following the death of his Scottish-born shipbroker father Philip Nelson (1822–1883).\textsuperscript{1144} Like Burrell’s, Nelson’s collection of stained glass was extremely large, totalling around 400 panels and windows, although some of these were copies of medieval items rather than genuine articles, made variously by Wilfred and Canterbury Cathedral’s (Kent) glazier Samuel Austin Caldwell Jr. (1862–1963). Following an appraisal by John Hunt, the majority of Nelson’s stained-glass collection was purchased by the Walker Art Gallery (Liverpool) after Nelson’s death in 1953. It is not known what proportion of Nelson’s acquisitions were installed at his south Liverpool home, Beechwood (in Calderstones Park), as only minimal records of this property and its contents survive.\textsuperscript{1145}

Nor is much known of the provenance of Nelson’s collection, although Wilfred did supply Nelson with several panels, such as several English sixteenth-century armorials,\textsuperscript{1146} and a fourteenth-century English roundel.\textsuperscript{1147} However, by the 1940s, Burrell had observed that Nelson had become ‘more of a seller than a buyer’,\textsuperscript{1148} indicating that Burrell kept a close eye on his competitors in the medium. Nelson’s switch to seller was indicative of the wider changing political and economic climate after Europe’s entry into the Second World War. At least nine of Nelson’s panels were offered by Wilfred to Burrell and purchased at this time, including several fourteenth- and fifteenth-century English shields (fig. 247).\textsuperscript{1149} Wilfred also

\textsuperscript{1143} VAA, Blythe House, Nominal Files, Wilfred Drake folder, MA/1/D1564, “Minute Paper,” October 25, 1946.

\textsuperscript{1144} London, High Court of Justice, Principal Probate Registry, March 10, 1884, “Nelson, Philip.”

\textsuperscript{1145} Nelson’s records, made available to art dealer John Hunt, who appraised the collection for Sotheby’s in 1953, are now deposited at the Hunt Museum (Limerick); Hunt Museum, Hunt Family Files, Private Collectors – Doctor Philip Nelson, HM/ARCH/B4a/00001. An illustrated catalogue of Nelson’s stained glass has also been published; Penny Hebgin-Barnes, The Medieval Stained Glass of Lancashire, CVMA Great Britain (Oxford: British Academy, 2009), 147–246.

\textsuperscript{1146} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 47, stock card C[jóstessey].14; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, stock cards nos. 1235, 1802.

\textsuperscript{1147} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock card no. 1359.

\textsuperscript{1148} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.523, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, April 15, 1944 (Appendix C, document 539).

\textsuperscript{1149} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.506, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, November 2, 1943 (Appendix C, document 522); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.546, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, July 8, 1944 (Appendix C, document 565); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.554, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell,
acted as Nelson’s agent in other sales, such as a small English sixteenth-century Tudor rose medallion, which was accorded a price of $800; the use of the dollar currency suggesting Thomas and Drake intended to sell this panel on his behalf in America.\textsuperscript{1150} Having perhaps felt that he had fully mined Wilfred’s stock, by the 1940s Burrell began to allow Wilfred to cast his net more widely, selecting prime specimens from major American sales. These were Burrell’s most expensive acquisitions of stained glass, and yet were not to be viewed or enjoyed by him at Hutton Castle, underlining Burrell’s serious focus and investment in the creation of a museum-worthy collection. Starting in 1938, through Wilfred and Roy’s agency, Burrell purchased at least eighteen panels and whole windows of English, French, German, and Austrian stained glass ranging in date from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{1151} Several English royal heraldic devices, as well as several German fifteenth-century windows depicting the \textit{Life of Christ} and \textit{St Cunibert}, originally from Boppard, were acquired from Hearst’s New York sale (fig. 248).\textsuperscript{1152} Wilfred and Burrell picked over the collection over a twelve-month period until they had exhausted its contents, leaving Burrell to summarise: ‘now as you know the Chase bank sold privately as much as they could (through Mr Parish Watson) – then the top floor of one of New York’s stores was filled, and as much as possible was sold there, and the newspapers stated that all New York flocked to that sale [...] now comes this catalogue, so that, speaking generally, the items in it must be, if not altogether, at least to a large extent the “left overs”.\textsuperscript{1153} Further panels originally from Boppard, depicting the \textit{Madonna and Child}, were purchased by Burrell through Thomas and Drake’s agency from Ogden Goelet’s estate, father of Burrell’s neighbour May Goelet Roxburgh. At a cost of £1,100 (equivalent to just under £33,000 today) plus a further £35 to cover exchange-rate loss, these were significant additions to Burrell’s collection (fig.

\textsuperscript{1150}SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, no stock number. Wilfred had previously also produced copies of a series of fourteenth-century \textit{Tree of Jesse} panels for Nelson, underlining that unlike Burrell, Nelson was happy to own and display copies as well as original panels; Penny Hebgin-Barnes, “Stained Glass in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool,” \textit{Journal of Stained Glass}, 23 (2009): 12–25.

\textsuperscript{1151} These were the multi-millionaires to whom Roy had sold stained glass just a few years earlier (see Chapter Two), showing just how quickly fortunes could change.

\textsuperscript{1152} Cannon, \textit{Glass in the Burrell}, 89; Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/144, 45/203, 45/233–34, 45/236–37, 45/365–66, 45/372, 45/382–83, 45/410, 45/480–81, 45/485–87.

\textsuperscript{1153} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.434, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, December 31, 1941 (Appendix B, document 450).
Anxious to obtain panels of the highest quality, Burrell had asked Wilfred in relation to this deal: ‘Do you consider window A is on the same level with the best which I have recently bought from you?’.

Through Wilfred, Burrell also began selecting panels from Roy’s American branch, although only four were sent from New York before Roy’s permanent return to Britain in 1947. A further fifteen panels were acquired from this source by Burrell in April 1948, after Roy had relocated to Britain (see further below), just months before Wilfred’s death. This included a series of twelve armorials, which Roy was instructed to send directly to the Glasgow Corporation. Other panels included several fourteenth- to sixteenth-century English and German armorials, two fourteenth-century Austrian panels depicting the **Resurrection** and **St Nicholas**, two Flemish fourteenth-century lancets depicting saints **Nicasius** and **Clement**, an English fourteenth-century **Crucifixion**, and a French fourteenth-century **Madonna and Child**. From September 1947, the keeper of the Burrell Collection was making arrangements to have the Glasgow-based removal firm Totten and Co. drive to London, and begin collecting the numerous cases of art that Burrell had acquired for the museum but stored with art dealers in order to spread his wartime liability. At this stage, Wilfred alone reported that he had seven cases packed and ready to be given to the moving
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1154 Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/487a–b.
1155 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.287, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, August 17, 1939 (Appendix B, document 299).
1156 GMRC, Dealer Correspondence A–R, Wilfred Drake, letter to Andrew Hannah, April 21, 1948.
1159 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book II, 64–67, nos. 1959–60. In 1936, these panels had been offered to the MMA for $8,000; MMA, Central Archive, Dealer Correspondence, Roy Thomas folder, G4638, “Minute Paper,” 1936. Burrell paid a figure significantly less, after Roy reluctantly agreed to reduce the price to £450 for the pair, and sell to Burrell, indicative of the poor market; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.283, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, August 10, 1939 (Appendix B, document 293); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, no reg. no., Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, February 8, 1940 (Appendix B, document 340).
1160 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, stock book I, 82–83, no. 2052; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.241, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, April 5, 1939 (Appendix A, document 250); Wells, *Figure and Ornamental*, 19; Burrell Collection, acc. no. 45/23.
1162 GMRC, Dealer Correspondence A–R, Andrew Hannah, letter to Wilfred Drake, September 16, 1947.
company, including the monumental French St John the Baptist window from Blithfield (see above), and the Vale Royal armorials (fig. 246).

Despite collecting with a museum in mind, some of Burrell’s personal preferences prevailed: ‘I don’t like to buy anything unless it appeals to me’. Heraldry features in great quantities; panels of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries are also rare. As an exception, Burrell purchased and retained (after obtaining Wilfred’s approval to do so) a low-quality panel, dating presumably from the 1870s or 1880s, which was designed and executed by painter Matthijs Maris (1839–1917) when he was in residence at Daniel Cottier’s London studio (fig. 250). Unlike any other panels in Burrell’s collection, he revealed it held special sentimental value, explaining: ‘I am a great admirer of Maris’ work [on canvas], and it was for that reason that I bought the panel many years ago [...] I have about 40 of his paintings and drawings’.

Other panels did not make the cut, and were removed from the collection, including a series of mainly nineteenth-century Dutch and Swiss medallions. By June 1941, a box containing over 100 panels was sent to Wilfred in London to be sold. Often, Burrell gave Wilfred full autonomy over these decisions, writing, for example, in July 1941: ‘if you think they are not worth keeping as examples I shall sell them, but if you think they are good enough to keep as little specimens for the museum I should like to retain them’. That the Burrell Collection now contains any specimens of Dutch glass at all is down to Wilfred, as in February 1941 Burrell remarked: ‘I think of excluding from my collection all my Dutch glass as I think it is
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1163 GMRC, Dealer Correspondence A–R, Wilfred Drake, letter to Andrew Hannah, September 22, 1947.
1166 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.422, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, October 30, 1941 (Appendix B, document 437); Burrell Collection, acc. nos. 45/561.
1168 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.401, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 24, 1941 (Appendix B, document 415).
1169 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.415, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, July 30, 1941 (Appendix B, document 429).
rather a blot than otherwise on the rest [...] is this too drastic?'. 1170 Wilfred’s immediate response sought to persuade and reassure Burrell otherwise, firmly stating: ‘This would be too drastic as the collection being of such a comprehensive nature should surely include examples of Dutch work, and yours are of good quality’. 1171 Burrell also later briefly thought of donating the lower-quality panels to a small museum. Instead he instructed Wilfred to continue to sell the panels, and in a remarkably generous move, for Thomas and Drake to ‘keep the proceeds’. 1172 After the stained glass was removed for wartime safe-keeping, it was reinstated without revision sometime after 18 January 1946, when Burrell remarked that he hoped to start reinstalling his stained glass ‘soon’. 1173 While the majority of Burrell’s collection was transferred to the Glasgow Corporation as part of his gift, he initially retained most of the stained glass reinstalled after the war at Hutton Castle, most of which was not removed and added to the museum’s collection until much later, being transferred in two waves – the first in 1956, and the second in 1962, after Constance Burrell’s death. 1174

The Closure of Thomas and Drake’s Business

During times of economic hardship, Burrell’s reliance on Wilfred’s services proved vital in staving off total closure of the company. The first outward signs that Wilfred’s branch was struggling, or that he had been required to come to the aid of the ailing American branch (see Chapter Two), occurred around December 1931, not long after the start of the Great Depression. Wilfred had sent at least twenty-eight seventeenth- and eighteenth-century panels, some seemingly part of the same fairly low-quality stylistic series, and some in poor condition, to auction at Christie’s London salerooms in 1931 (fig. 251). 1175 A further seventeen panels of similar quality and condition were also recorded as having been sold at
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1174 This work was done by the Newcastle-based firm Reed Millican, a subsidiary of glass manufacturers Pilkington Brothers.
1175 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 128–29, 132, 237, 293, 832, 872, 888, 918, 926, 1102, 1168, 1179–82, 1241, 1321, 1345, 1484, 1486, 1508, 1518, 1827, Cas[siobury].69, Cas[siobury].86.
Christie’s, but no date was provided by Wilfred.\footnote{1176} This represents a change in the way the firm was selling its stock, suggesting that from late 1931 Wilfred had to release a high volume of stock in one go, likely in order to obtain a quick cash injection.\footnote{1177} In March 1933, Burrell’s remarks suggest that one or both of Thomas and Drake’s branches were in difficulty: ‘Am glad you are keeping busy, I am very hopeful that your business will gradually improve’.\footnote{1178}

Whole batches of glass were again brought to auction by Wilfred during the Second World War. Wilfred entered at least 83 panels for sale at Sotheby’s; stock cards for 33 of these have no date of sale,\footnote{1179} but the remaining 50 span a period from 1942 to 1946, with at least 18 recorded to have been sold there in 1942,\footnote{1180} 19 in 1943,\footnote{1181} 5 in 1944,\footnote{1182} 6 in 1945,\footnote{1183} and finally 3 in 1946.\footnote{1184} However, Wilfred acknowledged that the panels he was willing to part with in this manner were of a relatively poor condition, and photographs of the panels support this (fig. 252). In a letter of 1943 Wilfred lamented: ‘the glass which I have been selling this year at the sale rooms is not really of sufficient quality to call your notice. Many of the panels are mere fragments and few of them have any colour. I had a very large stock when I moved [my workshop] from Kensington [in 1940] and have been selling them a few at a time ever since’.\footnote{1185} Many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century panels and windows were disposed of, in addition to various fragments, damaged panels, and small quarries.

\footnote{1176} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 1834–35, 1360, 1372, 1375–76, 1386–87, 1418, 1445, 1448, 1479, 1482, 1626, 1630, 1783, Cas[siobury].64.
\footnote{1177} It is unlikely that this was in order to make purchases of new stock, as no significant acquisitions were made at this time.
\footnote{1178} William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, March 2, 1933, GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.100 (Appendix A, document 108).
\footnote{1182} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 1143, 1147, 1462, 1764, 1873.
\footnote{1183} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 35, 146–47, 755, 1169, 1802.
\footnote{1184} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock cards nos. 853, 808, 1367.
\footnote{1185} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.508, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, November 9, 1943 (Appendix C, document 524).
During the war, established dealers such as Leitch and Kerin closed their galleries entirely, and John Hunt retreated to eighteenth-century Poyle Manor (Berkshire), and then by 1940 to Dublin and Limerick in Ireland. Charles of London and Roberson of London both also ceased trading. In 1941, Wilfred ominously reported: ‘Sotheby’s and Christie’s are both deserted, Bond Street is incredibly quiet’. Frank Partridge’s and John Hunt’s King Street galleries, as well as Christie’s, were obliterated after a bomb directly struck their buildings during a particularly heavy raid in February 1944. Many associated with the art trade could no longer afford to make new purchases, and were purely sellers. This factor led Wilfred to appeal to Burrell’s penchant for a bargain: ‘I cannot buy any glass for myself but I would be pleased to bid on your behalf [...] the war has taken such a serious turn that you may decide not to buy glass for a while. On the other hand, it is probable that the bidding will be very limited’. The British Society of Glass-Painters even established an emergency wartime committee in order to attempt to offer financial assistance to those in the stained-glass industry. The group also issued a series of guidelines, urging donors and authorities to continue to support the arts. Fortunately, in 1943 Wilfred completed a rare new commission, for St Andrew’s Church (Watford), where he arranged nine sixteenth-century Flemish medallions in a window.

Wilfred was one of only a few art dealers to remain in business, although it is clear that this did not provide him with sufficient income. By November 1941, Wilfred described his search for alternative paid employment: ‘I am now trying for a post in the corps of Military Police where they consider men with military service who are of a more mature age [...] I have also tried the Ministry of Supply, the Ministry of Labour, and the local munitions factory, without

1187 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.387, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, April 8, 1941 (Appendix B, document 401).
1189 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.351, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, June 6, 1940 (Appendix B, document 365).
1190 Christopher Woodforde, “Note by the Honorary Secretary,” Journal of the British Society of Master Glass-Painters, 8, no. 2 (April 1940): 84–86.
1191 Ibid.
1192 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 46, Wilfred Drake, letter to Christopher Woodforde, February 1, 1944.
success’. By November 1941, Wilfred had also sent his large collection of stained-glass books to auction at Sotheby’s. He had earlier attempted to sell these privately, even inviting Burrell to consider forming a small library of books to compliment his collection: ‘I would like to sell my collection of books, pamphlets, and catalogues of ancient stained glass (numbering over 100) [...] If you think that any might interest you [...] Together with your own books on stained glass, they might form quite a beneficial library to accompany a collection of stained glass’. Wilfred explained:

There will doubtless be much restoration work to stained glass needed after the war. The difficulty for some of us is how to bridge the gap in the meantime. My collection of glass here, mainly small panels, cost me £1,279 (actual cost price) and I would cheerfully sell it for far less than it cost. The same applies to the oddments of old furniture and pictures which I have [...] a bank manager does not regard such products as collateral security [...] I am renewing my efforts to obtain employment in national service.

British wartime banking restrictions, which prohibited the transmission of money internationally, also had a considerable impact on Thomas and Drake’s transatlantic business. This had the effect of isolating the two Thomas and Drake branches from each other, a situation summarised by Wilfred in February 1940:

It appears that the Bank of England restrictions now prevent the transfer of money, i.e. the purchase [of stained glass panels in America], ridiculous though it may seem [...] I should not be allowed to send R. Thomas any money

---

1193 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.713, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, November 1, 1941 (Appendix B, document 438). For the duration of the war, Wilfred was a volunteer in the Home Guard, although this was an unpaid position; Private Collection, Frank Drake, letter to Wilfred and Bessie Winifred Drake, September 5, 1940, with thanks to Frances Page; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.380, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, January 30, 1941 (Appendix B, document 394); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.433, Wilfred Drake to William Burrell, December 10, 1941 (Appendix B, document 449).

1194 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.713, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, November 1, 1941 (Appendix B, document 438).


1196 This was exacerbated by major disruptions to the international postal services; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.306, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, November 6, 1939 (Appendix B, document 317); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.387, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, April 8, 1941 (Appendix B, document 401).
until after the war. The whole thing is absurd – and it has also a very serious side for me – business with America is now impossible to transact [...] These restrictions make it very difficult for me to continue in business, and I have had to decline an offer from a Swiss Museum, for a panel now in the Hearst collection, as I should not have been able to remit the money to the USA.1198

The New York branch had entirely closed by 1943, having recorded no sales since 1941 (see Chapter Two).1199 However, Wilfred’s close relationship with Burrell must have provided Thomas and Drake’s London branch with some much-needed income. The firm’s accountant, Wilfred’s son Frank Frederick Drake (1908–1971) remarked in a letter of May 1940: ‘I’m glad Sir William Burrell is still a staunch friend’.1200 From 1939, as well as his normal duties of sourcing and repairing stained glass for Burrell, Wilfred was asked by Burrell to design stained-glass arrangements for his proposed museum.1201 To this end, Wilfred grouped Burrell’s smaller panels and roundels into periods and styles. Many of the initial phases of these plans survive, and show Wilfred having begun grouping panels into their national and periodic styles.1202 Wilfred produced numerous diagrams, and amendments to these schemes that reflected Burrell’s feedback, until a total of twenty-six windows was settled upon, sorted by period and country of origin.1203 During this time, all of Burrell’s stained glass had already been stored for wartime safeguarding, and was therefore inaccessible. Burrell anxiously commented: ‘in arranging a window one has to consider not only shape and size

1199 Wilfred described the restrictions on goods entering Europe as ‘distressing’, explaining that Roy and other art dealers in New York were finding business hard; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.331, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, February 16, 1940 (Appendix B, document 344).
1200 Private Collection, Frank Drake, letter to Wilfred and Bessie Winifred Drake, May 18, 1940; with thanks to Frances Page.
1201 These plans were already underway and clearly defined by April 1941, when Burrell remarked: ‘I have been looking at your suggestions for the placing of the stained glass’; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.386, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, April 3, 1941 (Appendix B, document 400). The last letter of this kind was written by Wilfred in June 1941, when Wilfred explained: ‘I endeavoured to include as many examples of the whole collection in as few windows as possible’; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.398, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, June 4, 1941 (Appendix B, document 412).
1202 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.386, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, April 3, 1941 (Appendix B, document 400).
1203 Wilfred Drake, GMRC, Correspondence Prior to 1944 Gift, Stained glass diagrams, c.1939-1941.
but also colour and that we have not been able to do, not having the glass beside us’, again highlighting his focus on the aesthetic quality of stained glass.\footnote{GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.395, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, May 26, 1941 (Appendix B, document 409).}

By the late 1940s, Burrell’s interior designer Frank Surgey had been invited by Burrell to submit designs for the layout of a museum to house the collection, and at this preliminary stage, Surgey stated his intention to use Wilfred as a stained-glass consultant.\footnote{GMRC, Andrew Hannah Papers, Frank Surgey, letter to Andrew Hannah, February 3, 1948.} However, soon after, Surgey reported to the keeper of the Burrell Collection, Andrew Hannah: ‘You have probably met Wilfred Drake, and will be sorry to hear that he died on Tuesday night. Both Sir William and I regarded him as a very great authority on stained glass, and we very much liked his friendly personality. For some time I have been hoping he would be able to collaborate with me in setting up the glass in conjunction with the elevations of the windows for the museum, but he had been too unwell’.\footnote{GMRC, Dealer Correspondence S–Z, Frank Surgey, letter to Andrew Hannah, September 23, 1948. Roy had already commented in correspondence with the Keeper of the Burrell Collection that ‘Mr Drake is not well enough just now’, suggesting his health had been in decline for several months; GMRC, Andrew Hannah Papers, Roy Thomas, letter to Andrew Hannah, August 19, 1948.} Ultimately, neither Wilfred’s early designs nor Surgey’s later ones were used by the Glasgow Corporation by the time an appropriate site for the museum was found over four decades later.\footnote{The display of the Burrell Collection is discussed by Marks, Portrait, 186–97. Rival preliminary schemes for the layout of Burrell’s proposed museum were submitted by Murray Adams-Acton and Frank Surgey, who by this time had dissolved their partnership; Marks, Portrait, 161–63.} This was the first time that such a large volume of stained glass would need to be accommodated in a newly built museum – comparable holdings at the MMA and V&A were built up gradually, long after their galleries had been designed and laid out.

Wilfred was not entirely reliant on sales, and could derive additional incomes from external practical stained-glass work. As early as January 1941, Burrell had urged Wilfred to look into obtaining work of this kind, imploring: ‘If I were you I should call and see those in charge of cathedrals and churches, which have valuable stained glass – and suggest the taking of it out [...] it is absurd that you should not be kept very busy in these critical times’.\footnote{GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.377, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, January 22, 1941 (Appendix B, document 391).} Wilfred’s obituary in The Times confirms that his later career was dominated by this type of work:
‘since the war he had been actively engaged upon the restoration of some of the many beautiful old windows removed or damaged during the war’. 1209

A high number of Wilfred’s restorations were connected to buildings associated with the British monarchy, presumably as the government was more willing to divert wartime funds to the safeguarding of these high-value sites. As early as May 1934, Wilfred had already been involved in the restoration of a series of nineteenth-century windows designed by Thomas Willement (1786–1871) and depicting Henry VIII in the oriel window in the great hall at Hampton Court Palace (Greater London). 1210 By 1938, Wilfred had also restored selected windows in the Stuart Room at Windsor Castle (Berkshire), including a lancet depicting the arms of King Henry VIII, also designed by Willement, in c.1830. 1211 Two years previously, in 1936, Wilfred had furnished a window in Windsor Castle’s library with two panels of sixteenth-century English armorial stained glass, depicting the bearings of Edward, Prince of Wales (1537–1553), an assignment brokered by the castle’s librarian (1926–1958) Sir Owen Morshead (1893–1977). 1212 As part of a widespread campaign to safeguard the castle’s treasures, 1213 in November 1940, Wilfred superintended the removal of the stained glass of the great west window in Windsor Castle’s St George’s Chapel, the third-largest expanse of glass in Britain. 1214 In his report, published in the Journal of the British Society of Master Glass-Painters, Wilfred revealed that he was ‘assisted by skilled craftsmen from Eton Wick’, a village near Windsor, and that his team had removed and stored seventy-nine panels dating from the late fifteenth, early sixteenth, and mid-eighteenth centuries. 1215 By July 1945,

1209 “Mr Wilfred Drake,” The Times, September 24, 1948, 6.
1210 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.115, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, May 15, 1934 (Appendix A, document 124). At an unknown date he was also involved in another project with royal connections, the restoration of the early seventeenth-century armorial window in one of a few surviving sections of the sixteenth-century Chapel of the Master of the Rolls, which was later incorporated into a neo-Gothic library and record office, renamed the Maughan Library, in 2001; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 47, “Thomas and Drake,” advertisement, 1947–48.
1212 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 54, stock card no. 1786.
1214 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.373, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, November 25, 1940 (Appendix B, document 387); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.374, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, November 30, 1940 (Appendix B, document 388).
Wilfred confirmed that he had been awarded the contract of reinstating this monumental window after the cessation of conflict, a job he was able to begin several months later. In 1943, Wilfred was subcontracted by the newly formed Ancient Monuments Branch of the Ministry of Works, whose principal aims were the requisitioning of buildings for military use, and the safeguarding of historic monuments. His first known work for this organisation was the removal of the stained glass at another royal complex, taking out eight fifteenth- to eighteenth-century windows in the chapel at the Tower of London, panels previously in the collection of politician and antiquarian Horace Walpole (1717–1797) at his Gothic-Revival villa Strawberry Hill (Greater London). To this end, Wilfred removed twenty-one English armorials and nine Continental figural panels ‘to safety’. Wilfred was also responsible for the removal of stained glass at three unnamed English churches in mid-1944, one of which was probably the Church of St Peter and Paul in Cudham (Kent), where, Wilfred later revealed, he had ‘rescued three armorial shields from a window’. The following year he restored and reinstated the east and clerestory windows of Wells Cathedral (Somerset). From July to November 1946, Wilfred had also repaired a seventeenth-century window depicting King Henry VIII in the great hall at St Bartholomew’s Royal Hospital (North London), a job which he had completed by November 1946 (fig. 253).

1219 Ibid.
1220 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.558, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, September 27, 1944 (Appendix C, document 575).
1222 GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.590, Wilfred Drake, letter to Wilfred Drake, June 9, 1945 (Appendix C, document 609); GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.592, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, July 3, 1945 (Appendix C, document 611); Ayers, Wells Cathedral, pt I, 343.
The shift in emphasis from sales to restoration work was reinforced by the fact that by December 1940 Wilfred had given up his Kensington workshop, moving his stock to the relative safety of home, Casillis, in Twickenham (Greater London). Consequently, Thomas and Drake no longer had a formal presence in central London. After the war, Wilfred continued to work from his home, presumably as it presented significant savings in rental costs; there is no evidence that he looked to obtain a separate workshop again in Kensington or elsewhere. By this time, Roy and Wilfred may already have decided that Roy was to return to England and establish a studio for them in London, which he had done by mid-1947. Roy opened a small combined home and studio at 9 Hillsleigh Road in Kensington, less than a mile from Wilfred’s and Grosvenor’s former studios.

Roy’s move back to London, and Wilfred’s remaining out at his workshop in Twickenham suggest that in this post-war period Thomas and Drake were looking to downsize their operations significantly, focusing their attentions on the running of just one branch from their original British base. Aside from sales made by Wilfred to Burrell, Roy seems to have been once again at the helm of the firm’s sales. William Cole, a friend of Roy’s, purchased at least seven English and French fifteenth-century figures and armorials from Roy in 1949. African colonial administrator, Sir Hector Duff (1872–1954), purchased a Dutch seventeenth-century armorial in 1948 for £15 and a buyer identified only as ‘Lewis’ purchased five Dutch seventeenth-century panels depicting musketeers and cavaliers in 1951.

---

1225 Wartime bombing raids caused damage to the roof and windows of Wilfred’s workshop; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.368, Wilfred Drake, letter to William Burrell, October 31, 1940 (Appendix B, document 382).
1226 Roy had first tried and failed to obtain premises in New York after the war, before abandoning the country altogether; GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.685, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, March 26, 1947 (Appendix C, document 707).
On the death of Wilfred in September 1948, just months after Roy’s return, both the technical and sales aspects of the business passed permanently to Roy, as the last remaining partner in the business. During the restoration of Burrell’s thirty-nine Fawsley Hall armorials in 1950, Roy had originally intended simply to supervise the work, but shortly after he reported: ‘our old glazier, who was to do most of the work, fell off his bicycle and broke his leg and fingers [...] Messrs Lowndes and Drury have now kindly agreed to help’. However, Lowndes and Drury were so busy that they could only commit to the restoration of around half of the collection, leaving Roy to attempt restoration of the rest single-handedly, as he had not succeeded in finding a replacement glazier at such short notice. This work involved the leading of cracks, insertion of glass ‘of the period’, and re-puttying of the panels, for which he charged the relatively low sum of £53.13.6, presumably indicative of his lack of experience. Despite the less than ideal situation, Roy did a remarkably good job; although it was he who likely failed to mix the putty to a sufficient consistency, and remove the residue still present on the surface of many of the panels.

Burrell all but ceased purchasing from Thomas and Drake after Wilfred’s death, indicating his reluctance to deal with anyone within the firm other than Wilfred, the exception being the completion of the acquisition of armorial panels from Fawsley Hall, for which Wilfred had originally begun the protracted negotiations as early as 1938. With the cream of many stained-glass collections having been thoroughly picked over by Wilfred and Burrell, and now the death of Burrell’s trusted advisor, Burrell ceased his collecting of stained glass altogether. His departure took with it one of Thomas and Drake’s most loyal customers, which must have dealt Roy’s business a further critical blow. While Thomas and Drake were well established, Roy’s contacts and networks were principally based in America, where he had worked for over twenty-five years. The V&A’s keeper of ceramics and stained glass, Edward Arthur Lane (1909–1963), gave his summation of meeting Roy for the first time in 1948. Apparently a frail character who was now in his early sixties, Lane noted: ‘he seems alright, but rather old and

1231 GMRC, Andrew Hannah Papers, Roy Thomas, letter to Andrew Hannah, January 19, 1950.
1232 GMRC, Andrew Hannah Papers, Roy Thomas, letter to Andrew Hannah, February 18, 1950.
1233 GMRC, Andrew Hannah Papers, Roy Thomas, letter to Andrew Hannah, March 1, 1950.
1234 GMRC, Andrew Hannah Papers, Roy Thomas, invoice, March 17, 1950.
1235 There is no evidence to suggest that these panels have been touched by conservators since Roy; thanks to Marie Stumpff.
1236 Marks, Portrait, 172–73.
slow, perhaps even a little pitiful. It is no good coming back to England at that age now’. This figure was perhaps far removed from the man who in the decades previously had dealt directly with some of America’s most powerful individuals, and their agents. Roy died in late 1952 with no successor, though his wife later noted: ‘Roy felt he wished he had someone to help him and hand on to, he said so very often to me’.

Conclusion

While Wilfred’s operations in Europe were on a far more modest scale relative to Roy’s American activities, many significant sales were made. Wilfred’s skills were diverse, and what the London branch lacked in volume of sales, it made up for in restorations, glass arrangements, and the execution of new works. Of greatest significance, however, was Wilfred’s nurturing of one of the firm’s most enduring and significant relationships, during the course of which he secured the custom and loyalty of William Burrell. This was a collaboration that surpassed any of Thomas and Drake’s other buyers in ambition, influence, longevity, and volume, one that endured as a lasting legacy as part of the internationally renowned Burrell Collection museum. Burrell’s closest private-sector counterparts trailed behind significantly in matters of scale, quality, and breadth, and Burrell’s was a collection exceeded in volume only by the V&A and MMA. Wilfred’s involvement in the formation of this remarkable collection was perhaps the firm’s greatest achievement. However, while Burrell owed a great debt to Wilfred, without his regular and substantial purchases, and the prestige associated with being the main supplier to perhaps the world’s largest private collector of stained glass, Thomas and Drake may also have been significantly poorer without Burrell. This reciprocal relationship was perhaps best summarised by Burrell himself in 1947, in one of the last of over 700 letters between the pair before Wilfred’s death: ‘It is I who has to thank you, and not you me, for, without you, I could not have had so much good glass as you have enabled me to get’. Their respective legacies and importance to one another are inextricably linked, and so their sharing of a chapter is especially apt.

1237 SAL, Christopher Woodforde Papers, box 31, Edward Arthur Lane, letter to Christopher Woodforde, December 9, 1948.
CONCLUSION

This thesis has explored the origin, formation, operation, and output of the transatlantic firm Thomas and Drake from around 1900 to 1950, the only art dealers to have specialised solely in stained glass during the first half of the twentieth century. It has examined their networks of dealers and buyers, their methods of marketing and selling, and how their stock was repaired, altered, arranged, and installed. It has considered both the importance of the art dealer, and of the restorer, in the presentation, sale, and incorporation of collected stained glass in new settings. It has also brought to the forefront the motivations for purchasing stained glass – its use in museums and churches, but also its frequent application as part of the furnishing of the homes of newly wealthy customers, situating the trade in ancient stained glass alongside the spheres of interior design and architectural salvage. Before the emergence of Thomas and Drake, a limited number of buyers competed for a limited numbers of panels, but Grosvenor, and later Thomas and Drake, changed that, bringing thousands of panels to market.

This research has demonstrated Grosvenor’s and Thomas and Drake’s central role in the acquisition, formation, alteration, and dispersal of thousands of panels of high-quality medieval and Renaissance stained glass. This is all the more remarkable as, while the handling and selling of stained glass was a life-long occupation for both Roy and Wilfred, Grosvenor maintained he was a landscape painter and continued a relatively successful and critically acclaimed career as an artist. They made, or perhaps reinvigorated, the market for ancient stained glass, providing unprecedented choice, range, and quality. Having analysed an extensive range of rich primary source material, this work contributes to and extends research on the formation of primarily British and American collections of stained glass during the period. By examining Wilfred’s interventions, it has become evident that these panels could easily be changed in appearance, size, shape, and material according to a client’s needs, so their stock was extremely versatile. Wilfred’s appointment opened up an array of options for customers, giving them a flexibility in how objects could be presented and incorporated. It also allowed the Thomases to align their new business with a well-known and respected name in the stained-glass world, as Wilfred Drake was from a long-established stained-glass dynasty. Through this research other secondary participants in the trade and restoration of this collection have emerged, such as the London firms of Burlison
and Grylls, Clayton and Bell, and Lowndes and Drury, none of which have so far been explicitly associated with the trade in ancient stained glass.

Grosvenor’s, and Thomas and Drake’s, activities provide one of the missing chapters in a history of the dispersal of European stained glass that began in the early nineteenth century, with the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars, and saw trade in Continental stained glass, frequently collected by British aristocrats and incorporated in their country estates, conducted in large volumes. This research demonstrates that, in many instances, British estates proved to be just a temporary home for these objects, as financial troubles a century later led to the downfall of the English country house, and the reintroduction of these panels back to the art market. Grosvenor, and later Thomas and Drake, were by far the most prolific participants in this new cycle of dispersal, channelling medieval and Renaissance stained glass in great volume to collections in new locations, and to a new generation of private buyers and public institutions. Many English country-house collections of stained glass were at serious risk of neglect and loss in the twentieth century, when so many great estates fell into ruin. Grosvenor’s, and Thomas and Drake’s actions ensured the survival of many outstandingly important European panels, and encouraged a new wave of interest in the medium.

Grosvenor’s decision to concentrate on the salvaging of stained glass from ailing English country estates was a vital and prescient move. As a fragile architectonic medium, stained glass was hard to handle, light, and install without the assistance of an experienced craftsman, so was unpopular amongst established dealers of medieval and Renaissance goods. The same can be said of his purchases of alabasters, ivories, and sarcophagi, which were often extremely heavy and difficult to accommodate in the average home. While others were clamouring for the more traditional saleable contents of these houses, Grosvenor received little competition for the stained glass, which presumably allowed him to obtain it at low prices, and with relative ease. Owing to his limited finances—for he was a self-made, albeit shrewd businessman of relatively ordinary wealth, according to what is known of his upbringing and early occupations—it its low cost must have particularly appealed to Grosvenor.
As Grosvenor purchased entire collections of stained glass, he also effectively prevented any sort of comparable business forming in competition, meaning that Grosvenor and later Thomas and Drake could maintain a monopoly in the medium in choice and volume. Grosvenor’s art-world links, through his Glasgow-based oriental and picture-dealing businesses, and as part of his activities as an artist with the Glasgow Boys, perhaps gave Grosvenor both the confidence to seek out stained glass as an investment, and the knowledge and experience to be able to market and sell it effectively. Owing to the relatively small pool of known buyers of stained glass at the start, this was a venture that came with considerable risk. However, of the known prices that changed hands, from the outset Grosvenor was able to command substantial figures. The sheer volume of panels Grosvenor was able to acquire in this way fed his massive transatlantic exhibitions for almost two decades, and both branches of Thomas and Drake’s business for a further three decades; almost half a century of stained glass sales were founded on Grosvenor’s impressive core collection. Rarely did they have cause to make any new purchases, and when they did, it was mainly to buy back panels that had previously been in their own stock. However, even after the deaths of Grosvenor, Roy, and Wilfred, the partners had not succeeded in selling all of the collection Grosvenor had initially amassed decades previously, underlining its enormous size.1240

As part of his role as head of Thomas and Drake’s New York branch, Roy must be given credit for the significant and numerous sales he made there, and the networks and collaborations he nurtured. It was during Roy’s tenure that the firm became more closely associated with the glazing of mansions of extremely wealthy Americans, often working alongside other British dealers working in America, particularly interior designers and period-room importers. Many sales to churches and museums can also be associated with funds from these customers, so it is hard to see how Thomas and Drake could have maintained a business at all without Roy’s successful assimilation with those servicing this ultra-rich set. Many of Roy’s buyers were Jewish, and many were connected through familial or occupational links, showing that a taste for medieval and Renaissance furnishings, and for ancient stained glass, was common across members of the same social circles. The sales of Roy’s branch also particularly demonstrate the importance of female buyers as dynamic decision-makers in the often opulent and high-value decoration of their homes, situating

1240 See the postscript for the dispersal of their remaining stock.
women at the vanguard of collectors in their willingness to incorporate significant amounts of ancient glazing in their homes. This thesis has also examined how perhaps the most powerful man in the world at the time, Rockefeller Jr., used Roy exclusively for his stained-glass purchases. Roy had remarkably close contact with Rockefeller, who involved himself heavily in the process of selection and acquisition of panels from Roy’s studio, challenging the view that members of the wealthy elite did not involve themselves directly with such matters. This thesis has also identified some trends in the purchasing of stained glass. For example, the enduring popularity of heraldry amongst newly rich sets, despite the fall of the British aristocratic way of life, and the acquisition of whole and composite monumental windows for recreated chapels in public institutions.

The diminishing finances of a British elite brought about the formation of Grosvenor’s stained-glass business, but it was the failing fortunes of their American counterparts a generation later that ultimately led to the end of the firm. The unpacking of some of these relationships has demonstrated how substantial this trade was during periods of general prosperity, but also the fragility of Roy’s business during times of economic trouble. For example, across Roy’s twenty-five years trading from his New York base, a pool of around seventy-five customers, from quite specific and limited geographic clusters, made purchases; few purchased across any sort of prolonged period, and most had acquired all they needed after just a year or two. These collections, obtained in order to compliment the furnishings of great mansions, are impressive for their quantity, but are often not wide-ranging, since buyers often purchased pieces in a favoured style in high numbers. These were not intended as comprehensive museum collections, even though many came to museums years later. The great majority of these customers made purchases in the strong economic climate of the 1920s. However, as has been demonstrated, after the stock-market crash in 1929, Roy lost practically all of his American-based clients almost overnight. However, what was America’s loss was Britain’s gain. William Burrell continued to buy, acquiring his most expensive works of stained glass from bankrupted American collectors, and bringing prime examples from their collections back to Europe once again.

Despite the over 130 combined sales completed by both branches of Thomas and Drake, it was perhaps the custom of Burrell that proved to be the most exceptional. Despite the American market’s being their main sales focus, and Wilfred’s London-based status as
primarily the firm’s technical director, Wilfred’s and Burrell’s extraordinary relationship stands perhaps as Thomas and Drake’s most lasting legacy, and it is for that reason that Wilfred has been featured throughout the thesis and afforded extended study in the final chapter. Wilfred Drake’s role as the firm’s restorer, and also as their London salesman, has been highlighted, allowing him to step out of the shadow of the Thomases. While Roy was Thomas and Drake’s American-based sales powerhouse, it has been demonstrated that Wilfred was its intellectual and practical core. Although Grosvenor and Roy had grown into experienced art dealers, nothing in their past suggests they were anything other than stained-glass novices when they suddenly launched onto the arts scene as sole traders of masses of medieval and Renaissance panels – Grosvenor was formerly a dealer in oriental art and landscape painter, and Roy was an electrician. While Wilfred was an art-dealing novice, he was the latest of several generations of a stained-glass dynasty. He provided the balance to the others’ skills, and was presumably the most at ease handling, researching, and talking about stained glass. It was perhaps this knowledge that appealed to Burrell, who maintained: ‘I like to understand what I have if I can’;\textsuperscript{1241} this is underlined in the numerous art-historical and heraldic enquiries he made to Wilfred regardless of medium. There was not a substantive body of stained-glass scholarship to guide either the dealer or the collector, which in America had unnerved several curators, who were anxious to avoid fakes in a field where there was little established knowledge.\textsuperscript{1242} Wilfred perhaps did not feel like an art dealer to Burrell, but instead appeared as someone who knew his subject well and could guide and educate Burrell accurately as an expert, and not just as an agent through whom a deal could be made. This association may have been lost if Burrell had not taken such a direct approach to his purchases, corresponding directly with Wilfred rather than using his interior designers or architects, as several of his American counterparts presumably did.

While all other sales from Thomas and Drake to private customers could be regarded loosely as part of the house-furnishing process, Burrell was the first and only one of their customers to move beyond that. After Burrell had furnished the windows of his home Hutton Castle in the late 1920s with panels that had been selected, supplied, and adapted primarily by Wilfred, a process that even extended the glazing programme to the servants’ quarters, Burrell did not stop. He refined his displays in the 1930s, and then began collecting the

\textsuperscript{1241} GMRC, Burrell/Drake Correspondence, reg. no. 52/56.45, William Burrell, letter to Wilfred Drake, December 13, 1929 (Appendix A, document 48).

\textsuperscript{1242} Burnham, \textit{Philadelphia}, 34.
medium in order to form a museum, in which stained glass would feature heavily. By the time of Burrell’s death, he owned over 700 panels and windows, comfortably the largest private collection of stained glass ever to be assembled worldwide, if Grosvenor’s own early collection of several thousand pieces is discounted. In volume, Burrell’s stained glass holdings were only surpassed by those of London’s V&A, and New York’s MMA.

This research has additionally shown how the Burrell Collection’s stained glass can, and should be, understood as two distinct groups. The first consists of approximately 300 panels previously installed in his homes from around 1900 to 1935, and another later collection of around 400 panels purchased with public consumption in mind and formed between around 1936 to 1952. Since the formation of the museum, all of Burrell’s stained glass has been mixed together, and no distinction has been made between these two very different collections—one that reflects Burrell’s personal tastes and with which he lived with on a daily basis, and one that was formed only to satisfy the need to form a comprehensive museum collection. The latter is consequently far more wide-ranging in scope, and includes large proportions of Continental glazing, which Burrell did not personally favour for his own homes. This research has also reconstructed the full layout of rooms and glazing of Hutton Castle for the first time, and transcribed and examined closely the extensive archive of letters sent between Wilfred and Burrell, which has opened new avenues of research and entirely original perspectives.

Due to the broad range of this thesis, and rich archival resources, a substantial amount of further research is possible on many of the private customers, museums, art dealers, and interior designers mentioned. Much more sustained work is required on the trade of architectural objects during this period, as well as on the activities of the Paris-based sellers of stained glass, Thomas and Drake’s main competition. Further, more minor, archives in America remain to be consulted, which unfortunately was not been possible within the scope of this study. However, the bringing together of all of this subsidiary information would undoubtedly provide an even fuller picture of the period, and of the firm, and prove to be a valuable addition to this body of work.
POSTSCRIPT

After the deaths of both Wilfred and Roy without successor, from late 1952 Roy’s widow Winifred Thomas (1890–1970), with the aid of Norwich-based glazier Dennis King (1912–1995), dispersed Thomas and Drake’s remaining stock and closed the business. She explained: ‘as there is no one to carry on here, I decided to dispose of the collection of old glass at reduced prices’, continuing in a separate letter: ‘I have lived with old glass around me all my married life, so I know how to handle it, and many times I have helped my husband arrange displays’. Despite her experience, her job cannot have been an easy one, as she was presumably dealing largely with the leftovers of their vast stock.

Some of her sales were likely using her husband’s previous connections, such as those associated with Eric Milner-White (1884–1963), dean of York (1941–1963). Roy had been engaged in supplying him with stained glass from at least 1949. Milner-White was recorded to have made acquisitions of at least eighteen figural and decorative panels, including several depicting Christ, and several consignments of ornamental and border pieces of stained glass, ranging in date from the fourteenth to the fifteenth centuries, of which stock cards for eight survive (fig. 254). A saint with scroll and a decorative trefoil remain in store at the York Glaziers’ Trust, other panels were inserted into windows in the south choir aisle of York Minster, a window created in 1955, and in n29 in the nave aisle. It is likely that some of this stained glass was also used as a stock of contemporary inserts for the minster’s 128 medieval windows. Significant quantities of ancient stained glass from New College (Oxford), which had been in the Minster’s stores, were used for this

---

1243 King purchased Thomas and Drake’s studio equipment; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, Winifred Thomas, invoice to Dennis King, June 24, 1953.
1244 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, Winifred Thomas, letter to Dennis King, January 28, 1953.
1245 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, Winifred Thomas, letter to Dennis King, February 5, 1953.
1246 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 43, Winifred Thomas, letter to Dennis King, June 29, 1953.
1248 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, stock cards nos. 666, 1413; information provided by Sarah Brown.
1249 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, stock card no. 1320; with thanks to Sarah Brown.
1250 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 50, nos. Cos[tessey].68, 1763; with thanks to Sarah Brown.
purpose when the early fifteenth-century Great East Window was restored under his supervision from the late 1940s.

Just two months after Roy’s death, in February 1953, Winifred wrote: ‘The Dean of York came early in January and said he would probably be able to send people here [to make purchases], and as you know Mr Kenneth Harrison [of King’s College] came through him’. A letter of February 1953 confirms that Harrison had visited Winifred, and purchased some ‘small panels’, including several English fifteenth-century quarries depicting birds, and a Flemish sixteenth-century panel depicting the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar. Before Milner-White’s appointment at York, he was chaplain and then dean of King’s College, and so this connection is not surprising. At the same time, in early 1953, Winifred also provided the stained glass for the composite three-light east window of St Nicholas Church in Great Bookham (Surrey), apparently at the instigation of William Cole. Buyers representing the church selected panels from Thomas and Drake’s Costessey collection, and the window was composed of religious scenes of fifteenth-century Flemish glass with plain-glazed modern surrounds (fig. 255). Winifred had stated: ‘I asked Mr Drury, who has always done the glazing for the Thomas and Drake firm, to come and hang the panels for me; the church will employ his firm to put the window in’. Winifred had negotiated a commendable £750 for the panels (equivalent to around £15,000 today).

The cathedrals of Exeter and Canterbury also made purchases from Winifred, although on a relatively modest scale compared with York. Canterbury acquired an Austrian fourteenth-
century panel, a French sixteenth-century grisaille, and a small collection of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century English fragments. Exeter purchased a series of Old Testament figures, and in February 1954 Winifred wrote: ‘Exeter Cathedral bought all the remainder of the Flemish series of the Costessey collection’. By this time, she had succeeded in selling much of the remaining stock, stating: ‘there are just a few large panels [...] and about 100 odd small panels of heraldry and roundels left’. York-based ecclesiastical architect George Gaze Pace (1915–75), a close friend of Milner-White, purchased much of what was left. Pace’s firm acquired at least fifty-five panels ranging in date from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries, beginning in 1956. In that year, Pace inserted a composite three-light window depicting angels and saints, made up of eleven Flemish, Dutch, and English panels ranging from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, at St Bridget’s Church in St Bride’s-super-Ely (Glamorgan). At the same time, at Llandaff Cathedral, he inserted two composite windows, using at least twenty seventeenth-century Dutch floral and bird panels in a window in the south wall, and seven sixteenth-century Flemish roundels in a window in the chapter house. By May 1957 at the latest, he had also made acquisitions of four roundels of fourteenth- to sixteenth-century Flemish saints, as well as sections of English scrollwork, for windows in the west end Galilee Chapel at Durham Cathedral. He also

\[\text{\footnotesize 260 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, Winifred Thomas, letter to Dennis King, February 5, 1954.} \]
\[\text{\footnotesize 261 SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, Winifred Thomas, letter to Dennis King, February 9, 1954.} \]
\[\text{\footnotesize 262 Winifred’s other sales included a French sixteenth-century Angel, and an English fourteenth-century Angel to All Saints Church, Margaret Street in central London; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 4–5, no. 25; stock book II, 28–29, 42–43, nos. 1759, 1844.} \]
\[\text{\footnotesize In November 1956, Winifred also sold a sixteenth-century Flemish saint roundel, with Wilfred’s strawberry-leaf border, to Chessington Church (Surrey); SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 32–33, no. 348.} \]
\[\text{\footnotesize In 1961, the Zwolle Museum (the Netherlands) purchased a Dutch seventeenth-century cartouche; SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book I, 68–69, nos. 1600–03 (A–B).} \]
purchased three sixteenth-century Flemish medallions for St Helen’s Church (York), which were inserted into a south window.\textsuperscript{1266}

Although Winifred’s goal was to sell Thomas and Drake’s remaining stock and close the business, unexpectedly she also acquired a collection of at least nineteen panels of sixteenth-century Flemish roundels and seventeenth-century Swiss ovals from the eighteenth-century house Haseley Court (Oxfordshire), for which no stock cards were produced.\textsuperscript{1267} These appeared in Thomas and Drake’s stock books on 1 February 1955, when a rudimentary stock-take had been undertaken by Winifred, after she had transferred the remaining panels to her Kensington flat, 16A Albert Court.\textsuperscript{1268} American-born interior designer Nancy Lancaster (1897–1994) had purchased Haseley Court in a near derelict state in 1954, and it is likely that the removal of the stained glass took place around this time. With her business partner John Fowler (1906–1977), their company Colefax and Fowler restored and furnished the property.\textsuperscript{1269} Winifred had sold several of the Haseley Court panels to King’s College by 1955, as well as to Pace for St Bridget’s in 1956, and to St Helen’s Church in 1957.\textsuperscript{1270}


\textsuperscript{1268} SAL, Grosvenor Thomas Papers, box 44, stock book II, 104–09.
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</tr>
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