

**“Casting a dim religious light”: the stained and
painted glass of York Minster, c.1450-1802**

**Volume One
(two volumes)**

Louise Ann Hampson MA

University of York

History of Art

PhD

December 2016

Abstract

This thesis investigates the glass history of the stained and painted glass in the windows of York Minster c.1450-1802. It sets the largely post-Reformation story of the windows into the broader historical context of York and cathedrals more widely, and of the survival of the craft of glass-painting in the post-Reformation period. It uses the archives and manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of York, in conjunction with antiquarian studies and the physical evidence of the extant glass, to explore how and why so much medieval glass has survived in York and to investigate the origins of York's claim to be a 'treasure-house' of medieval stained glass. Three key themes are explored in the course of this work. First, a reassessment of the craft practice and skills base of glaziers and glass-painters and the continuity of workshops in the period studied, with particular emphasis on the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries. Second, the question of patronage and how this was manifest, both in terms of the craftsmen and their business models and with regard to the care of the existing glass. A broader definition of patronage emerges, one which goes beyond conventional ideas of artist and patron into the relationships between the Deans, their Chapters and the craftsmen. Third, a consideration of how the glass was thought of, valued and written about. This focuses on the work of seventeenth-century antiquarian James Torre and the publications by Drake and Gent which followed his pioneering work. It also explores the reception and perception of the Minster generally and the intellectual and cultural influences operating within York itself and society more widely. This thesis demonstrates how the undertaking of close and detailed analysis of the archival and other documentary records alongside the surviving glass of a single cathedral can produce new insights and understanding. These themes set out a new methodology for approaching the comprehensive contextual study of the glass history of other cathedrals and create a better understanding of glass-painting in England in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries.

List of Contents

Volume One

Abstract	2
List of Contents	3
List of Figures	7
Acknowledgements	11
Declaration	12
Chapter One: Introduction	13
Impact of the Reformation	14
Stained glass studies	16
Cathedral studies	18
Crafts and Guilds	20
Studies of antiquarians and antiquarianism	23
The religious context: politics and churchmanship	26
Structure, terminology and methodology	29
The archival and manuscript sources	31
Conclusion	41
Chapter Two: The Glazier's Craft	
Introduction	42
The medieval context of glazing in York, 1450-1500	44
The structure and employment of the Petty workshop	52
New glaziers, continuing practices	53

The workshop of John Alman and the glazing of St Michael-le-Belfry	56
The workshop of the Thompson family, 1568-1620	60
The role of the Guild of Glaziers in workshop structure	73
The workshop of the Crosby family 1621-1639	75
The changing nature of glass supply 1550-1650	81
The impact of the Civil War and Commonwealth	84
A craft and workshop re-emerges: the Crosbys, 1660-1703	86
The separation of glass-painting as an 'art', 1690-1750	103
The changing nature of glass supply:	
Yorkshire glass production 1651-1758	107
York glass-painting in the eighteenth century	108
Conclusion	112

Chapter Three: Patronage

Introduction	114
Memorial glass of the early sixteenth century	116
The pre-Reformation Dean and Chapter as patrons:	
the St Michael-le-Belfry project	122
The immediate impact of the Reformation on Minster patronage	123
The Dean and Chapter as Patrons, 1600-1700	128
Wider circles of patronage: Henry Gyles' glass-painting business	140
Changing patterns of patronage in the eighteenth century	148
A fortunate survival?	156

The influence of Deans	159
Conclusion	174
Chapter Four: Reception and Perception	
Introduction	176
The impact of the Civil War	177
Restoration and renewal	187
The rise of antiquarian interest	190
Antiquarian studies of cathedrals	195
York and Yorkshire’s antiquarians 1660-1700	197
York’s eminent antiquarian, James Torre	198
Torre’s methodology	203
Torre’s terminology	208
Torre’s legacy	221
New audiences 1700-1765	223
The market for publications	228
Francis Drake	232
Thomas Gent	234
Conclusion	240
Chapter Five: Conclusion	243
Abbreviations	253
Sources and Bibliography	254

Volume Two

List of contents	307
List of figures	308
Figures	312

List of Figures

- Figure 1: The Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of St Peter in York
- Figure 2: Plan of York Minster with CVMA window numbering
- Figure 3: The Great East Window (1)
- Figure 4: The St William window (n7 panel 10b)
- Figure 5: The St Cuthbert window (s7)
- Figure 6: North nave clerestory (N25)
- Figure 7: Fragment of fifteenth-century figurative glass
- Figure 8: The first page of the register of the Guild of Glaziers
- Figure 9: The ruins of the north nave aisle of St Mary's Abbey
- Figure 10: The interior of the lantern of the central tower
- Figure 11: Cross keys emblem from the lantern glazing
- Figure 12: The south front of York Minster
- Figure 13: Two tracery panels (s9) by Peckitt
- Figure 14: Panel of St George from St Michael-le-Belfrey church
- Figure 15: Earl Leofric panel from Brereton Hall, Cheshire
- Figure 16: East window of the south quire aisle (s2)
- Figure 17: Tracery panel in s2 with Holloway arms
- Figure 18: Panels depicting scenes from the life of St Thomas Becket
- Figure 19: The Five Sisters window (n16)
- Figure 20: The signature page for 1627, register of the Guild of Glaziers
- Figure 21: The Ingram arms in the north nave aisle (n28)
- Figure 22: Woodcut of a glass-furnace from *De la pirotechnica*
- Figure 23: Tracery panel from the Chapter House (CHn4)
- Figure 24: Henry Johnston's sketch of the Petty memorial glass
- Figure 25: Agreement for glazing work, 1692 YMA B3/1/1
- Figure 26: Circular window at the west end (w2)
- Figure 27: Figure of Edward the Confessor (CHn9)
- Figure 28: Detail from CHn9 pre-restoration

Figure 29: Reference to marked lead in Crosby bill B3/1/2

Figure 30: *The Manner how to Anneile, or Paint in Glass*

Figure 31: Tracery in St Michael-le-Belfry showing Linton signature

Figure 32: Glazing of the south front (s20-s22)

Figure 33: St Thomas Becket in the Parker window (n9)

Figure 34: Glass sundial in Gilling Castle by Bernard Dininckhof

Figure 35: Armorial of Slingsby and Ingram, Temple Newsam

Figure 36: Inscriptions in the dining room, Temple Newsam

Figure 37: East window of Peterhouse College Chapel, Cambridge

Figure 38: Detail of crucifixion scene, east window, Peterhouse

Figure 39: East window of Wadham College Chapel, Oxford

Figure 40: East window of Lincoln College Chapel, Oxford

Figure 41: The arms of Williams as Bishop of Lincoln (s6 panel 1c)

Figure 42: The Lamplugh tapestries in the sanctuary

Figure 43: East window, Denton-in-Wharfedale church

Figure 44: Glass sundial in Tong Hall by Henry Gyles

Figure 45: Armorial of Archbishop Lamplugh (s6)

Figure 46: Armorial of Archbishop Lamplugh (s6) in context

Figure 47: Monument to Archbishop Lamplugh, south quire aisle

Figure 48: Bottom half of a figure of St Christopher (n29 panel 5b)

Figure 49: Portrait of Archbishop Lamplugh on glass

Figure 50: Portrait of Bishop Edward Willes, Bishop of Bath, on glass

Figure 51: Plate of the quire from Drake's *Eboracum*, 1736

Figure 52: South quire aisle looking west to location of s8

Figure 53: Panel from the Te Deum window (s27)

Figure 54: Panel from the Te Deum window, now in s10 (panel 1a)

Figure 55: Te deum panel in St Michael, Spurriergate

Figure 56: Print of St Martin, Coney Street with Classical porch

Figure 57: Sts Thomas and Bartholomew from w1 (panels 5a, 6a)

Figure 58: Detail of crucified Christ from south nave aisle (s36)

Figure 59: Figure of a donor, possibly Thomas de Bouesden (s36)

Figure 60: Figure of Manassah in the Jesse window (s8)

Figure 61: Tracery panel of John the Baptist with Agnus Dei (s8)

Figure 62: Tracery detail of painted figures (s8, panel A3)

Figure 63: Panel of Virgin and Child in High Melton Church

Figure 64: The 1310 Jesse window in the south nave aisle (s33)

Figure 65: Tracery light by Peckitt in s30 with legs of Eve

Figure 66: Restored figure of St William (s20)

Figure 67: Tracery light by Peckitt in north nave aisle (n27, panel D1)

Figure 68: King Solomon by Peckitt (s19)

Figure 69: St Peter by Peckitt (s24)

Figure 70: The Rose window (s16) restored by Peckitt

Figure 71: Central marigold from the Rose window (s16)

Figure 72: Trinity image from St Martin, Coney Street

Figure 73: Detail of a bishop from the Great West window (w1)

Figure 74: Detail of the Coronation of the Virgin (w1)

Figure 75: Detail from the Bell-founders window (n24, panel 1b)

Figure 76: Detail of the arms of the See of York (s12)

Figure 77: Reconstructed window in south nave aisle (s35)

Figure 78: St William window in the Chapter House c.1948 (CHn3)

Figure 79: Annunciation to Mary (s35, panel 1b)

Figure 80: Detail of the Annunciation to the Shepherds (s35, panel 3b, 4b)

Figure 81: Plate from John Dart's *History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Canterbury* showing the tomb of the Black Prince

Figure 82: Plate from John Dart's *History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Canterbury* showing the tomb of Odo Collinge

Figure 83: Page from Torres manuscript YMA L1/7 f.18v

Figure 84: Tracery panel of John the Baptist with Agnus Dei (s36)

- Figure 85: Tracery panel of St Clare (s36)
- Figure 86: Panel of the Virgin Mary with book (s36, panel 2a)
- Figure 87: Panel of St John the Evangelist (s36, panel 2c)
- Figure 88: Detail of St Katherine from the north nave aisle (n30, panel 2a)
- Figure 89: Annunciation to Mary (n28, panel 5a)
- Figure 90: Visit of the Three Kings (n28, panel 5c)
- Figure 91: Panel from the legend of St John as a pilgrim (s2, panels 1c, 1d)
- Figure 92: Detail of the Monkeys' Funeral (n25)
- Figure 93: Detail of the murder of Thomas Becket (n9, panel 1b)
- Figure 94: Detail of 'Dr Priest' in the Penancer window (n27, panel 2a)
- Figure 95: Plate from Drake, *Eboracum*, showing the Burlington pavement
- Figure 96: Plate of the Great East Window from Drake, *Eboracum*
- Figure 97: Fold-out wood-cut of the Great East Window from Gent
- Figure 98: Detail of the Brazen Serpent image from Gent

Acknowledgements

My thanks to my supervisors, Sarah Brown FSA and Dr Kate Giles, who have provided unfailing support and advice throughout the whole lengthy gestation of this thesis; the result is much the richer for their input. I would also like to thank the staff of York Minster Archives and Library, especially the archivist, Peter Young, for access to the archival material, sometimes at short notice, and for his interest in the project.

My thanks also to Brian Sprakes for his generosity with his research on Bernard Dininckhof and Temple Newsam, and the many long conversations in the Minster and elsewhere. I would also like to thank Revd Gordon Plumb for the use of his excellent photographs of stained glass.

My thanks are also due to my colleagues in The Centre for the Study of Christianity and Culture, University of York, especially the director, Dr Dee Dyas. Without their support and encouragement, the task of undertaking a part-time PhD whilst working full-time would have seemed insurmountable.

My biggest thanks go to my family, especially my husband Jeff and my two children. Their patience and understanding throughout this have made it possible.

It was my father's greatest delight that I was undertaking this PhD and it is a constant sadness that he died before I could complete it. This thesis is dedicated to him, John Whitaker, (1929-2015).

Author's Declaration

I declare that this thesis is a presentation of original work and I am the sole author, except where indicated by specific reference as a quotation in the text. This work has not previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, university. All sources are acknowledged. Any views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and should not be understood to represent the University of York.

CHAPTER ONE: - INTRODUCTION

In 1988, in their introduction to the ‘glazing history’ of Exeter Cathedral’s Great East Window Chris Brooks and David Evans noted that:

“Studies of medieval glass have been largely dominated by questions of authorship, style and iconography. The result has been a presumption that the post-medieval history of a body of glass – its story, that is, over some four and a half centuries – is marginal.”¹

Brooks and Evans argued that such a history was necessarily “*diachronic rather than synchronic*”.² The study of stained glass has increasingly embraced this diachronic approach for the study of individual windows and related assemblages. It is this approach to the glazing scheme of York Minster [Figure 1] for the period c.1450-1802 which is adopted in this thesis. Recent works by scholars such as Madeline Caviness, Rachel Koopmans and Sarah Brown have explored the wider context for the creation, reception and continuing history of individual windows and assemblages, using approaches and sources from the fields of manuscript and literature studies, archival records, and more traditional art historical study of the glass.³ In Koopman’s work, the role of the stained glass at Canterbury is an integral part of her exploration of the presentation and reception of the Becket miracle stories. In considering the glass in this way, she goes beyond the discussion of authorship and style and sets its creation and iconography in the context of purpose and reception. In recent developments in art history more widely, the question of the reception of art and how this has changed across time has come to the fore. How is the understanding and appreciation of an artwork mediated by the passage of time? In the instance of inherently public works like stained glass this can be a complex blend of the perception and reception by different audiences across centuries. Each viewer

¹ Chris Brooks and David Evans, *The Great East Window of Exeter Cathedral: A Glazing History* (Exeter: University of Exeter, 1988) unnumbered second page of Introduction.

² Ibid.

³ Madeline Harrison Caviness and Jeffrey Weaver, *The Ancestors of Christ Windows at Canterbury Cathedral* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2013); Rachel Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate: Miracle Stories and Miracle Collecting in High Medieval England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011); Sarah Brown, *Apocalypse: The Great East Window of York Minster* (London: York Minster & Third Millennium Publishing, 2014).

brings their own preconceptions, cultural reference points and prior knowledge, but their response is also shaped by the value and interpretation which have been placed upon the glass by the institution in which it sits. The completion of a window is not the end of the story, it is the start of the next phase of its life.

The impact of the Reformation

The extent of the impact of iconoclastic reformers on the stained glass of churches and cathedrals, and the timing of such destruction as did occur, is much debated. The impact of iconoclasm more broadly is discussed in the work of both Eamon Duffy and Margaret Aston and it is within this broader framework of the attacks on images of all kinds (both *ymages*, which normally indicated three-dimensional objects, and two-dimensional *pictours*, the classification into which glass normally fell) where the destruction of figurative glass needs to be considered.⁴ Parry's assertion that "The iconophobia of Edwardian times resulted in an immense destruction of medieval glass..." is not borne out by the evidence, but is a widely-held belief.⁵

As Aston discusses in *Broken Idols of the English Reformation*, imagery in stained glass was not a principal target for destruction in any but the most ardently Protestant parishes in the sixteenth century and "the saints in glass rarely featured in the sixteenth-century episcopal injunctions."⁶ Most of the destruction, which undoubtedly did take place in both parish churches and cathedrals, can be attributed to the actions of seventeenth-century reformers and, to a lesser extent, eighteenth-century 'improvers'. The enduring popularity of the mis-attribution of the destruction of glass to the Tudor period has had a negative effect on the comprehensive study of the surviving stained glass of the late sixteenth century, creating a climate where it is believed there is little of any merit to be studied. It has also created a false context for understanding the

⁴ Margaret Aston, *England's Iconoclasts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); *Broken Idols of the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580* (New York: Yale University Press, 1992).

⁵ Graham Parry, *Glory, Laud and Honour: The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), 100.

⁶ Aston, *Broken Idols of the English Reformation*, 634.

ambiguous attitudes to imagery, including stained glass, which emerge in the seventeenth century, as discussed by Haynes, which is particularly problematic in Parry's otherwise excellent work on the art of the seventeenth century.⁷ The broadened remit of the work of the Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevii (CVMA) to include early modern glass, such as the important figurative glass at Brereton Hall, Cheshire, is starting to challenge that, but in the words of stained glass scholar Revd. Gordon Plumb the later sixteenth century "is a very under-studied period".⁸ This is especially true of cathedrals, where the focus of scholarly attention has been on the institutional changes and the practice of the liturgy with comparatively little interest paid to date on the care, repair or creation of the glass. This thesis addresses that with regard to York Minster and in so doing creates a possible model for taking a similar approach to other cathedrals.

For individual buildings a number of edited volumes, such as the 2005 publication on the stained glass of St George's Chapel, Windsor, have provided a valuable breadth of perspective by drawing together articles from a range of scholars, each examining a specific period, window or aspect of the history; but they remain a collection of essentially stand-alone pieces.⁹ A single-authored diachronic study of the glass in a single cathedral is still the exception rather than the rule, but this thesis seeks to show how this approach enables us to see the history of the glass more holistically, as part of the life-story of a particular building in a specific geographical location. Such a study demands a broad and interdisciplinary approach, exploring aspects of art history, history, archaeology and literature; and within those disciplines, stained glass studies, antiquarian scholarship, economic history, archival and manuscript study, religious and institutional history, and the specific history of York and its people.

⁷ Parry, *Glory, Land and Honour*; Clare Haynes, *Pictures and Popery* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

⁸ Penny Hebgin-Barnes, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Cheshire* (Oxford: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2010).

⁹ Sarah Brown, *A History of the Stained Glass of St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle*, ed. The Revd Canon John A. White, Historical Monographs Relating to St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle (Windsor: The Dean and Canons of Windsor, 2005).

Stained glass studies

Studies of the stained glass of York Minster, like those for other cathedrals, have historically focused on the biographies and iconography of individual windows or related assemblages, particularly on establishing the identity and outputs of individual craftsmen or workshops. In moving away from the broadly narrative histories of the antiquarian works of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, art historians focused instead on a more directed and analytical approach, which gave primacy to the identification of authorship and attribution of style. In so doing the post-creation biographies of windows received less attention. At York, it was Canon Frederick Harrison who first attempted to use an examination of the medieval glass of the cathedral and city churches to prove his hypothesis of York School of glass-painters in his 1927 work *The Painted Glass of York*. His interest was solely in the medieval output and so it has largely remained: with some notable exceptions (Brighton's work on William Peckitt and Henry Gyles, for a York example), the focus of study both in York and elsewhere has been overwhelmingly on the medieval craftsmen and their productions.¹⁰ The work of the CVMA, founded in 1949, understandably from its title, places most emphasis on the close study of medieval glass and its iconography. However, a review of condition and restoration history have always been integral parts of their research methodology, and was written into the very first set of international guidelines for the production of their volumes. It is in these that we see the first (albeit brief) notice being taken of the post-medieval history of the Minster glass and the use of antiquarian sources to explore that. The 1987 volume by French and O'Connor on the west window of York Minster, for example, includes transcriptions of both Torre's seventeenth-century description of the glass and the 1758 glazing account which details the work by William Peckitt.¹¹

¹⁰ J. Trevor Brighton, "The Enamel Glass-Painters of York: 1585-1795" (University of York, PhD thesis, 1978).

¹¹ Thomas French and David E. O'Connor, *York Minster: A Catalogue of Medieval Stained Glass Fascicule 1 the West Windows of the Nave Wi, Wii, Nxxx, Sxxxvi* (Oxford & New York: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1987), 86-91.

For York, such post-medieval interventions had hitherto been either largely dismissed - “we really ought to be thankful that, in an age when the priceless Early English glass of Salisbury Cathedral was being ruthlessly destroyed, in York Minster Peckitt contented himself with re-leading a window here and there...” (Canon Harrison) - or lamented, notably by Dean Milner-White (1941-63).¹² Whilst such recent moves towards considering the post-medieval history are positive, their necessary brevity has meant they have often been confined to the inclusion of only exceptional evidence of major restoration or loss. French’s volume on the Great East Window (I), for example, has a very summary history of restoration, with some reference to published versions of the original records, but the primary focus is the impact it had on the condition of the glass as found in 1995.¹³

This extends to the study of stained glass more widely in works such as Michael Michael’s 2004 work *Stained Glass of Canterbury Cathedral*.¹⁴ This detailed study of the iconography and context of selected windows has a very short final chapter on restoration and conservation over the last two-hundred years, but it omits any real engagement with the archival sources for the period between the creation of the glass and the nineteenth-century reawakening of interest in it. What has not been undertaken for York or elsewhere is the systematic and detailed study of the post-medieval archival record across all the windows with a view to establishing what work of any scale, not just major campaigns, was being undertaken. From this, what then can be drawn out about the cathedral’s attitude to its glass, and in what contextual or environmental framework, and how do these differ from elsewhere?

The move to a more contextualised, multi-disciplinary approach within other branches of history, particularly architectural history and the archaeology

¹² Revd Frederick Harrison, *The Painted Glass of York: An Account of the Medieval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches*, 1st edn. (London: SPCK, 1927), 1; Dean Eric Milner-White’s *Index Guide and Index to the Ancient Windows of the Nave* (York: H. Morley for The Friends of York Minster, 1959).

¹³ Thomas French, *York Minster: The Great East Window*, ed. Prof.C. M Kaufmann, vol. Summary Catalogue 2, *Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi Great Britain* (Oxford: The British Academy, 1995), 11-13. French used *The Fabric Rolls of York Minster: With an Appendix of Illustrative Documents*, ed. James Raine, Surtees Society 35 (Durham: published for the Society by G. Andrews, 1859). Browne published a list of ‘corrections’ in 1863, contested by Raine, but Raine’s original volume is still widely used.

¹⁴ Michael A. Michael, *Stained Glass of Canterbury Cathedral*, ed. Sebastian Strobl (London: Scala, 2004).

of buildings, began in the last quarter of the twentieth-century, with a move away from the traditional gazetteer/catalogue-style study into the use of more holistic frameworks in which consideration of all the factors influencing the development of individual buildings could inform analysis of similar structures elsewhere. Paul Barnwell and Arnold Pacey's edited volume on Beverley Minster takes this diachronic contextual approach, richly exploring various topics across chronological boundaries, although glass (with the exception of the possible attribution of the east window to John Thornton) is not one of them.¹⁵ The 2009 work on Salisbury by Tim Tatton-Brown and John Crook likewise adopts this more contextual approach for the detailed study of the medieval period of building, but tantalisingly curtails the post-medieval story which has shaped the building as we experience it today.¹⁶

Surprisingly, the loss of Salisbury's remaining medieval glass in the eighteenth century receives only brief attention in this volume, despite fundamentally altering the appearance and aesthetics of the building. The circumstances around its removal and the reactions to it both at the time and in subsequent years form an important chapter in the history of Salisbury, but it is one which has been seldom explored.¹⁷ The continuing dominance of the cult of authorship and origin in the scholarly study of cathedral fabric has overshadowed the importance of addressing the agents whereby these buildings have come down to us in the form and appearance they now present. But cathedrals are not simply beautiful buildings, they are the home of institutions whose functions and activities they reflect and serve.

Cathedral studies

The study of the history of cathedrals set against the wider context of the religious and political history of England has been led for the last twenty years by

¹⁵ Paul S. Barnwell and Arnold Pacey, *Who Built Beverley Minster?* (Reading: Spire Books: In association with The Friends of Beverley Minster, 2008).

¹⁶ Tim Tatton-Brown and John Crook, *Salisbury Cathedral: The Making of a Medieval Masterpiece* (London: Scala, 2009).

¹⁷ One such response is recorded in a letter dated 10 December from 'An Enthusiastic Admirer of Salisbury Cathedral', "Salisbury Cathedral", *Gentleman's Magazine*, (1789).

Stanford Lehmborg. His works chart the history of cathedrals as corporate bodies, in which the fabric features primarily as evidence for the physical impact of religious and organisational change.¹⁸ In *Cathedrals under Siege*, Lehmborg drew on a wide variety of sources to explore thematically how several of these buildings reflected the tumultuous events of the seventeenth century. However, stained glass plays only a minor role in Lehmborg's work, despite the significant impact of the Civil War on the glass of, for example, Lichfield and Worcester cathedrals. Although Lehmborg's useful thematic approach highlights the variety of attitude and approach across the country's cathedrals, it does not readily allow for consideration of the dynamic interplay between elements within a single institution.

Following in the antiquarian tradition, for the study of the cathedral of York, the landmark work is undoubtedly the 1977 edited volume by Aylmer and Cant, *A History of York Minster*. This magisterial work explores the entire history of the Minster, from the Roman fortress to 1916, in a set of essays by acknowledged experts in their fields.¹⁹ They are a mixture of chronological account and specialist topic, presenting various aspects of the history of the Minster as both a building and an institution, with the stained glass covered in a chapter by O'Connor and Haselock.²⁰ Their observation "When we consider the enormous losses sustained by English medieval glass, then the survival of so much in the Minster becomes something of a miracle" provides the inspiration for this thesis, and with it an opportunity to test some of the hypotheses articulated here. In particular, to examine the evidence for the care of the glass from the Reformation onwards, exploring in greater depth the work and workshops of the glaziers, to consider the economics of post-medieval glazing and to discuss how the imagery was perceived and understood as the religious environment in which it was produced irrevocably changed.

¹⁸ Stanford E. Lehmborg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals: Cathedral in English Society 1485-1603* (Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press, 1988); *Cathedrals under Siege: Cathedrals in English Society 1600-1700* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996).

¹⁹ Gerald Aylmer and Reginald Cant, eds. *A History of York Minster* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).

²⁰ David O'Connor and Jeremy Haselock, "The Stained and Painted Glass," in *A History of York Minster*, ed. Aylmer and Cant, 313-393.

Crafts and Guilds

All stained and painted glass had, of course, to be made before it could become a part of the building for which it was destined. The focus of scholarship hitherto has been on the point of creation of glass and not on its subsequent history, or the role of the guilds within that. The organisational structures of the crafts involved were an integral part of the formation of the guild system in the medieval period, a potent blend of civic concerns, religious identities, quality control and protectionism. The development of the guild structure across Europe and its impact on the output of a broad range of creative crafts in the late medieval and early modern period has most recently been examined by Karel (Carolus) Davids and Bert de Munck, while James Ayres' 2014 work *Art, Artisans & Apprentices* focuses more directly on the training and employment of artists in all media in the early modern period in Britain.²¹ His study of the guild structures and their role in training and regulation considers their relevance to many crafts, with a particular focus on the visual arts which fell under the umbrella term 'sculptor'. Whilst, as this thesis will show, those professing the 'art' of glass-painting largely stepped outside the craft guild structure from the late seventeenth century, the glaziers' guild in York continued to operate into the middle of the eighteenth century.²² Indeed, the fraternal support structure which was an important part of a guild emerged in the new form of a Friendly Society in Newcastle for glass-makers in 1755.²³

The separation of 'art' from 'craft' and the concomitant downward shift in status of craft as the product of Ayres' "mere mechanic", which he dates to the eighteenth century, is a key theme in his book and an important aspect of the study of craft and patronage in this thesis.²⁴ Ayres charts the sharp decline in

²¹ James Ayres, *Art, Artisans & Apprentices: Apprentice Painters and Sculptors in the Early Modern British Tradition* (Oxford; Philadelphia: Oxbow Books, 2014); *Innovation and Creativity in Late Medieval and Early Modern European Cities*, ed. Carolus Augustinus Davids and Bert De Munck (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

²² For London see http://www.worshipfulglaziers.com/?page_id=1194; "York Guild of Glaziers and Plumbers Ordinance Book, 1598-1742" (Corning Museum of Glass, New York and Borthwick Institute) MFE246.

²³ *Articles, Laws and Rules, of the Glass-Makers' Friendly Society, Held at the House of Mr. William Wilson, Sign of the Sun, in the Broad-Chare, Newcastle Upon Tyne. Begun November 15, 1755* (Newcastle: printed by M. Angus, 1800).

²⁴ Ayres, *Art, Artisans & Apprentices*, xi.

the social value of demonstrating a competence in practical, mechanical craft skills from the early eighteenth century onwards and cites the invention of ready-made oil paints which enabled the elevation of painting to a 'liberal art' "freed from the bondage of manual craft".²⁵ This privileging of the intellectual component of a skill over the manual proficiency is particularly relevant to my analysis of the presentation by William Peckitt of his 're-discovery' of glass-painting techniques in 1751 and his claims that his skills were entirely self-taught, based solely on scientific experimentation and study and *not* on any craft training.²⁶

The role of the medieval guilds in York and Yorkshire, both those explicitly religious in purpose and those focused on a specific craft or group of affiliated crafts, has been the subject of study by many scholars. David Crouch's 2000 work *Piety, Fraternity and Power* includes an analysis of the rise of the religious guilds to 1547 and their membership, and the 1997 collection of essays *The Government of Medieval York* examines both the role of guilds in civic governance and conversely the influence of civic interests on the formation and regulation of the craft guilds.²⁷ Both focus on guilds as a group, rather than studying an individual guild in depth, but these throw up some interesting data: Crouch's analysis of testamentary evidence, for example, shows no bequests made to a religious guild associated with the glaziers.²⁸ This situates the glaziers' guild very firmly in the group of guilds formed as a trade protection and quality control mechanism, with individual members expressing their religious affiliations and social standing through membership of guilds like the Corpus Christi Guild. Heather Swanson's, *Building Craftsmen in Late Medieval York* remains a very useful survey of the documentation of the structure, practices and 'lived experience' of the York craft guilds, although the discussion of each

²⁵ Ibid, 7-8 and 18.

²⁶ J. Trevor Brighton and Brian Sprakes, "Medieval and Georgian Stained Glass in Oxford and Yorkshire: The Work of Thomas of Oxford (1385-1427) and William Peckitt of York (1731-1795) in New College Chapel, York Minster and St. James High Melton," *Society of Antiquaries* LXX, no. part 2 (1990), 381.

²⁷ David J. F. Crouch, *Piety, Fraternity, and Power: Religious Guilds in Late Medieval Yorkshire, 1389-1547* (Woodbridge, Suffolk; Rochester, NY: York Medieval Press, 2000); Sarah Rees Jones, *The Government of Medieval York: Essays in Commemoration of the 1396 Royal Charter* (York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York, 1997).

²⁸ Crouch, *Piety, Fraternity, and Power*, 134.

trade or craft is relatively brief.²⁹ Her assertion that “The majority of glaziers who appear in the records were freemen of York” and what this meant for both the craft structure and the power of the guild, particularly post-Reformation, is one which I challenge as the close study of the records supports a different interpretation of what the status of freeman meant for workshop practice. A significant strand which runs through this thesis is a new emphasis on the importance of the role of patronage, favour and family networks in the maintenance and development of craft skills, networks which were managed in and affected by the religious, economic and political context in which they operated.

The related history of traders in glass, the merchants who imported the white and coloured glasses from the continent prior to the establishment of English glasshouses, has most recently been considered as part of a wider study of trade and the economic decline in the later medieval period by Jennifer Kermode. Her 1987 article and subsequent book *Medieval Merchants: York, Beverley and Hull in the later Middle Ages* discuss the northern evidence for the widely-held view that towns and cities entered a long-slow decline from the early to mid-fifteenth century onwards, creating wage stagnation and stunting creativity.³⁰ The evidence she presents for the northern towns and cities paints a more nuanced picture, breaking this monolithic (and largely London-centric) view down so that the depression of the trade in wool and grain in competition with Europe is contrasted with the continued resilience of the luxury trades like painted glass, in which York emerges as a regional hub serving most of northern England down to the Midlands. The importance of this analysis for understanding the economic drivers behind the working practices of the York glaziers’ workshops and the distribution of York glass across such a large geographical area is considerable. Kermode’s work sets out the wider socio-economic context in which the glaziers’ craft can be seen as one which required

²⁹ Heather Swanson, *Building Craftsmen in Late Medieval York*, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research Paper 63 (York: University of York, 1983).

³⁰ Jennifer Kermode, "Merchants, Overseas Trade, and Urban Decline: York, Beverley, and Hull C.1380-1500," *Northern History* 23 (1987); *Medieval Merchants: York, Beverley, and Hull in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

a broad clientele across a large geographical area in order for workshops and their specialist training structure to be economically viable. For the purposes of this thesis, it has enabled the subsequent contraction and fragmentation of skills to be seen in an economic context as well as a religious one. It also creates a framework in which to set the continuity of some economic practices, particularly the cultivation and maintenance of a very broad client base which was necessary for a workshop to function in the post-Reformation period. Building on Kermode's work, the analysis of the post-medieval trade in glass in York extends the study of this important area and shows the connections and continuity of practice between the pre- and post-Reformation worlds.

The study of antiquaries and antiquarianism

Although their work and interests were initially much derided, it was antiquarians who first began to document cathedrals in any systematic and objective way.³¹ Their records and publications are frequently the earliest record for many aspects of a cathedral's history or fabric, often preserving material which has since been lost. Moreover, it is my contention that such men and their works had a significant and positive influence on attitudes to the preservation of the glass. The study of antiquaries and antiquarianism has gained considerable momentum in recent decades with major works by scholars including Stanley Mendyk, Graham Parry, Lucy Peltz and Rosemary Sweet.³² These have demonstrated the importance of the field for understanding concepts of regional and national identity, the origins of the idea of museums and museology, and

³¹ The character and work of the antiquarian is savagely satirised in an essay in John Earle, *Microcosmographie or a Peece of the World Discovered in Essays and Characters*, 5th edn. (London, 1629). See also Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); "Earliest Antiquaries," in *Making History: Antiquaries in Britain, 1707-2007*, ed. David R. M. Gaimster, David Starkey, and Society of Antiquaries (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007); Daniel Woolf, "Images of the Antiquary in Seventeenth-Century England," in *Visions of Antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries of London, 1707-2007*, ed. Susan M. Pearce (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 2007).

³² Stan A. E Mendyk, *Speculum Britanniae: Regional Study, Antiquarianism and Science in Britain to 1700* (Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1989); Parry, "Earliest Antiquaries"; Lucy Peltz, "Aestheticizing the Ancestral City: Antiquarianism, Topography and the Representation of London in the Long Eighteenth Century," *Art History* 22, no. 4 (1999); Rosemary Sweet, *The Writing of Urban Histories in Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

the development of many scholarly disciplines including local history, archaeology, natural science, and physical geography.

In her work on the representation of London in the eighteenth century, Peltz asserts that the very idea and mode of representation of London's past was the product of antiquarian study and attitudes.³³ The rapid pace of change as London rebuilt itself sparked a frenzy of recording by antiquarians desperate to capture a fast-disappearing topography, but it also threatened a crisis in the sense of national identity which was averted principally by this antiquarian response which allowed the past to be kept alive and act as a point of reference.³⁴ This exploration of the role of eighteenth-century antiquarianism in the formation and preservation of national and other identities is explored more broadly in a collection of essays edited by Peltz and Myrone.³⁵ This work underpins a major strand of enquiry and argument in this thesis, that antiquarians had a significant influence on attitudes towards the medieval glass of the Minster and contributed to the emergence of the idea of York's unique status as a 'treasure-house of stained glass'. The role of antiquarian study in the revaluing and rehabilitation of the medieval past, resulting ultimately in the alignment of Gothic architectural style with national identity, is explored in an essay by Alexandrina Buchanan.³⁶ Buchanan argues that it was necessary to impose a scientific approach on architectural study in order to rescue the study of buildings from the 'despised hand' of the antiquarian.³⁷ Although she dates this shift to the early nineteenth-century, this thesis will show that it is possible to identify the very early stirrings of such an impulse at a much earlier date amongst the York antiquarians, particularly the seventeenth-century York antiquarian, James Torre working between 1675 and c.1691.³⁸

Studies of the antiquaries themselves across the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have shown up the great variation in motivation, interests,

³³ Peltz, "Aestheticizing the Ancestral City", 473-4.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Martin Myrone and Lucy Peltz, *Producing the Past: Aspects of Antiquarian Culture and Practice, 1700-1850* (Aldershot; Brookfield, Vt.: Ashgate, 1999).

³⁶ Alexandrina Buchanan, "Science and Sensibility: Architectural Antiquarianism in the Early Nineteenth Century," in Myrone and Peltz eds. *Producing the Past*, 165-186.

³⁷ Ibid, 169.

³⁸ Torre's manuscripts are preserved in YMA. His Minster manuscript is L1/7.

approach and attitude in those who fell under the wide (and often disputed) umbrella of 'antiquarian'. In *The Trophies of Time*, Graham Parry examines the complex networks and relationships which operated within and between seventeenth-century antiquarians, such as Sir William Dugdale, John Weever, John Aubrey and Thomas Browne.³⁹ Parry reveals the multiplicity of personal connections and modes of enquiry which formed the antiquarian world throughout this period as well as the intricate webs of patronage, rivalry, scholarly ambition and intellectual endeavour which divided, and in some cases united, their efforts. For Parry, it is scholars such as Dugdale, who catalogued, ordered and documented and whose "definitive studies are a permanent contribution to the scholarship, the basis of all future work in their respective areas" who are the heroes of this movement.⁴⁰ Whilst he admires John Weever's pioneering approach in twisting together "many strands of learning", he is also slightly critical that "a strong regard for tangible evidence is modified by an uncritical fondness for the venerable legends of the nation".⁴¹ Whilst this thesis acknowledges the rigorous approach which antiquaries such as Torre endeavoured to adopt, it also notes the value for modern scholars of some of the incidental information which he and others like Weever captured.

Rosemary Sweet's work demonstrates the value of understanding the cultural worlds in which antiquaries were working, examining their role in preserving and presenting the different eras of British history from ancient Britons to the Middle Ages.⁴² Sweet also considers the influence and impact of audience on the presentation, reception and popularisation of such works.⁴³ The tangible effects of antiquaries on the attitudes and decisions of those responsible for preserving historic buildings, particularly cathedrals, is illustrated by case studies such as Salisbury and Durham.⁴⁴ Sweet's work in particular has influenced my analysis of the way in which the work of York's antiquaries

³⁹ Parry, *The Trophies of Time*.

⁴⁰ Ibid, 217

⁴¹ Ibid, 216.

⁴² Rosemary Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Hambledon and London, 2004).

⁴³ Ibid: for women see 69-69; for Popularisation see 309-344.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 287-294.

created the cathedral's credentials as a treasure-house of explicitly medieval stained glass. In so doing, such intervention went beyond the simple avoidance of destruction or functional repair into the realms of constructing a carefully curated version of the cathedral's windows which deliberately added to the stock of such glass on view to the public.

The religious context – politics and churchmanship

The emphases in the literature surveyed thus far have been on the study of the materiality of the glass and the building in which it is set, and the external factors which exerted pressures of various kinds (economic, social, intellectual) on the Minster and those responsible for its care and upkeep. The Minster was and is, however, a place built for the daily worship of God and the attitudes, predilections and religious leanings of the many clergy and lay staff charged with delivering or overseeing this function must have had a profound influence on the fabric of the building and on its glass. The Minster is the Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of St Peter in York, the seat of one of England's two Anglican archbishops but run by the governing body, the Dean and Chapter.

The monumental studies of leading figures within the Reformation and Stuart church like Archbishops Laud (Hugh Trevor-Roper) and Cramner (Diarmaid MacCulloch), coupled with extensive work by MacCulloch and others on the Reformation church more widely have provided the national context within which the York picture can be considered.⁴⁵ MacCulloch's assertion that the Reformation created a vacuum in which cathedrals became "the Trojan horse by which Laudianism was introduced into the English church" is challenged by Ian Atherton who counters that cathedrals "were not the agents of Laudianism; they were its - albeit not always entirely unwilling – victims".⁴⁶ Whilst this may be an

⁴⁵ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cramner* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1996); Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud 1573-1645*, 2nd edn. (London: Phoenix Press, 1962; repr., 2000); Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*, 2nd edn. (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001); *Building a Godly Realm: The Establishment of English Protestantism, 1558-1603* (London: Historical Association, 1992); Patrick Collinson, *The Sixteenth Century 1485-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

⁴⁶ Ian Atherton, "Cathedrals, Laudianism, and the British Churches," *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 4 (2010), 896.

oversimplification in the case of York, the relationship between cathedrals and the Laudian movement was an ambiguous one.⁴⁷ Atherton considers the importance of the Laudian movement on the placement and embellishment of the altar, and on the role of music, especially that of the organ in the performance of worship. However, given the importance that Laud himself placed on the role of glass in the beautifying of churches and the significance of it in his trial it is surprising that neither Atherton nor Trevor-Roper consider it in detail.⁴⁸ The influence and connections of Laud with important figures in York's story, notably Archbishop Richard Neile and the seventeenth-century Chapter at York are discussed with regard to patronage and perception. The work of both Fincham and Tyacke, particularly *Altars Restored* (2007), *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism* (Tyacke) and Parry's *Glory, Laud and Honour* (2006) approach Laudianism in terms of the aesthetics between the two ends of the churchmanship spectrum.⁴⁹ Parry links in the interests and efforts of antiquaries like Spelman and Dugdale and paints a richly detailed picture of the material impact of the movement on cathedrals, churches and the college chapels of Oxford and Cambridge. Fincham and Tyacke give a much more nuanced assessment of the role and use of imagery and glass across the religious spectrum, showing that it was not a clear-cut ideological divide, while Keith Thomas discusses the relative unimportance of the beauty or craftsmanship of artworks in approaches to iconoclasm and attitudes to art in this period.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Ibid, 918. This is a topic considered for college and private chapels by James Sherrington Jago, "The Dissemination and Reassessment of Private Religious Space in Early Modern England 1600-1660: An Examination of the Cultural Contexts Surrounding Royal, Episcopal and Collegiate Chapels from the Accession of James I to the Restoration" (University of York, PhD thesis, 2012).

⁴⁸ Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud 1573-1645*.

⁴⁹ Parry, *Glory, Laud and Honour*; Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Nicholas Tyacke, *The English Revolution c.1590-1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007); Nicholas Tyacke and G. R. Elton, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590-1640*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1987); Nicholas Tyacke, Kenneth Fincham, and Peter Lake, *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006); Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590-1640*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).

⁵⁰ Keith Thomas "Art & Iconoclasm in Early Modern England" in Tyacke, Fincham and Lake eds, *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, 16-40.

For the clerical history of York diocese and the Minster, the publications of Claire Cross form an authoritative platform from which to consider the influence of churchmanship and internal politics on the constituency of the Dean and Chapter in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁵¹ The period of the Civil War and its immediate aftermath is addressed in Philip Withington's 2001 article on seventeenth-century York.⁵² The political and religious disconnect between the city and the Minster in this period is an important factor in our understanding of the reality of the threat not only to the glass posed by the views of the staunchly Parliamentary faction, a threat played out in the breaking of the glass in the parish church of All Saints Pavement, but to the continuing existence of the Minster.⁵³ Traditional art historical scholarship has focused on the creation, craftsmanship, iconographic meaning and thus intended reception of the glass for medieval audiences. However, as set out in my preface, it is time to understand *why* the glass has survived; to do so we need to understand its post-medieval history. This is in line with new directions in scholarship across a number of disciplines that have become more interested in the concept of diachronic studies, particularly the biography of a building and its art over time, and the role and significance of antiquarians not only in documenting lost elements but in shaping attitudes and cultures of preservation.⁵⁴

This thesis shows that glass craftsmanship did not stop at the Reformation, but rather continued in different, active and adaptive ways which provides a whole new chapter in our understanding of this period. Crucially, the

⁵¹ Claire Cross, *The Economic Problems of the See of York: Decline and Recovery in the Sixteenth Century* (London: British Agricultural History Society, 1970); *Church and People, 1450-1660: The Triumph of the Laity in the English Church* (London: Fontana, 1976); "From Reformation to Restoration," in *A History of York Minster*, ed. Aylmer and Cant; *Religion in York 1559-1662* (York: Dean and Chapter of York, 1977); *Priests into Ministers: The Establishment of Protestant Practice in the City of York 1530-1630* (London: Scholar Press, 1980); *Close Encounters: English Cathedrals and Society since 1540* (Nottingham: University of Nottingham, Dept. of Adult Education; Sherwood Press, 1991); Christopher C. Webb, "Cathedral Patronage: York Minster 1625-1677", in *Patronage and Recruitment in the Tudor and Early Stuart Church*, ed. Claire Cross, Borthwick Studies in History (York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, 1996).

⁵² Phil Withington, "Views from the Bridge: Revolution and Restoration in Seventeenth-Century York," *Past and Present* 170 (2001).

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 142.

⁵⁴ The recent (2014-2016) York interdisciplinary AHRC project, *St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster: visual & political culture 1292-1941* (<https://www.virtualststephens.org.uk/>) is a good example.

attitudes of the clergy and wider historical events are not just played out through the treatment of the windows, but that the painted glass itself becomes an agent of change and statement of political and religious meaning. In the context of the Minster glass, this study of its fortunes over time provides a model for how the glass history of other cathedrals may be undertaken. Central to the success of this is the adoption of a multi-disciplinary approach, drawing on antiquarian, historical and archival sources to go beyond the important but partial evidence of the extant glass.

Structure, terminology and methodology

Structure of the thesis

The thesis is organised into three major chapters on the themes Craft, Patronage and Reception and Perception. Within these, the material is presented largely chronologically and together they cover the period c.1450-1802, although not every theme is explored across the full chronological range. Within this thematic structure I am using the documents to try and understand the story of the glass from three different perspectives. First is that of the craftsmen and how the nature of glass-painting and the craft of glazing was organised and responded to the seismic changes in their traditional markets. Second, from the viewpoint of personal patrons and institutional patronage, discussing those who commissioned and paid for the work and what this tells us about attitudes to glass, particularly medieval glass, and the evolving nature of what can be understood as 'patronage'. Third, from the perspective of the viewer, whether Chapter member, antiquarian, publisher or casual visitor. All these constituencies were affected by the same historical, economic and religious currents, but differently and crucially, they left different forms of record, discourse, material traces behind them. Given my background with the Minster, I am uniquely placed to unlock these stories.

Numbering system and terminology

There have been numerous systems used to identify the windows and their individual panels at different times, but the system used here is that of the CVMA which uses a combination of orientation and an intra-building locator code to identify a window precisely and unambiguously: for example, CHn3 is the third window on the north side of the Chapter House. Within a window, the individual lights are numbered left to right, and the individual panels within those are lettered up from the bottom of the window: panel 1b, for example, would be the second panel or section up from the sill in the first light. Where appropriate, names such as the Rose window and the Great East Window are used in conjunction with the CVMA number.⁵⁵ A plan of the Minster is included [Figure 2].

It has long been a convention at York, both informally and in published works, for the term 'the Minster' to be used to refer both to the building and to the people who run it. It is officially the Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of St Peter in York, but the term 'Minster' has been in common usage since the medieval period. Whilst the term 'Dean and Chapter' is used specifically for the capitular body, the term 'the Minster' is used more generally to denote the wider body which could encompass them as well as the vicars choral, vergers, lay staff and others. This convention is used here.

Methodology

Contrary to the popular perception, the glass has undergone profound change and some loss since the Reformation. The underpinning primary research of this thesis has been the close engagement with the archives and antiquarian manuscripts preserved in the Minster collections, much more than some art historical scholarship where the extant glass has been the principal focus. The nature of these is discussed below. Selected examples of the surviving glass have then been compared to the analysis of the archival evidence

⁵⁵ The Dean and Chapter's preferred usage of capitalisation within window names has been respected.

and antiquarian sources. For example, Torre's detailed recording has allowed for a very close study of individual windows, allowing the discussion to move from an analysis of craftsmanship to the contemporary understanding and identification of individual panels. Thus, it has been possible in those instances to ascertain not only what traces of the work done remain, in some cases suggesting authorship of otherwise unattributed post-medieval glass, but to challenge accepted orthodoxies about the glass and its care. It has been necessary, therefore to undertake an extremely detailed examination of the archival evidence of expenditure on the glass to provide the fineness of detail which allows the small incremental changes in practice or ethos to be picked up and understood. This approach is not in itself new: the work on the history of buildings in the late medieval and early modern periods by Louis Salzman, particularly the glazing of St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster, provides a comparable methodology.⁵⁶ What is new in this thesis is taking that documentary analysis into the study of York's glass to uncover the broader cultural, social, religious and economic story of this neglected period of the Minster's glazing history.

The archival and manuscript sources

The original material held in York Minster Archives can be divided into archival series generated by the Dean and Chapter and their officials in the conduct of the Minster's business, and manuscript material created by others, but now in their care. Within the archival series, a useful distinction can be made between financial records of various kinds and documentary material generated by other activities. None of these series is complete, the losses in some classes are considerable (the Chapter Act books from the period of the Reformation, for example), but the chance survival of related material does fill some gaps and, in some cases, sheds light on administrative and craft practices relevant to this thesis of which we would otherwise be completely ignorant. Periodic evidence

⁵⁶ Louis F. Salzman, "The Glazing of St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster, 1351-2" *Journal of Stained Glass* 1, no. 4 (1926), 14-18; no. 5, 31-35; no.6 (1927), 38-41; *Building in England down to 1540: A Documentary History* (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, repr. with correction, 1967).

for the maintenance and alteration of the Minster itself can be found in a number of these, including the Chamberlains Rolls, registers and Chapter Act books, but the principal sources for the routine work to the fabric are in the series known collectively as the fabric rolls.⁵⁷ The survival of other manuscript material, most notably the antiquarian notes of James Torre, is largely serendipitous, with there being no programme of intentional or systematic acquisition of manuscript material relating to the Minster's history until the late twentieth century.⁵⁸

1. Financial records

The various financial series were generated by the different officers (both clerical and lay) of the Minster and record both the sources from which they drew their income and their expenditure on the various activities for which they were responsible. There was no mechanism for any summation of these different classes into a single, annual statement of the overall financial position and, as a presentment of 1519 vividly depicts, it was not always clear to whom responsibility for various tasks should fall.⁵⁹ As such, the records can contradict each other, overlap and omit seemingly vital material. It is clear, however, that the majority of surviving documents are the very summary 'fair copies', written up from drafts and other iterative sources, which each officer presented to Chapter or the relevant dignity on an annual basis. Where the rough versions and source materials, such as the original bills and vouchers, do survive these provide invaluable additional information.

⁵⁷ Chamberlains' Rolls which survive for 1370-1679 are YMA E1/1-138; Chapter Act Books 1345-1936 survive in 21 volumes YMA H1/1 – H11/4; Fabric Rolls and vouchers 1370-1886 are principally E3/1-218v, but there is subsidiary material listed in other classes and sub-divisions, B3 and E4. E3/194v-218v (1827-1886) are original vouchers.

⁵⁸ The archive material was not catalogued until the 1970s, by Katherine Longley, and an acquisitions policy not formulated until 1995. Torre's manuscripts are class L1, with the Minster fabric material as volume L1/7.

⁵⁹ YMA L2/3c f.148v et seq. The presentment was by the Vicars Choral to the Archbishop.

The Fabric Rolls

The most relevant class within the financial series is the fabric rolls, an unusually rich source of craft detail, and it is from these that much of the evidence has been drawn.⁶⁰ These survive as an extremely partial series from 1370, but with almost complete coverage from 1660, the form not changing from that of rolled parchments to a book alone until 1827. Whilst the Minster is not unique in having fabric records from this period (Wells cathedral, for example, has a series of fabric accounts 1390-1849), such extent of survival is relatively unusual.⁶¹ The study of such records with regard to glass has normally been confined to the identification or pursuit of specific campaigns of work, or the careers of individual craftsmen or 'schools', and predominantly for the period before 1500.⁶² This thesis uses these records differently in order to approach the sixteenth century on its own terms through the work and practice of the craftsmen.

The fabric rolls are a series of accounts for the fund specifically designated for this purpose. The fabric fund's principal income was from property rentals from a collection of properties the number and relative value of which remained largely static until the nineteenth century. Prior to the Reformation, further funds for the fabric were raised by the perambulation of seven reliquaries around the diocese to stimulate donations by the faithful, but from 1540s onwards the rentals were the sole source of routine maintenance funding.⁶³ The rolls were created by the Clerks of the Fabric, responsible to the 'custos', as a record of the amounts paid out for workmen and materials for the routine work and small-to-medium projects in the Minster. They seldom contain any details of the large, contract works, such as the Great East Window. Their format, where expenses are grouped by subject or trade for inclusive periods of days or weeks, strongly suggests that from the early modern period (and probably before) they were written up from vouchers or bills presented for

⁶⁰ YMA E3/1 et seq.

⁶¹ Wells Cathedral fabric rolls are at Wells, ref. DC/F/2.

⁶² For a study of Wells Cathedral medieval glass, see Tim Ayers, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Wells Cathedral* (Oxford: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2004).

⁶³ Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, 122.

payment quarterly, or otherwise periodically, by the workmen or suppliers and then summarised in these rolls. Bundles of vouchers survive sporadically for the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with occasional chance survivals from earlier periods, such as the set of three bills presented by the Crosbys in the 1690s for work on the chapter house glazing.⁶⁴ This summary nature of the surviving records, and the likely reason for it, is an important consideration when using the rolls as a source. When the work was being done and paid for, the vouchers and/or the creditors would have been on hand to provide any details and the location and nature of the work was probably obvious. As a result, the rolls are frequently frustratingly uninformative about the precise location or exact nature of work being undertaken. The rolls entries are quite explicit when work is being undertaken outside the Minster, either in another church or in a property, so it is possible to identify when the glaziers listed are working on the Minster itself, just not precisely where. However, it is possible, when considered with other Dean and Chapter sources build a picture of the pattern of work on the glazing.⁶⁵ It is also possible to consider the amount spent on the windows relative to the rest of the fabric, and assess over time the care that was exercised in their maintenance.

The content of the rolls follows a regular format, with payments to regular workmen listed before exceptional payments. Expenditure on materials and small items are listed in an all-encompassing 'Expenses minutiae': purchases of glass, lime, and turves appear alongside new psalm books, parchment for the roll and cushions for the quire. Written on parchment, the rolls are in Latin until the mid-sixteenth century, with occasional phrases in Middle English and Norman French, as the clerk gave up the unequal struggle of translating the names of, for example, the various types of nails and other technical terms such as "le skaffoldyng"⁶⁶.

⁶⁴ YMA B3/1/1-3.

⁶⁵ Neither the Chapter Acts, nor the Chamberlains Rolls are primarily concerned with fabric expenditure, but there is occasional overlap between these series, particularly in the earlier period when responsibilities appear to be less well-defined.

⁶⁶ YMA ref. E3/17: expenses for timber.

From the mid-sixteenth century onwards, they are primarily in English, although Latin lingered on in phrases and headings. Following the Visitation of Archbishop Frewen in 1662-3, greater financial scrutiny and accountability were required to ensure the several funds of the Chapter were properly managed.⁶⁷ From this date they adopted the method of attaching each new year's account sheet to its predecessors by means of a thong through the top of the first membrane, creating a huge and unwieldy roll of over forty membranes with the most recent addition on the top. This rendered the previous years' entries very difficult to access and, coupled with the fact that the membranes enclosed within the huge rolled bundle created are extremely clean, is indicative that these were immediately stored with the muniments as the 'official' copy. As a result, there are paper account books as well as the parchment rolls from this date. From 1715, with the arrival of a new Treasurer, a role reinstated after its dissolution at the Reformation, this was further organised into expenses (debtors) on the verso and receipts (creditors) on the recto, rather than the closely-written continuous text of the previous century. At each year-end the accounts within the book were 'accepted' by the dean and residentiary canons with their signatures.⁶⁸

The paper books were probably the 'working copies', maintained in tandem with the rolls, but they occasionally have differing entries.⁶⁹ For example, the paper account book contains three entries for 1691-93 for the purchase of pewter (presumably for the making of solder) for the glaziers from James Secker totalling £4 14s 2d, which do not appear at all in the parchment rolls. The omission of this significant sum may be simple error, or it may be that the book was also serving as the Clerk's running record of works expenditure, whereas the parchment roll was only for individual expenses directly chargeable to the Fabric account. If so, then the payments for pewter formed part of the

⁶⁷ Accepted Frewen, *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry Concerning Matters Ecclesiasticall: Exhibited to the Ministers, Church-Wardens, and Side-Men of Every Parish, within the Diocesse and Province of Yorke: In the Metropolitall Visitation of the Most Reverend Father in God Accepted, by Divine Providence Lord Arch-Bishop of York: Begun in the Year of Our Lord God, 1662: And in the Second Year of His Graces Translation*, (York: Printed by Alice Broade, 1662).

⁶⁸ YMA E4a covers the period 1661-1827; a supplementary account book created from separate audited sheets, (E4d) gives fuller information for the period 1763-1826.

⁶⁹ A further paper volume, a Day Book kept by the Treasurer (YMA E4b), survives for 1677-1748.

Clerk of Work's expenses on 'all things necessary' for the work of the glaziers, which was at his charge and for which regular entries began to appear as lump sum payments in the rolls.⁷⁰ Discerning the function of original records (rather than the uses to which later generations put them) is necessary to ensure that the inclusion or omission of data from apparently similar records is correctly interpreted.

From 1698 onwards, the records both in book and roll form became considerably more summary. Most expenses had little or no detail attached to them and were clearly originally all supported by bills and vouchers, most of which are now lost. In line with modern accounting practice, once the accounts had been formally presented and accepted, it would not be considered necessary to retain all the primary material. A valuable exception is for the period 1693-1696: this is not covered in the surviving main rolls series at all, but single line entries for each year appear in the paper account book, together with a loose account sheet for 1696 and the original vouchers for payment from the Crosby workshop.⁷¹

Vouchers and agreements

In addition to the system of bills ('vouchers') and receipts, there were contracts and agreements for larger pieces of work. These were created by the head of the workshop and detailed the work done by all his staff on the job. In the case of larger projects, he also listed any additional expenditure beyond that agreed in the contract price. These were given to the 'custos' or keeper of the fabric (designated as the Treasurer after 1660, who delegated the day-to-day work to a Clerk of the Fabric) for payment and enrolled in the relevant account in summary form. Agreements were created in duplicate for retention by the Treasurer and the craftsman. References to the expense of these being drawn up appear occasionally in the fabric rolls, but again, it is only by chance that one of these survives. It is for work by the Crosby family and it seems they accidentally left their copy along with the vouchers for the work: this tiny bundle somehow

⁷⁰ YMA E4b. Typically these are for £100, for example the payment on f.36v.

⁷¹ YMA E3M/4.

escaped destruction. These hint at the considerable administrative machinery which once lay behind the fabric rolls, most of which is now lost.

The Chamberlains' Rolls

Similar in format to the fabric rolls, the Chamberlains' rolls likewise recorded income from rentals and expenditure.⁷² This money supplied the Common Fund from which the residentiary canons drew income, beyond that generated by their prebendal estates, for duties performed and expenditure they had incurred. In 1662 Archbishop Frewen was concerned that this fund had been dipped into for fabric purposes; this was not its designated purpose and such misappropriation of funds could prompt a further Visitation, with all its unwelcome nosing into Dean and Chapter affairs.⁷³ Whether any of the money received by Chapter members was subsequently used for personal patronage, such as the Archbishop Rotherham window discussed in Chapter 3, is hard to determine as these would have generated separate contracts which do not survive.

2. Documentary records

The Chapter Acts

The Chapter Act books record the decisions of the Dean and Chapter as agreed at Chapter meetings.⁷⁴ These large, parchment volumes were written up from drafts (a very few of which survive) as fair copies for preservation.⁷⁵ The content consists in large part of a record of appointments to livings and disputes about the statutes and income, there is little about the fabric or other practical matters.⁷⁶ Meetings, which were monthly or more frequent in the decades after the Reformation steadily declined in number so that by the 1660s they took

⁷² YMA E2.

⁷³ Frewen, *Articles of Visitation*.

⁷⁴ YMA H1/1 – H11/4. There is a related and interwoven series of Chapter Minutes and drafts 1661-1938 at H8/1-6 and H12/1-5R.

⁷⁵ An example of a draft book is YMA H8/8 for 1669.

⁷⁶ A decision regarding the consecration of the cathedral (25 May 1472) is a single paper sheet at M1/1c.

place, on average, only three or four times a year and frequently with only two or three (not always including the dean) present. It is not relevant to discuss the complex history of the residency system, but from these records it is clear that most decisions about the work on the fabric were made outside of these meetings, quite possibly by a single residentiary which, from about 1700 was almost certainly the dean alone.

Inventories and visitations

The Dean and Chapter recorded information which mattered to them, such as their material possessions of any value and the requirements placed upon them by the archbishops, in a series of soft-bound parchment books.⁷⁷ These more narrative records include inventories of treasure, which document the richness of the pre-Reformation Minster. Many of these pieces of plate, textile and books were given by clergy, some for chantry purposes, but at no point do these 'treasures' include a record of the donation of windows even one as splendid as the Great East Window. As Keith Thomas elucidated, discussed above, these were not regarded as treasures, or art, or items of value until the late seventeenth century at the earliest, so were not treated or recorded as such.

3. Manuscript sources

The manuscripts of James Torre

The most significant manuscript source for this thesis is the exceptional record of the appearance of the Minster interior fabric compiled by the York antiquarian James Torre between c.1675 and c.1685.⁷⁸ He and his work are discussed in depth in Chapter Four, so this section will focus on the format of his record. His seven manuscript volumes were deposited in the Minster Library in

⁷⁷ These form the somewhat diverse L2 and M2 classes.

⁷⁸ YMA L1/7.

1715 by the executors of Archbishop Sharp.⁷⁹ Sharp had purchased them from Torre's widow in 1699 because he wished to exploit the detailed study Torre had made of the history, rights and privileges of the diocese and deaneries in his first six volumes of notes; the survival of the seventh volume on the fabric of the Minster, was largely due to the value placed on the content of the other six.

The format of Torre's manuscript

Torre's manuscripts were created as a series of loose-leaf quires of thin paper which were then collated and bound into leather-bound volumes. The thinness of the paper and the thickness of the ink sometimes caused words to be obscured on the reverse of a folio by the ink bleeding through, but the manuscripts as they survive today do appear to be a fair copy, rather than original site notes. There are numerous corrections and crossings out, but these were done neatly, again suggesting later review with a view to publication. The pages are numbered consecutively, but some have more than one contemporary number sequence; a second consecutive sequence was imposed once the loose quires had been collated and used as the basis for the contemporary index also compiled by Torre. These are labelled inconsistently as 'f' for folio, or 'p' for page, or sometimes neither.⁸⁰ Accompanying the description of each window was a small diagram with each panel numbered, enabling the reader to cross-reference quickly between text and location.

The very ordered nature and two-column layout of the work is not exceptional, but reflects the appearance of published work such as Dugdale's *Monasticon*.⁸¹ There was no colour used anywhere in the manuscripts; instead he devised a supplemented version of the heavily abbreviated but precise terminology of heraldic description to record colours and details of dress. His terminology and the significance of his language is discussed in Chapter Four.

⁷⁹ A. Tindal Hart, *The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York* (London: S.P.C.K., 1949), 325-331; Thomas Sharp, *The Life of John Sharp, Lord Archbishop of York: To Which Are Added, Select, Original, and Copies of Original Papers, in Three Appendixes* (London: C. & J. Rivington, 1825), 110.

⁸⁰ Torre's nonclemanture has been respected in this regard.

⁸¹ Sir William Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum, or, the History of the Ancient Abbies, and Other Monasteries, Hospitals, Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in England and Wales. With Divers French, Irish, and Scotch Monasteries Formerly Relating to England* (London: for Sam. Keble, Hen. Rhodes, 1693).

However, this employment of his own version can cause difficulties when comparing his description with the glass as it stands today: for example, the distinction between 'blue' and 'azure' is inconsistent and occasionally strays into colours which today would be described as purple. In describing the building and particularly the windows, Torre's level of detail appears to have been based solely on ground level personal observation: there are no references to any other sources, such as the fabric rolls, being used apart from the contract for John Thornton's work on the Great East Window, which he copied out and translated from the Latin. Whether he sought access to them, or was aware of their existence, his record was in the new spirit of scientific empirical study.⁸² This aspect of Torre's study is explored in Chapter Four.

The manuscript history of Thomas Gale

The only other manuscript description of the Minster predating 1800 in the collections of the Dean and Chapter is a small notebook history written in 1700 by Samuel Gale, the son of the dean Thomas Gale (1697-1702).⁸³ This, by Gale's own admission, drew heavily on Torre's work, demonstrating the networks within which such manuscripts as Torre's were used. This is a topic explored in Chapter Four, but it serves to highlight the extraordinary level of detail and completeness of Torre's work. Gale's small work paid scant regard to the windows, choosing instead to summarise the key historical figures and major events in the building of the Minster. When talking of his own time, his detail was slightly greater, but his record is cursory and difficult to interpret for specific windows or locations. Why the eighteen-year-old Gale wrote this is hard to discern. His father had written a history of the Minster, discussed in Chapter Four, so perhaps he was experimenting for the distinguished career which lay ahead of him?⁸⁴

⁸² Charles Coulston Gillispie, *The Edge of Objectivity ; an Essay in the History of Scientific Ideas*, 2nd edn. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1960; repr., 1990); Steven Shapin, *The Scientific Revolution* (Chicago, IL.; London: University of Chicago Press, 1996); Mendyk, *Speculum Britanniae: Regional Study, Antiquarianism and Science in Britain to 1700*.

⁸³ YMA AddMSS 43.

⁸⁴ *Sweet, Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, 165.

Conclusion

The emphasis on archival and manuscript sources for the history of the windows, privileging these above the evidence of the glass itself, is a less traditional to stained glass studies, but one better placed to uncover this forgotten history across the period from the Reformation to 1802. The glass was, in many areas, very significantly altered and rearranged in the twentieth century under the direction of Dean Eric Milner-White (1941-1963). Milner-White actively sought to erase the interventions and repairs, no matter how skilled, of post-medieval craftsmen and restore what he considered to be the 'correct' medieval appearance of the Minster. In the process, a great deal of physical evidence was lost, or reduce to mere traces. I hope that by revealing the detail of work done and the craftsmen and patrons responsible, it may be possible in future work to uncover more physical traces in the glazing today and re-establish the position of those forgotten glaziers and glass-painters in the history of English stained and painted glass.

CHAPTER TWO:- THE GLAZIERS' CRAFT

Introduction

The study of stained and painted glass in York has hitherto largely focused on identifying individual craftsmen or schools.⁸⁵ Comparatively little attention has been paid to the documentary evidence for the structure and organisation of the workshops and guild system within which they operated, and the ways in which specific skills were nurtured and passed on in the post-Reformation period. The resilience and flexibility of the workshop system, whereby craftsmen rising from apprentice to master could not only acquire specialist expertise but 'inherit' the workshop, is what enabled the craft not simply to survive the Reformation, but adapt to and thrive in new conditions and seize new opportunities. By tracing the chronology of who was working when and in what capacity it is possible to reconstruct the lineages of these York workshops as skills and connections were passed down from generation to generation. This is an approach David King has adopted for the 'craft genealogy' of the Wighton workshop in medieval Norwich, tracing work across thirty sites and one hundred and fifty years.⁸⁶ With the inheritance of the Thompson workshop's Minster contract by the Crosbys, for example, we can see a single workshop specialise, expand, contract and expand again in response to market conditions across the period 1621-1703. Through tracing these lineages, it is then possible to look across the period of study and draw out the themes of the ebb and flow of the status of glaziers in comparison with other crafts and internally in response to external factors, the role and eventual decline of the role of the guild of glaziers, the sourcing and use of materials and the ultimate separation of the skill of glass-painting from the workshop and guild structures in which it had been the highest level of the craft.

⁸⁵ The many excellent county, city and cathedral volumes produced by the British Committee of the CVMA have sought to identify the hand of individuals or workshops in surviving medieval glass. For a comprehensive list see <http://www.cvma.ac.uk/publications/index.html>. See also Richard Marks, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1993).

⁸⁶ David King, "Glass-painting in late medieval Norwich: Continuity and Patronage in the John Wighton Workshop" in Paul Binski and Elizabeth A. New eds. *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium* Harlaxton Medieval Studies, XXII (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2012), 347-365.

This chapter presents the considerable body of evidence for the continuity of craft structures and practice beyond the period when new commissions could reasonably be expected to continue to flow in and thereby challenges the idea that glass painting and the workshop structures necessary to support it died out in York as Peckitt asserted and later authors have maintained.⁸⁷ How did the craft structure respond to the Reformation which removed many of the traditional clients for glass and what were the workshops producing? The chapter explores the 'genealogy' of the principal glazing workshops connected with York Minster through the records of the work they undertook there. Within this broadly chronological framework, I draw out the strong themes of the nature of the work being done and what this tells us about the continuity and development of glass-painting and stained glass, the resilience and flexibility of the workshop structure, the role of the guild and the long shadow which later artists like Henry Gyles and William Peckitt have cast over our understanding of the craft in the post-Reformation period. Building on the work done by Barrie Dobson on medieval freemen's rolls, I also offer a new interpretation of the significance of being a freeman in relation to estimates of the numbers of those employed in the craft in the sixteenth to early eighteenth centuries. I argue that to be a freeman and to have the right to practise as a glazier in the city was in fact necessary only for the master leading a workshop, so the numbers involved in the craft were much higher than previously estimated.⁸⁸ The fluctuations in the status of the glaziers were in part a response to market forces and social trends. In the very short term, it was a flexible response to a temporary economic down-turn, but in the longer term it was the result of the specialist skills which could command the highest wages breaking away. The role of the Guild of Glaziers in quality control, and the implementation of restrictive practices undergirded by the desire to maintain York's reputation for high-quality glazing work, is also considered, from its robust

⁸⁷ Brighton and Sprakes, "Medieval and Georgian Stained Glass in Oxford and Yorkshire: The Work of Thomas of Oxford (1385-1427) and William Peckitt of York (1731-1795) in New College Chapel, York Minster and St. James High Melton", 381.

⁸⁸ R. Barrie Dobson, "Admissions to the Freedom of the City of York in the Later Middle Ages," *Economic History Review 2nd Series* 26 (1973), 1-22.

defence of the craft against outsiders in the late sixteenth century to its ultimate decline and loss of control in the mid eighteenth century.

The medieval context of glaziers in York 1450-1500

To understand how the craft of glass-painting and glazing could survive the abrupt removal of its principal client base, it is necessary to consider briefly the situation of York glaziers in the period immediately leading up to the Reformation, and how this position of regional (almost national) dominance and economic solidity had been achieved. By 1450 the installation of the finest of York Minster's painted glass was complete. The Great East Window (1) [Figure 3], created and installed by John Thornton of Coventry between 1405 and 1408, flanked by his exceptionally fine St William window (n7) of c.1414 and the St Cuthbert window (s7) [Figures 4 & 5] of c.1440 in the north and south quire transepts respectively, formed (as discussed by Norton) a coherent and potent iconographic scheme.⁸⁹ This deliberate pairing of St. William with that great northern saint, Cuthbert, on either side of the high altar, flanking the magnificent Apocalypse window at the liturgical heart of the cathedral, was a calculated use of stained glass to bolster the reputation of St William. The commissioning of these windows, certainly the east window, was by individually negotiated contract securing the services of a master glazier.⁹⁰ Although it was the Dean and Chapter who contracted with Thornton, acting for the donor, the principal costs do not appear in the fabric rolls.⁹¹ This was to be a pattern of working and accounting which was repeated across long periods of the Minster's history and which makes an early administrative distinction between the work of external stained-glass artists, such as John Burgh, and the payments for repairs

⁸⁹ Christopher Norton, "Richard Scrope and York Minster," in *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr*, ed. P. Jeremy Piers Goldberg (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2007), 148-149.

⁹⁰ A seventeenth-century English copy survives in James Torre's manuscript YMA L1/7 p.7, whilst his Latin version is in L1/2 part II.p.34. These and a further Latin copy by Matthew Hutton, now in the British Library (Harleian MS.6971, f.141v) are recorded and discussed in French, *York Minster: The Great East Window*, 153-154.

⁹¹ The fabric roll for 1399 (YMA E3/5) records the purchase of large amounts of white glass for the Great East Window, indicating the purchase of materials was outwith the contract terms.

and materials funded by the fabric fund of the Dean and Chapter.⁹² Such administrative distinctions have repercussions when evidence of patronage is being sought, as is discussed in Chapter Three, and the uneven survival of the various types of archival material discussed in Chapter One, and necessarily affect the extent to which a full picture of workshop structure and practice can be built up. Misconceptions about the comprehensiveness of archival sources which are, as I will demonstrate, quite selective in content, has led to a falsely poor impression of the skills sets and robustness of the early modern workshops.

By 1500, the Minster contained stained and painted glass from each of the preceding four centuries, including the earliest glass in the cathedral from the twelfth-century quire of Roger Pont L'Eveque already re-used in the nave clerestory [Figure 6].⁹³ The windows of the lantern tower had been installed in the 1470s by the Pettys, a noted York family of glaziers who were also routinely engaged with maintaining the windows and who continued to appear regularly in the accounts into the sixteenth century.⁹⁴ However, the Pettys were far from the only glaziers in the city. Several glaziers lived and worked in and around Stonegate and Blake Street, making a comfortable living from the glazing requirements of the various religious institutions in the vicinity and further afield.⁹⁵

Robert Preston, a man of substance

The ongoing economic value of such business can be seen in the will and testament of one Robert Preston '*cyttysen and glasyour of Yorke*', written on 24th July 1503 and proved on 2nd August 1503.⁹⁶ In addition to the provision he made for his burial, a year's chantry and bequests totalling £7, he left detailed bequests of the tools, stock of glasses and necessary equipment of his trade to

⁹² John Burgh was the retained glazier in the late fourteenth – early fifteenth centuries responsible for much of the quire clerestory glass according to Knowles.

⁹³ Sarah Brown, *Stained Glass at York Minster* (Scala: London, 2017), 10.

⁹⁴ YMA ref E3/33. The Petty's workshop is discussed below.

⁹⁵ John Blair and Nigel Ramsay, *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, Products* (London: Hambledon Press, 1991), 275.

⁹⁶ *Testamenta Eboracensia: A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Vol. IV*, ed. James Raine, Surtees Society 53 (Durham: published for the Society by George Andrews etc., 1869), 216-17.

his partner, Thomas Ynglyshe, and one of his apprentices Robert Begge.⁹⁷ Preston's testament gives an insight into the workshop practices, tools and organisation of the craft of glazier in York around 1500. The bequest he made to Robert Begge of "*all my books that is fitte for one prentesse of his craffte to lerne by*" is interesting. It is somewhat ambiguous whether these were specifically books necessary to the practice of the craft of glazing, perhaps a recipe book for paints or fluxes, or whether he was to have only the books deemed suitable for the general education of someone of his age and social standing. Either way, Preston expected his apprentices to learn from books and to be literate.

The evidence of wills and testaments of other glaziers from this period support the hypothesis that the glaziers had not suffered as much as some other trades from the economic slump and the market for this luxury craft had held up well. Swanson attributes this to the rise in the domestic demand for glass from the late fifteenth century onwards.⁹⁸ This new market, coupled with the geographical spread of their trading base would have contributed to their resilience. John Thornton himself is a good example of this entrepreneurial spirit. Born in Coventry, a city with a thriving community of glaziers from the thirteenth century onwards, he came to York (possibly as a result of the patronage of Richard Scrope, sometime bishop of Coventry and later archbishop of York) for the Great East Window commission and was able to undertake other commissions in the city as a result of becoming a freeman in 1410.⁹⁹ Despite his York business and property interests (he rented a property from the Dean and Chapter), he clearly retained a strong connection with Coventry, leasing a property there for a term of sixty years from 1413 and producing glass across the north and Midlands.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ It is clear from elsewhere in the will Begge was not the only apprentice, despite York gild regulations dated 1464 (see note 106).

⁹⁸ Swanson, *Building Craftsmen in Late Medieval York*, 31.

⁹⁹ Norton, 'Richard Scrope and York Minster', 150.

¹⁰⁰ Joan C. Lancaster, "John Thornton of Coventry, Glazier," *Birmingham Archaeological Society Transactions and Proceedings* 74 (1956), 56-58; Marks, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages*, 182.

York, the glazing capital of the north

From the fragmentary records of the glaziers we can glimpse something of the range of sites and geographical spread across which they operated. In John Petty's will of 1508 he left ten sheaves of Rhenish glass to St Mary's Abbey in York, where he had worked, but also one mark (13s 4d) to the Cistercian Furness Abbey in Cumbria because he had "*wroght mych wark thare*".¹⁰¹ A surviving fragment of glass from Furness [Figure 7] is thought to be Petty's work and depicts an angel executed in black line pigment and yellow stain. The Petty family worked across Cumbria and the north east, including in the city of Durham and surrounding area: John's older brother Robert worked at Durham cathedral priory and at Finchale, a small house under the control of Durham.¹⁰²

The role of York glaziers in Cumbria shows York operating as a significant regional centre for this luxury craft with workshops running several projects simultaneously. The work at Furness was undertaken alongside the Minster work, showing that even a large and regular contract like the Minster did not command the whole attention of the workshop. Whether this was on purely economic or wider business grounds, such as the need to compete for work with other glaziers like Preston (who also worked extensively in Cumbria), is unclear, but several York glaziers evidently enjoyed a high social status and operated commercially far beyond the city. As Swanson has shown glaziers continued to command the higher wages established in the boom years of 1350-1450 throughout this period.¹⁰³ The demand for their skills within 'the second city' made York a natural home for specialist craftsmen, and a centre for patrons from smaller centres across the north.

The emergence and role of the Guild of Glaziers

The importance of York as a northern hub for workshops is demonstrated by the formation of guild of glaziers to regulate the trade and monitor standards of those based within the city. Understanding the development of structured

¹⁰¹ *Testamenta Eboracensia: A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Vol. IV*, 333-335.

¹⁰² Jasmine Allen 'An excavated angel from Furness' <http://vidimus.org/issues/issue-31/panel-of-the-month/>.

¹⁰³ Swanson, *Building Craftsmen in Late Medieval York*, 31-32.

workshops and the development and delineation of specialist skills which this allowed is essential to understanding what happened to the craft in later centuries. The perception of late fourteenth and early fifteenth-century York is that of a city filled with craft guilds for every conceivable trade.¹⁰⁴ The role of guilds in regulating - and restricting - craft practice in both England and more widely in Europe has been widely discussed, most recently for glass and glaziers by Maitte with reference to Venice.¹⁰⁵ The earliest glaziers' guild in England was the company established in London in 1328. Despite what must have been a thriving trade, the earliest known glaziers' guild regulations in York only date from the late fourteenth century, with further regulation and restrictions, notably the restriction on employing apprentices, imposed in 1463-4.¹⁰⁶ Although some members of the guild can be deduced from freemen's rolls and will evidence, the earliest surviving registers for the glaziers' company do not begin until 1598 [Figure 8].¹⁰⁷ Marks has commented on the exceptionally restrictive nature of the 1463 regulations which hint at a small number of prestigious workshops anxious to maintain their reputation and market monopoly, possibly in the face of increasing competition for a shrinking, or less certain, client base.¹⁰⁸ It is likely these regulations were drawn up as a form of 'insurance' both to ensure quality and to prevent undercutting of price by alien craftsmen. The role of the guilds was not only about control and enforcement; there were also significant benefits to guild membership which included financial support in the case of illness, injury or death, the protection of apprentices and mutual craft support.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ Palliser, *Medieval York*, 208-9.

¹⁰⁵ Corine Maitte, "The Cities of Glass: Privileges and Innovations in Early Modern Europe," in *Innovation and Creativity in Late Medieval and Early Modern European Cities*, ed. Carolus Augustinus Davids and Bert De Munck (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

¹⁰⁶ The regulations prohibited the employment of a second apprentice before the first had completed at least four of the seven years. See Marks, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages*, 43.

¹⁰⁷ *York Guild of Glaziers and Plumbers Ordinance Book*. Sadly, the original register has been irreparably damaged by flooding in the archive store at the Corning Museum and (despite digitisation of the damaged manuscript) the microfilm copy is the most legible record extant. Given the very strict nature of the regulations, which would have required a close monitoring of members of the guild, it is very likely that there were earlier registers which are now lost.

¹⁰⁸ Marks, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages*, 42.

¹⁰⁹ For the wider role of guilds within medieval Yorkshire society, see Kermodé, *Medieval Merchants: York, Beverley, and Hull in the Later Middle Ages*.

As Kermode has observed, York had three large religious guilds and about ten smaller parish guilds, to which individual glaziers may have belonged.¹¹⁰ One of the largest was the prestigious Corpus Christi guild. This was established in 1408 and drew its membership predominantly from the social elite, or those who aspired to social prominence.¹¹¹ Membership of such a guild was part of the social armoury of late fifteenth-century life in York - what Kermode refers to as “the social cachet of belonging to an association which included many of the city’s ruling group”.¹¹² John Petty, who held numerous civic offices and became Lord Mayor in 1508, was a member of both his craft guild and the Corpus Christi guild.¹¹³ Petty’s membership reflected his social standing and would have given him access to some wealthy potential patrons.¹¹⁴ The wide canvas across which the workshops operated and the desire to maintain that monopoly in the north made intra-city regulation essential. As workshops could be undertaking work in abbeys, towns and cities across the north where local guild rules would be irrelevant, it was essential that the York glazing fraternity maintained the standards on which their reputation (and their prices) rested, controlled the craft and kept out interlopers. York served as a central base and undoubtedly the very successful Preston and Petty families would have used their prestigious York commissions as a showcase for their talents to win their contracts further afield.

Beyond the restrictive practices of a formal guild there was further bureaucratic regulation from the city itself. Whether the city instigated the formation of the craft guilds in order to exercise civic control is much disputed, but the city did require those operating within its walls as master craftsmen (i.e. those permitted to take on an apprentice) to be freemen.¹¹⁵ Goldberg suggests that guild ordinances surviving in civic records may reflect the concerns or

¹¹⁰ Kermode, *Medieval Merchants: York, Beverley, and Hull in the Later Middle Ages*

¹¹¹ *The Register of the Guild of Corpus Christi in the City of York*, ed. Robert H. Skaife, Surtees Society 57 (Durham: Andrews, 1872).

¹¹² Kermode, *Medieval Merchants: York, Beverley, and Hull in the Later Middle Ages*, 37.

¹¹³ David E. O'Connor, "John Petty, Glazier and Mayor of York: An Early Sixteenth-Century Memorial Window Formerly in the South Transept of York Minster," in *Glas Malerei Forschung: Internationale Studien Zu Ehren Von Rüdiger Becksmann*, ed. Ivo Rauch and Daniel Hess (Germany: Deutsche Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 2004), 37.

¹¹⁴ Frederick Harrison, *The Painted Glass of York* (London: SPCK, 1927), 16.

¹¹⁵ David M. Palliser, *Medieval York: 600-1540* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). For a discussion of the emergence of craft guilds in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries see Goldberg, *Medieval England: A Social History, 1250-1550*, 63-68.

priorities of the authorities as much as, or more than, the ordinary guild members.¹¹⁶ In the case of the glaziers, I would argue that the concerns were largely the same; quality control and the restriction of competition, this latter a factor which gained increasing importance in the post-Reformation period. In 1487 the city authorities fined one William Graenburgh 20s for operating as a glazier without being free and required him to take out the freedom to continue practising.¹¹⁷ Numerous glaziers, including those in the Petty workshop, appear in the register of freemen of the City of York, but the Minster was in its own jurisdiction, The Liberty of St Peter. This was legally and administratively quite separate from the city in every way and its rights jealously guarded. For those working exclusively in or for the Liberty, the freedom of the city was unnecessary: for example, John Thornton was contracted by the Minster in 1405 but was not made a freeman until 1410 when, presumably, he wished to seek work in the city itself.¹¹⁸ Thornton's work elsewhere had been sufficient advertisement of his credentials and it was the direct patronage of the Minster which brought him into the city. The role of the Minster as patron and regular employer was considerable and, along with houses like St. Mary's Abbey [Figures 9a&b], had provided a steady stream of work for York's glaziers. However, with the large glazing schemes complete and no evidence for any major remodelling of the Minster being planned, the economic landscape after 1500 looked rather different.

The archaeological excavation of a rubbish pit on the City Garage site in Blake Street in 1975 made the rare discovery of the possible location of a glazier's workshop operating around 1500.¹¹⁹ The identity of the glazier is not known, although several possible names occur in the rolls of York Freemen.¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ Goldberg, *Medieval England: A Social History, 1250-1550*, 64.

¹¹⁷ Swanson, *Building Craftsmen in Late Medieval York*, 23.

¹¹⁸ *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*, ed. Francis Collins. Surtees Society, 96 (Durham: Andrews, 1897), 115.

¹¹⁹ David O'Connor, "Debris from a medieval glazier's workshop" *Interim: the Bulletin of The York Archaeological Trust* (1977), 11-17.

¹²⁰ *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*, Surtees Society 96. Between pages 217-254 covering the period 1491-1534 twelve glaziers are listed either being admitted as freemen or as the fathers of those being admitted, such as William Hucheson, glazier son of William Hucheson (1508-9 p.233).

One of these is John Alman, who was admitted as freeman in 1540/41.¹²¹ The Blake Street workshop is in close proximity to both the Minster and to the hub of glazing activity around Stonegate, but appears to have been abandoned in the sixteenth century leaving only the cheaper white glass fragments as debris.¹²² The material cost of white glass was cheaper than coloured glass, but it was also required as the basis for painted schemes using silver stain and a restrained palette, and for a background to the highly-coloured heraldry which was also such a feature of this period.

The high proportion of cheaper white glass used in the Petty's scheme [Figures 10 & 11] for the lantern tower (armorials set in white glass) has been cited as evidence of the glaziers' craft being affected by the harsher economic climate.¹²³ However, the choice of scheme for this area of the Minster would have been governed in part by practicality. The lantern windows give light into the area of the crossing to the eastern side of which lay, in this period, the tomb of Saint William of York. Whilst the elaborate stone shrine with feretory lay further to the east still, behind the high altar, the site of William's original interment was still a significant place of veneration and one which was publicly accessible in ways which the main shrine normally was not. The need for light to fall into that dark, but liturgically potent, central axial space would have been a significant factor in the choice of glass for the lantern, so the use of white glass with limited coloured insertions cannot be taken in isolation as evidence for a decline in the value of the glazing market. As I have demonstrated, glaziers in York in the early sixteenth century were still enjoying a lucrative living from contracts secured across a wide geographical area and the Petty's workshop was the glazier of choice for the Dean and Chapter.

¹²¹Ibid, 261.

¹²² Salzmann calculated 6d per foot for coloured glass against 4d per foot for white. See Salzmann, *Building in England down to 1540*, 176-177.

¹²³ Ibid.

The structure and employment of the Petty workshop 1470-1528

The Petty family first appear as glaziers in York records in 1437 and continued to be major players in York until the death of Robert Petty in 1528.¹²⁴ In the early sixteenth century John Petty was succeeded by William, his eldest son, then by Robert, William's brother. The Pettys and their workmen, notably William Hutchinson, Robert Thorneburgh and Richard Awger were responsible for the glazing of the lantern in the 1470s and the re-glazing of the south front [Figure 12] in the early years of the sixteenth century.¹²⁵ The fabric rolls show they were employed in twos or threes on day rates on a sporadic basis and were not fully-employed throughout the year, so to sustain their households and workshops they would have had to be capable of securing work beyond the Minster's purview. As discussed above, within the city it was possible to secure such employment for the workshop through the freeman status of the master glazier alone. An analysis of the workmen connected with the Petty workshop demonstrates this: apart from the Pettys themselves, only William Hutchinson (alias Hucheson) is listed in the register of freemen, and then not until 1508.¹²⁶ Robert Thorneburgh does not appear at all, and although a Richard Awger does appear in the register for 1516, it is as an ironmonger.¹²⁷ Workshops would have required someone skilled in the use of iron to make nails, tie bars and saddle bars, as well as replacement tools such as grozing irons, so it possible it was the same man who had branched out into trading in iron goods.¹²⁸

Despite the retrospective perception that the Minster was now 'complete', the records show that the second decade was one of greater economic activity in the Minster, although the expenditure on both glazing and

¹²⁴ Knowles, *Essays in the History of the York School of Glass Painting*, 235.

¹²⁵ YMA E3/24-26: includes payments for copious quantities of glass as well as work done. The glazing of the lantern was paid for by the Dean and Chapter themselves, so a great deal of information is contained within the routine Fabric accounts.

¹²⁶ *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*, Surtees Society 96, 233. William's admission is *per patres* with his father's name also given as William. However, there are no earlier entries for a William Hucheson as glazier.

¹²⁷ *Ibid*, 239.

¹²⁸ According to Salzmann, the accounts for St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster, show grozing irons being purchased in considerable numbers as the building progressed, presumably as they became too blunt and could not be re-finished. Salzmann, "The Glazing of St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster, 1351-2", 14-17 and continued in vol. 2 no. 1 (1927), 38-41.

other crafts was still small compared to that of the major building programmes of the previous centuries. Robert Petty alone was paid for ten days work in 1516, but in 1518/19 he and William Reme were each paid 6d per day for four weeks work, and William Elliot for five weeks and two days on the glass, working six days a week.¹²⁹ According to calculations made by Blair and Ramsey this pattern of work and payment is most commonly associated with simple maintenance and minor schemes: for example, the glaziers at Eltham Palace were paid 6d per day in 1406 for making a window for the king's chamber and for routine repairs.¹³⁰ In this period, payments made to the Petty workshop totalled nearly £12.¹³¹ All named glaziers were paid 6d per day, and working relationships between the Pettys and other named glaziers are indicated by 'his man' before a name. This nomenclature is important in building up a picture of work on the glass and workshop structures, because it distinguishes between groups of workmen and those employed alone and is indicative of relative status within the workshop. Following the death in 1528 of Robert, the last glazier in the Petty family, the work in hand and, possibly, leadership of the workshop passed into other hands.

New glaziers, continuing practices after 1500

There is a gap in the records until 1525/6, when work began on the embellishment of St. William's feretory with new carving and gilding.¹³² The new glaziers were named as William Thomson (sometimes Thompson) and John Alman. They worked fourteen and thirteen weeks respectively at the 6d per day rate which had remained unchanged for more than a century. As is frequently the case, no location for this work was given, but it may be conjectured that at least some of it consisted of work to windows near the feretory to ensure that

¹²⁹ YMA E3/37. This very long roll includes repairs to the windows in Topcliffe church and chapel, as well as extensive ornamentation of the altars and provision of images.

¹³⁰ John Blair and Nigel Ramsey, *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, Products* (London: Hambledon Press, 1999), 291.

¹³¹ YMA E3/33-35: payments listed under 'Vitri'.

¹³² YMA E3/38.

the setting for the new work was in good order. Windows S8 and S9 [Figure 13], the third and fourth from the west in the south side of the quire clerestory both have tracery repairs dated 1794 (possibly part of the bill for £179 11s 3½ d presented that year by 'Elizabeth Clarke the Glazier), which indicates that the upper parts of the windows had failed in some way and may have required earlier interventions too.¹³³ It is also possible that the clear glass in N2 and N3, the clerestory windows nearest the east end and directly behind where the shrine stood, was the work of 1525/6.

Alman was listed an apprentice in 1527/8, but both he and Thompson were replaced in 1529/30 by John Dowthwait, *vitriatoris*, who was paid the considerably higher rate of 4s per week, and his apprentice John Dere at 2s per week. Given his regular employment at the Minster, Alman's absence from the glaziers' list in 1529-1531 is surprising, but his possible contribution to the St Michael le Belfrey project is discussed below. Dowthwait had purchased his freedom of the city as glazier in 1527, but John Dere was not a freeman. As Dobson has noted with reference to the fourteenth century, this has clear implications for how such records are used for the calculation of numbers engaged in the craft and indicates that both the workshop structures and the numbers of craftsmen was significantly higher than the rolls alone might suggest.¹³⁴ Dowthwait and Dere were paid for thirteen weeks and three days each, installing the "*ii cistes [boxes] glass Rennysh*" bought from Richard Tailys for 33s 4d¹³⁵. The purchase of this expensive, probably coloured, imported continental glass and the duration of their employment at a higher rate of pay than was normal for this period suggests they were engaged for a (possibly prestigious) project requiring specific skills. The quantity of glass purchased, estimated at ninety-six pieces each approximately a foot square, was more than

¹³³ The glass itself may have been supplied by William Peckitt in 1794. An entry in his commission book for 22nd September 1794 refers to the supply of 53 feet of 'Gray Ground Glass dappled at 4s pr foot', worth £10 12s. Trevor Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795" in *The Fifty-Fourth Volume of the Walpole Society, 1988* (London: The Walpole Society, 1991).

¹³⁴ Dobson, "Admissions to the Freedom of the City of York in the Later Middle Ages", 2.

¹³⁵ YMA E3/40.

would be required for simple patch repairs, but it is not possible in the glazing today to identify where this work might have been.¹³⁶

The special project work of 1529/30 had clearly ended when only two wisps of glass were bought in 1530/31 for 17d.¹³⁷ At this point Dowthwaite's wages were cut to the standard 3s per week, evidence that wages were dictated by the skill being employed, not the artisan per se. Their work in 1531/2 was supplemented by the reappearance of John Alman as the principal glazier, his son and apprentice (also named John Alman), and John Day.¹³⁸ This brought the total time spent on the glass close to the regular three months of the previous rolls, although rates of pay were lower. The payment of these craftsmen as a day-rate rather than a salary, the same method as if they were journeymen, shows them being employed for small pieces of maintenance and routine jobs, rather than major schemes. This is further evidence of the skill-level of the work being done, as there is no suggestion elsewhere within the rolls that the Minster was in financial difficulty.

This pattern of work and expenditure indicates a planned and extensive programme of routine repair and maintenance of which the glazing was a part. But the craft of glazing in York was not confined to simple preservation of existing glass, and the Minster authorities were still in the market for new and innovative glass. A major new Dean and Chapter-funded project was already underway: the rebuilding of the church of St Michael le Belfrey. The motivation for this project will be explored further in Chapter Three, but here the importance of this work lies in our understanding of the state of the craft in the 1530s. It was not a craft in decline, but one exploring new styles and new techniques.

¹³⁶ According to Salzman, *Buildings in England down to 1540*, a measurement of a chest or case typically contained sixteen 'bunches' each of three 'tables', a table being a piece of glass a foot square. Each 'table' weighed c.2½ lb and each case would contain 48 tables. The two chests noted here would therefore supply 96 tables, each worth about 4d, a figure commensurate with that paid for coloured glass for Lady Margaret Beaufort's manor at Croydon.

¹³⁷ A wisp was another term for a 'bunch', comprising three tables of glass.

¹³⁸ YMA E3/42.

The workshop of John Alman and the glazing of St Michael le Belfrey

The church of St Michael le Belfrey sits immediately outside the south front of the Minster. The responsibility for the upkeep of the church, particularly the chancel, was the Dean and Chapter's, but they had a lamentable track record in this regard.¹³⁹ By 1529 the church had deteriorated to such an extent that rebuilding was required. The patronage of this programme, and its possible motivation, are discussed in Chapter Three, but the result was a severe Perpendicular box which gave prominence to the windows. Harrison asserts that much of the glass from the earlier church was reset and incorporated into the new design, particularly in the east window, but the ongoing work on this church by Professor Lisa Reilly may cast new light on this.¹⁴⁰ Was this re-use a matter of financial prudence, a desire to maintain a link with the earlier building (particularly the earlier benefactions of the Latimer family), or an indication of a reduced ability to create stained and painted glass of comparable quality, thus making the preservation of the fourteenth-century glass more desirable? This cannot be answered with certainty; it was most likely a combination of all three.

In his article on the Thompson family of glaziers in 1921, Knowles wrote "There can be little doubt that William Thompson was the artist who executed the windows of St. Michael le Belfrey church", but the archival evidence strongly supports the case for them being the work of John Alman.¹⁴¹ As the Minster's principal glazier and very likely a product of (and possibly now head of) the former Petty workshop, Alman would have been best placed to undertake this prestigious project. The quality of painting and artistry in the 'new' glass has been the topic of some debate, being described by Knowles as 'coarse in character and brutal in execution', but rigorously defended by O'Connor and Haselock as showing "the glass-painters of the time to have been still open to

¹³⁹ O. M. Saunders, "Minster and Parish: The Sixteenth Century Reconstruction of the Church of St. Michael-Le-Belfrey in York," (York, MA dissertation, 1996), 10-11.

¹⁴⁰ Harrison, *The Painted Glass of York*, 144.

¹⁴¹ John A. Knowles, "Glass Painters of York viii: The Thompson Family," *Notes and Queries* 12, no. S IX (1921), 163-165. For a discussion of the arguments put forward by Milner-White and Gibson see Saunders, 45-46.

new styles and techniques and to have been competent practitioners of their art".¹⁴² The polarity of these two views may be accounted for, to some extent, by the considerable difference in style between the Belfrey glass and the style associated with the York School of the previous century, and much admired by Knowles. In the Belfrey glass, the figure of St. George (St Michael-le-Belfrey s5, 3a and 4a) is an example of this employment not only of new techniques [Figure 14], but also of work in style different from that of the London glaziers. Comparisons may be drawn with the figures as geographically far apart as those in the windows of the church at St Neots and the domestic glazing of Brereton Hall, Cheshire [Figure 15].¹⁴³ This suggests a much wider influence than simply the trends of London and the royal court; York glaziers were in contact with new ideas, perhaps even Continental craftsmen, and were developing their own version of the latest styles.¹⁴⁴ It seems unlikely that the Dean and Chapter would have gone very far afield to find their glazier for this new work. If John Alman was trusted to work on the Minster's windows, he would surely have been heavily involved in a scheme that was entirely the Dean and Chapter's responsibility and, except for the aisle windows donated by named clergy and laity, being completed largely at their own expense.¹⁴⁵

Although the number of glaziers whose sons were admitted by patrimony to freedom as glaziers was apparently declining, workshops and masters such as Alman continued to generate sufficient work to employ apprentices.¹⁴⁶ This demonstrates that there was a continuing and significant enough demand for glass to support the maintenance of formal workshop structures, and the craft itself was still viewed by some as a career worthy of investment. John Alman continued to be listed with various apprentices (some of whom were his sons, but he periodically employed others) in the few surviving rolls that cover the period to 1550, although the time spent on glazing for the Dean and Chapter gradually declined, particularly once the St. Michael le Belfrey project was

¹⁴² O'Connor and Haselock, "The Stained and Painted Glass", 385 and note 302.

¹⁴³ Hebgin-Barnes, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Cheshire*.

¹⁴⁴ Marks, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages*, 208-228.

¹⁴⁵ See Chapter Three for a discussion of this.

¹⁴⁶ *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*, Surtees Society 96.

complete. As far as can be ascertained from the very patchy survival of the records, the purchase of one cradle of Normandy glass for 16s and one chest of wisps of glass for 20s in 1537/8, together with the employment of two extra glaziers, Ambrosius Dowwith and an apprentice Thomas Benyson, marked the end of this relatively expansive period.¹⁴⁷ Dowwith was almost certainly the same man as the Ambrosius Dunwich, glazier, made free in 1517.¹⁴⁸ He was probably also the Ambrose Dunwith listed as a workman in the Thompson workshop and mentioned in the will of William Thompson in 1539.¹⁴⁹ As discussed above, William Thompson and John Alman were products of the Petty workshop, although it appears Thompson had branched out and formed his own firm, whereas Alman had taken on the Petty mantle.

The two surviving rolls from the 1540s show a marked decline in work undertaken, a decline which coincided with the appointment of Nicholas Wotton as dean in 1544.¹⁵⁰ Wotton's role in the patronage of the glass is discussed in Chapter Three, but with the completion of the St. Michael-le-Belfrey project and the expenditure of the preceding decade, work on the Minster reverted to the most basic maintenance paid for through the fabric fund. Ironically, the Minster glazing was complete and in good order at exactly the time that the use of figurative imagery in churches was being called into question. With such scant evidence for the 1540s, it would be making too much of too little to say that this is evidence of the impact of the Reformation, an event for which records are largely missing: windows would still require maintenance even if new commissions tailed off. As Aston, most recently, has discussed, stained glass was not a primary target for reformers even after the 1547 injunctions (the first to mention glass) regarding the removal of 'superstitious' images and despite earlier ambitious plans.¹⁵¹ The necessity of maintaining a weatherproof building envelope and the prohibitive cost of wholesale replacement for even small

¹⁴⁷ YMA E3/44.

¹⁴⁸ For Ambrose Dunwich's freedom see *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*, Surtees Society 96, 240.

¹⁴⁹ The will of William Thompson is discussed in Knowles, "Glass Painters of York viii: The Thompson Family", 164.

¹⁵⁰ YMA E3/45&46. Laurence Spenser appears alongside John Alman here, and again in 1550.

¹⁵¹ Aston, *Broken Idols of the English Reformation*, 620-626.

churches meant the zealous fervour of reform, where it existed, had to be tempered with practicality. For the Minster, a review of the activities of the first half of the sixteenth century is more profitable. Knowledge of subsequent events give the illusion that this period was the final phase in the Minster's creation, albeit with the realisation that by 1550 most of the glazing was already between one and four centuries old and the product of a rolling programme of work. At the time, it probably seemed to be simply part of a continuum, the natural rise and fall in the rhythms of maintenance and embellishment, with changes in style, leadership and fortunes dictating the extent and nature of any work undertaken.

The great embellishments of the first quarter of the century were not matched in the second, when the focus and funds had swung to the essential St. Michael-le-Belfrey work. The apparent decline in expenditure on glazing in the 1540s is based on only two rolls, but the roll of 1549/50 (the first in English) also shows only twenty-eight days spent by John Alman and Lawrence Spencer.¹⁵² Despite the growing inflation of the later Henrician years, the rate paid was still 6d per day.¹⁵³ The two surviving rolls from the 1557/8 and 1558/9 record no payments for glass work, although much had been going on elsewhere on the fabric to accommodate the Marian restoration of the high altar and its accoutrements. The gap in documentation until 1568/9 means the impact of the first decade of Elizabeth's reign is unknown, but at this point John Alman disappeared from the record (he would have been in his late sixties) and Robert Thompson, grandson of William (Alman's former colleague), assumed responsibility for the glass.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵² YMA E3/47.

¹⁵³ Keith Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain, 1470-1750* (London: Penguin, 2002), 116.

¹⁵⁴ Knowles, "Glass Painters of York viii: The Thompson Family", 163-4.

The workshop of the Thompson family 1568-1620

The nature of the work

The evidence of the fabric rolls from 1568 onward clearly demonstrates that the art and craft of producing new work in glass in York had not only survived the Dissolution and Reformation, but was employing new techniques. The Thompson family, who were first recorded as glaziers in York in 1492, brought a broad range of specialist skills to the Minster glazing work.¹⁵⁵ Robert Thompson was paid 4s 9d @ 6d the pane, the same rate as a century earlier, for “*amending windows in the church*”, but was also paid the higher rate of 8d for a day’s work spent “*in stayninge certayne paynes of glasse*”.¹⁵⁶ This proves Thompson had the facilities and skills to work on glass beyond the mechanical cutting of pieces to size and the fixing with lead. This reference to ‘stayninge’ indicates the introduction of a relatively new technology, the application of coloured enamels to white glass to produce brilliantly coloured jewel-like effects. This palette was significantly different from the restrained tones of the later fifteenth-century, with its use of white glass and silver-stain, and was necessary for the accurate reproduction of heraldry in glass. Looking back to the work necessary to produce the glass for the St. Michael le Belfrey scheme, this suggests that the presence and transference of these new skills within the glazing community in York was continuous and that the craftsmen training apprentices maintained their ability to produce new work and employ new techniques.

It is clear, however, that these new techniques were still being applied to imported glass: there is no evidence that Thompson or any of his workshop were manufacturing glass. New, good quality glass was purchased, no doubt some for Thompson’s ‘stayninge’: 15s were paid “*to a Ducheman for xx wispes of Hasses glass @ 9d the wispe*” (more accurately ‘Deutschman’, being for glass from Germany), but for items and an amount now lost.¹⁵⁷ It was not all high-end work, however: Robert Atkinson, an employee of Thompson’s, was paid for “*xxii dayes*

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ YMA E3/50.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

work bestowed aboute the Repairinge of the decayed places of the glasse windowes after 8d the day 14s 8d".¹⁵⁸ Robert Thompson "*and his man*" continued with unspecified routine repairs in the early 1570s, but in 1575/6 there is more detail as to the location and nature of this work.¹⁵⁹ Robert Thompson and his two men were paid 8d and 6d per day respectively for forty-three days specifically on windows in the aisles and in the lantern, and for a further four days "*on other glasse windows of the Minster*", as well as 4d for bread and ale. The phrase "*other glasse windows*" in Thompson's entry seems tautologous: what other kind of windows would there be? The repetition of the phrase later in the same roll could be to distinguish glass work on windows from that of the other crafts such as masons or plumbers, but the later reference in Samuel Gale's work to there being windows with timber shuttering or louvres next to the lantern may be an indication that not all the windows did contain glass and it was necessary to be precise.¹⁶⁰ The same specificity appeared in the work of the plumbers and smiths making items specifically for "*the glass windows of the church*". This suggests that Thompson's forty-three days' work was largely composed of repairs using new glass, probably the ten wisps of Esse glass listed in the small expenses, for which Master Micklethwaite was paid 10s.

As the decade progressed, the work became much more extensive and ambitious: for example Robert and his man were paid for fifty-one day's work @10d the day on "*glazing and colouring the glass windowes of the cross aisle on the north side*" (presumably some of the windows in the north transept, possibly even the Five Sisters (n16)).¹⁶¹ They were also paid for: sixteen days' work on the "*north glass windows in the body of the church*" (i.e. the nave); seven and a half days on the Great East Window, with a further five days on that and the '*tomborode*' (the etymology of this word is unclear, but perhaps meaning the clerestory windows near the site of the former shrine of St William and the Great Rood, ie. tomb + rood?) on the north side of the quire; three days on the south nave aisle windows, and eleven and ten days respectively "*on the glass windows*

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ YMA E3/51-54.

¹⁶⁰ YMA AddMss 43: Samuel Gale, "Brief History of York Cathedral," (1700).

¹⁶¹ YMA E3/55.

over the south door of York Minster". In the same account, four wisps of "Burgoine glass" were bought from Mr. Beckwith @ 23d per wisp and six wisps of coloured glass from Mr. Harbecl @ 3s 4d per wisp, but there was also a payment of 5d to William Rawneson "for old silver for the glazier to gylt with", 2d spent on candles "at the ylinge [annealing or fixing of the painted layer in a kiln] of the glass", 2d on gum [for use in glass paint] "and callyber tayles" [presumably callipers?] for the glazier. All these entries are evidence for a workshop painting and staining glass, as well as cutting coloured glass, an unbroken inheritance of glazing skills in York.

Identifying the location and purpose of their work

The content of the fabric accounts, as discussed in Chapter One, means the tracking of the location or more detailed nature of craft activity is sporadic at best. References to specific locations are few and sometimes obscure. It is especially valuable then when such references do occur, even if their fragmentary nature means they require some speculative reconstruction. If the small amounts of time on a variety of windows represented routine repairs, this leaves two larger amounts of work: first, on the windows over the south door, and second, on the "cross aisle on the north side thereof".

The present windows over the south door are, of course, dominated by the figurative panels by William Peckitt inserted in 1796 (for which see Chapter Three) and presumably some or all of Robert Thompson's work was lost when this work was done. Of the figures known to have been in these windows, it is unlikely that such work would have been expended upon a figure of the Virgin and Child, or the figure of God, but the window in the west aisle of the south transept (s25) also contained figurative and heraldic memorial glass to Archbishop Thomas Rotherham.¹⁶² It is not possible to say with any degree of

¹⁶² Francis Drake, *Eboracum: Or the History and Antiquities of the City of York, from Its Original to the Present Times. Together with the History of the Cathedral Church, and the Lives of the Archbishops of That See, from the First Introduction of Christianity into the Northern Parts of This Island, to the Present State and Condition of That Magnificent Fabrick. Collected from Authentick Manuscripts, Publick Records, Ancient Chronicles, and Modern Historians. And Illustrated with Copper Plates. In Two Books.* By Francis Drake, of the City of York, Gent. F. R. S. And Member of the Society of Antiquaries in London (London: printed by William Bowyer for the author), 529.

certainty which pieces from this list may have been repaired or replaced by Thompson, although the interest in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in preserving and recording heraldry would make some work to the arms of Archbishop Rotherham with their gold and silver details a likely contender in this area of the Minster.¹⁶³ Much of the heraldic glass recorded by the seventeenth-century York antiquarian James Torre, whose work is discussed in Chapter Four, was late-medieval 'donor-recognition', but the Rotherham glass may have had different origins (see Chapter Three) and a somewhat different purpose as a result.¹⁶⁴ The maintenance of this glass in good order spoke to the continuity of authority of both the archbishops in its commemoration and the deans. The "*cross aisle on the north side thereof*" would be the windows in the north transept, including the chapels to east and west. This area was dominated by the business of the diocese, although the chapels would still have functioned. None of these retain any clear evidence of Thompson's work, although the white glass is difficult to date without chemical analysis.

The work of Robert Thompson and his workshop went far beyond the simple weatherproofing repairs of necessity, extending into working new glass in new techniques and continuing to supply painted glass for several locations around the Minster. These included the very public area of the nave as well as areas with more restricted access or usage such as the quire and the north transept. It is also clear that his work included large projects, such as the work on the St Cuthbert window (s7), which is discussed below. The role of the Dean and Chapter as the principal patrons of the glass work undertaken in this period is discussed in Chapter Three. General minor repairs by Thompson and his men in 1579 to the "*low glass windows in the aisles about the Minster*" are what one might expect, but the rolls for 1580-82 show there was a planned programme of work which was paying considerable attention to the maintenance and security

¹⁶³ William Camden, *Remaines, concerning Britaine: but especially England, and the inhabitants thereof. Their languages. Names. Surnames. Allusions. Anagrammes. Armories. Monies. Empresses. Apparell. Artillarie. Wise speeches. Proverbs. Poesies. Epitaphes. Reviewed, corrected, and increased* (London, 1614); Sir John Baker, "Tudor pedigree Rolls and Their Uses" in *Heralds and Heraldry in Shakespeare's England*, ed. Nigel Ramsay (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2014).

¹⁶⁴ Torre's manuscript containing his detailed recording the Minster glass is at YMA L1/7.

of the glass and included the undertaking of a series of major interventions into some of the largest and most prestigious of the medieval windows.¹⁶⁵

Restoring the great windows of the eastern arm

In 1580/1-1581/2 Robert Thompson and his man undertook the big project of re-leading and repairing some of the large windows in the eastern arm.¹⁶⁶ They were paid for “163 dayes work on the great lantern windows over the revestry in taking some of the glass down and in setting the same again in new lead @ 10d the day ... 135s 10d”. The revestry, at this date identifiable with the Zouche chapel, identifies the windows in question as those in the quire transept consisting of S6, S7 and s7 (the St Cuthbert window) [Figure 5]. Canon Harrison referred to the internal evidence for restoration/repair in the glass of the St. Cuthbert window, but put the earliest work at 1721.¹⁶⁷ He attributed the loss of order of the panels to Fowlers’ theory (disputed by Knowles and now known to be fallacious) that panels had been removed on the orders of General Fairfax, but it is possible that some rearrangement occurred as early as this re-leading. If, as seems to be the case, this was the first time this window had been re-leaded substantially since its insertion in the mid-fifteenth century, this may be the first point at which interventions resulted in the disruption to the order of the panels of the saint’s life.¹⁶⁸

There are five panels now known to be missing from the narrative depiction of St Cuthbert’s life within this window, for which alien panels have been substituted.¹⁶⁹ If these five panels were heavily repaired or replaced in this campaign, it raises the question of what had happened to them, or what they contained, to necessitate such an intervention. The window is not an easy target for stone throwing iconoclasts (who in any case would have had many other

¹⁶⁵ YMA E3/56 Thompson had a man, who was ‘*at the same work*’, and a labourer.

¹⁶⁶ YMA E3/57.

¹⁶⁷ Harrison *Painted Glass* p.110 refers to “words scratched on with a diamond: ‘This window was repaired 1721. Stonework and glass. Do. again repaired 1775, and again 1830’. To this list of three restorations may be added a fourth in the years 1887 and 1888”.

¹⁶⁸ This window is currently the subject of a doctoral thesis by Katie Harrison (University of York), whose work may shed new light on this.

¹⁶⁹ As mentioned above, s7 is currently (2018) the subject of doctoral research by Katie Harrison, so more on this question may come to light.

more controversial and accessible targets elsewhere in the glass) and, as Canon Harrison noted, the lower panels were undamaged. These lower panels depict the bishops and royal personages, and so were less likely to be attacked, if deliberate iconoclastic damage was the intent. It is stretching the bounds of credibility to suggest that level of precision at such a height. The presence of houses and other secular buildings against the south wall of the Minster may account for some damage, but as the original location of the lost panels is currently unknown, it cannot be attributed directly to a single cause with any confidence. If replacement or intervention was necessitated by the imagery they contained, it would be remarkable that, as I argue below, they appear to have been replaced with scenes from the Life of St Thomas Becket intentionally removed for this purpose from the windows of St Michael le Belfrey. If so, the window was not clumsily repaired with any glass which came to hand, nor with clear glass, but was sensitively restored with figurative panels whose colour palette and general arrangement helped them to blend into the overall aesthetic of the window.

Over the next two years, Thompson and his man were also paid for "*setting a pane of glass in new lead in the Great East Window and in mending other panes in the same window*", for which half a chest of Esse glass containing thirty wisps was bought at cost of 31s.¹⁷⁰ This is Thornton's monumental masterpiece and it must have been a daunting task for Thompson to intervene in such a window. Sadly, no traces of Thompson's repairs were identified in the restoration of this window completed in 2017 by the York Glaziers' Trust, so it is not possible to say which panel he re-leaded or which pieces he repaired.¹⁷¹ However, the work to the windows of the eastern arm continued apace. In 1582/3, a total of £8 15s 3d (£2 7d more than the cost of the work on the St Cuthbert window) was expended on work on the glass and Thompson's rates were going up.¹⁷² He undertook a total of seventy-eight days' work @10d per day on "*a great glass window at the East End of the Quire in the end of the south*

¹⁷⁰ YMA E3/59.

¹⁷¹ This intervention is not discussed in the history of the window in Sarah Brown, *Apocalypse: The Great East Window of York Minster* (London: Third Millennium Publishing, 2014).

¹⁷² YMA E3/58.

aisle there", the higher rate suggesting this was skilled work, possibly painting. This is s2, the late fourteenth-century St. John window [Figure 16], and seventy-eight days is a significant amount of work. The window is largely original glass, but has insertions dated to the seventeenth century in the tracery (an insertion by Henry Gyles of the arms of Holloway [Figure 17]), and nineteenth-century work in the tracery and base of the central light. If Thompson were working with enamel glass and doing more than re-leading, it is possible that the nineteenth-century repairs were necessitated by a failure after two hundred years of that enamel glass.

An amount now lost was also paid to Robert Thompson for "*certaine botchinge glasse*", the first time that this term 'botchinge' appeared: hitherto glass was either just 'glass', 'newe glass' or 'olde glass'.¹⁷³ Derived from a Middle English term *bocchen*, which simply meant 'to patch', the negative connotations the word has today did not (according to the OED) enter popular usage until about 1600. While it is tempting to see in this novel appearance of the term a nod towards that later meaning, it is also possible that Robert Thompson, conscious of his reputation for new glass work, felt it necessary to specify that it was simply glass for basic patching which was being supplied, not his better-quality work. It may be that Thompson himself used the term in a somewhat derogatory way to register his disdain for what was being asked of him. For the first time, he was listed as 'plumber glazier', indicating either that it was now necessary (or desirable) for the lead work around the Minster to be done by those who hitherto had confined their leading skills to the windows, or that the bulk of the window work was in fact lead work to maintain the integrity of the net, and not work on the glass itself. As turves and charcoal were bought "*for the plumber glazier*", but no glass other than the 'botchinge' glass was bought, it may be assumed that much of the work recorded in this roll was indeed re-leading, but not perhaps as extensive or drastic as the previous work on the St. Cuthbert window.

¹⁷³ YMA E3/59.

All this might be interpreted as a sign of a sudden reduction in the status of the craft, even the start of a decline with Thompson having to take on wider responsibilities to maintain his role, especially as this pattern of work continued the next year with only two months' leadwork on the "*great glass window at the East End of the quire*".¹⁷⁴ But in fact the Thompson workshop had another major project to undertake for the Dean and Chapter on the glazing of the church of St Michael le Belfrey, for which they (as a workshop) had probably been responsible only fifty years previously.

The modernisation of St Michael le Belfrey

The whole workshop, which comprised at least Robert Thompson, John Buckbarowe (listed as 'his man' in the preceding account) and possibly an apprentice as well, was occupied in 1587/8 on "*makinge and mending the windows in St. Michael le Belfrey*", for which they received an interim payment of £4 13s 4d "*towards the £13 6s 8d*" that they were apparently due that year for that work.¹⁷⁵ This was an enormous sum, representing 320 days of work if the rate remained at 10d per day and was solely for work done. However, although iron bars were made and mended and solder was bought, no glass purchases were listed. The cost of the glass must have therefore been accounted for elsewhere, probably through a contract which included Thompson providing the glass in the price. This would explain the phraseology used, "*towards the £13 6s 8d*", which otherwise sits oddly in the usual pattern of payments. Given that the church of St. Michael le Belfrey had been completely rebuilt only some fifty or so years before, work of such magnitude is unlikely to have been repair-driven: the sums involved indicate a substantial piece of work, possibly one or more complete windows.

In an article on the St Michael-le-Belfrey glass in 2014, Rachel Koopmans suggested that this entry dated the removal of the St Thomas glass from the two

¹⁷⁴ YMA E3/58.

¹⁷⁵ YMA E3/61.

windows overlooking the quire of St Thomas in the Belfrey church.¹⁷⁶ She concluded that the panels from these windows depicting less controversial events in the saint's life, such as baptism and marriage [Figure 18], were left in situ (minus their problematic inscriptions) as such anonymised scenes were still suitable for a conservative parish church, whilst the most inflammatory scenes of his martyrdom and subsequent sanctity were removed and (in some cases) destroyed. Thompson's work would therefore have consisted of bringing the windows into line with accepted post-Reformation iconography. But the surviving removed panels included those which were inserted into s7.

The chronology of these two events, the insertion into s7 and the re-glazing of the Belfrey windows is problematic: if the windows of St Michael-le-Belfrey were, as Koopmans contends, simply removed as part of a wider refurbishment and refitting of the church in accordance with Protestant requirements as recorded in the churchwardens' accounts and which included a new font and pulpit all paid for by the Dean and Chapter, their re-use in the Minster would necessarily post-date this process.¹⁷⁷ As it is, some of the panels appear to have been inserted into the St Cuthbert window some six years earlier, requiring them to have been removed from the church well ahead of the commencement of the refurbishment. As the fabric records are incomplete it cannot be conclusively ruled out that the 1580/81 work related to other glass which was subsequently replaced again with this Becket glass sometime between 1586 and the 1680s, but it is highly improbable.¹⁷⁸ The 1580/81 work was almost certainly the point at which the Becket glass was inserted into s7, but this leaves a six-year gap before the Belfrey work to be accounted for and raises the important question of why would this be the sequence of events?

One explanation is that the two Thomas windows were indeed removed in "*a single and deliberate campaign of removal and retention*" as Koopmans asserts, but in 1580/81, when Thompson was working on the St Cuthbert window, not 1586/87. The panels deemed most suited to the parish church were

¹⁷⁶ Rachel Koopmans, "Early Sixteenth-Century Stained Glass at St. Michael-Le-Belfrey and the Commemoration of Thomas Becket in Late Medieval York," *Speculum* 89, no. 4 (2014), 1057.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid*, 1058.

¹⁷⁸ The *terminus ante quem* of the 1680s refers to the recording work of James Torre.

subsequently returned in 1586/7 as part of a sanitised scheme which retained such elements of the glass beloved of the parishioners as could be used without causing comment, whilst the remainder had already been incorporated into skilful repairs to the Minster windows or destroyed. The pressure for their removal could have been parish-led, but with no plan in place for replacements. This also seems unlikely: Koopman's evidence is that the parishioners remained conservative and it would have been an extraordinary act of brinkmanship for them to succeed in their demand for the removal of glass (thus compromising the weather-proofing of the building) without having replacement glass in hand. An alternative scenario is that the Dean and Chapter went seeking suitable glass for repairs to one of their great windows, amongst those most visible from the city approach, and found it in the church for which they were responsible. Their long track record of neglect prior to the refurbishment and remodelling of the 1520s and 1530s, vividly described by Koopmans and others, would suggest they would have little compunction in considering the Belfrey church as a resource they could plunder for suitable materials.

The window repair campaign undertaken by Robert Thompson in the eastern arm of the Minster and detailed in the Minster's accounts in 1580/81 was one of the most ambitious since the completion of the glazing and would have been afforded a far higher priority by the Dean and Chapter than the concerns of the parish church. The job of acquiring suitable glass for the repairs would have fallen to Robert Thompson as master glazier and what better source to use than glass painted by the workshop in which he had probably trained? It may be that this uncharacteristically generous agreement reached in 1586 between the Chapter and the parishioners to refurbish the whole of St Michael-le-Belfrey church was in fact an act of restitution to the parish for this removal of their windows some six years earlier. It is hard to imagine otherwise why there would be the considerable gap between the two events if the motivation for removal was primarily to replace the Thomas Becket scenes with more acceptable glass, or as part of a general refurbishment. If the contention that the glass was removed explicitly for use by the Minster is accepted, it would suggest that the Minster was continuing to take the visual integrity and aesthetic

standards of its glass very seriously, sufficiently so to seek out figurative glass of a suitable quality to replace damaged panels in one of its major windows. This argues convincingly against traditional tropes of Reformation iconoclasm, the complete destruction of figurative glass and a drastic decline in glazing and glass painting, and argues instead for a reflexive, agile craft able to adjust to new demands from a smaller but no less demanding range of patrons. A project of this scale could not be undertaken by one man operating alone, nor by someone unskilled and capable only of 'botching', but instead required an organised and trained workshop of skilled craftsmen.

The structure and operation of the Thompson workshop

The evidence for the structure of Thompson's workshop may be extracted by close study of the phrasing within the fabric rolls. In 1582/3, John Buckbarowe, for example, was described as Thompson's 'man' and paid 8d per day against Thompson's 10d, his 20% lower rate of pay indicating he was junior to Thompson, but skilled.¹⁷⁹ Further evidence for the internal structure of the workshop appears later in the same roll; Thompson was paid for working for eighteen and a half days "*on the greate O under the new bell*" (a reference to s16 the rose window), with an apprentice for one day.¹⁸⁰ This was the first instance of the term 'apprentice' being used: hitherto the terms used had been 'his man', presumably indicating someone of journeyman status, or 'labourer', for someone without any craft skills. The apprentice was paid 6d for the day and the use of the distinct terms 'apprentice' and 'his man' in this roll indicate at least two levels of a workshop hierarchy below that of the freeman master. However, the amount of time paid for by the Minster in that year (a total of 240 days) self-evidently could not have sustained a workforce of this scale, or provided sufficient financial security to train an apprentice. The Thompson workshop must have had other work, probably a mixture of domestic and parish work.

¹⁷⁹ YMA E3/59.

¹⁸⁰ The term 'rose window' is a relatively modern one within the Minster. Here it is simply 'the great O', whereas Torre refers to it as 'the Marygold window'. The term 'rose window' emerges generally in the late eighteenth century, but does not appear in Minster publications until the early twentieth century.

Further clues as to the structure of the Thompson workshop are contained in the roll for 1584/5.¹⁸¹ Although the amount of work undertaken was considerably less than in previous years, Robert Thompson's 'man' was now identified as Roger Thompson, Robert's brother. Together they undertook a minor amount of on "*mending the low glass windows in the North and South aisles in the body of the Minster*", a continuation of the existing programme of minor repairs and re-leading. The disappearance from the rolls of John Buckbarowe and his replacement with Roger Thompson (who may have been the apprentice listed previously, now made journeyman) suggests a contraction in the Thompson workforce on site in response to reduced demand. Despite his disappearance from the Minster records, John Buckbarowe continued to be a glazier, purchasing his freedom as such in 1594-5.¹⁸² This suggests the reduction in Minster work was a localised downturn and there was sufficient other work to support Buckbarowe's work elsewhere for twenty years under the 'umbrella' of the Thompson workshop. No plumbing was separately listed, but lead was bought for "*the plumber glaziers*" as well as "*four loads of ellerwood*" for the casting of lead by Thompson, a continuation of the trend towards combining related skills to broaden the economic base of the workshop.¹⁸³ The flexible and responsive nature of the workshop was made clear two years later as the roll of 1587/8 shows payments to both Robert and Roger Thompson, each of whom had apprentices working under them, one of whom may have been George, Roger's son, but the identity of the other is unknown.¹⁸⁴ Thus the workshop at this date certainly consisted of at least four people, possibly five if John Buckbarowe continued to be connected with them. Roger had purchased his freedom in 1579 and he continued the family business with his son, George, being made free by patrimony as a glazier in 1613.¹⁸⁵ Despite the apparently flourishing nature of the business, Robert's son (also Robert) did not follow his

¹⁸¹ YMA E3/60.

¹⁸² *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*, Surtees Society 102, 236.

¹⁸³ A relic of Old Norse is preserved in the name for alder wood, the bark of which is naturally high in tannin. It was used in the production of white lead for pigments, but also (as here) to encourage the purity of the lead in casting.

¹⁸⁴ YMA E3/61.

¹⁸⁵ *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*. Surtees Society 102, 62.

father into the craft, choosing instead to obtain his freedom by patrimony in 1598 as a 'tapitour', a maker of coverlets, carpets and tapestries.¹⁸⁶ In addition to the modest amount of time spent in "*mending the glass in diverse windows about the church*", in 1587/8 Robert Thompson was additionally paid a yearly fee of 20s; this is the first time that a glazier is named and retained on an annual fee basis, separate from the daily rate paid for specific work. It was also a return to the separation of glazing work from plumbing.¹⁸⁷

The patchy survival of the rolls and scant recording of detail make close identification of the work programme problematic, but the roll of 1611/12 is reasonably specific about the work that Robert Thompson, his man and his apprentice were doing.¹⁸⁸ It seems unlikely that Robert's 'man' was still Roger: although he had been listed as such in 1584/5, despite being a freeman since 1579, his later appearance in 1587 with an apprentice of his own suggests he had increased his status within the workshop and perhaps was undertaking work elsewhere. Robert and his man undertook small amounts of maintenance "*on the long slittes in the Minster*" (the Five Sisters window, [Figure 19]) and "*on the windows of the Chapter House and other places*" for which they were paid in addition to Robert's 20s annual fee. Presumably Robert did a certain amount of work within his fee, and these payments were for additional days or activities which could not be covered by that. It is in this roll that the enigmatic "Dr. Bankes" made his sole appearance. He was appointed to be "*glazier and plumber and other workmen (sic)*" and was paid 8s, but no more is said of him. He does not appear in the guild register and there are no further mentions of him in the accounts. The possibility that this was a specialist craftsman from the Office of the King's Works has been explored; a Master Matthew Banckes was employed there in this period.¹⁸⁹ However, he was employed principally as a carpenter, so it is unlikely that it is the same man, unless the 'other workmen' is indicative of his competence or oversight of a broader range of trades. Robert

¹⁸⁶ Ibid, 43.

¹⁸⁷ YMA E3/61.

¹⁸⁸ YMA E3/62/2.

¹⁸⁹ Howard Colvin, *The History of King's Works* (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1963), 133.

Thompson died in 1620, so were the Dean and Chapter already exploring handing the regular maintenance contract to someone else?

The gap in the series from 1611 until 1623 means the precise date for Robert Thompson leaving the Minster's employ cannot be fixed, but the Thompsons were not the last family-led firm of glaziers to work on the Minster. The roll of 1623 is the first to mention the Crosbys, another family with a considerable range of skills.¹⁹⁰ Three generations of the Crosby family were involved in the care of the glazing across the next seventy years and the records of their employment include the rare survival of a group of vouchers which provide considerable insight into the working and accounting practices of this period. It is very rare to find such detail about a single firm across such a duration in this period, and the opportunity to study such an unusual survival makes a unique contribution to our understanding of the craft. The surviving documentation provides the elusive background detail behind the summary accounts, casting light not only into how such a workshop operated, but how the transfer and continuity of skills from apprentice to master worked in practice. These records show the transition from one dominant family to another, but I argue below that the underlying workshop structure supporting them remained the same.

The role of the Guild of Glaziers in workshop structures

The economy of the craft 'landscape' in which Robert Thompson and his workshop were operating was very different from that of his medieval predecessors. The dominance of the religious houses in the glass and decorative arts market had been swept away and been replaced with a more diverse economy of domestic glazing and ornamentation. But this was not, as has been supposed by previous scholars, entirely centred on London.¹⁹¹ This is demonstrated by the 1598 statutes of the York Guild of Glaziers. These give a

¹⁹⁰ YMA E3/62/3.

¹⁹¹ Ayres *Art, Artisans and Apprentices*; Geoffrey Lane, "A world turned upside down: London glass-painters 1600-1660" *Journal of Stained Glass* 29 (London: British Society of Master Glass Painters, 2005), 454-75; "Adding 'Beauty to Light': London glass-painters 1660-1710" in *Journal of Stained Glass* 34 (London: British Society of Master Glass-painters, 2009), 50-61.

vivid picture of a craft which felt the need to protect its reputation for quality and maintain its monopoly on the supply of available work.¹⁹² The requirement to be a freeman before being allowed to set up a workshop was of long standing, but the new ordinances '*added unto the same*' increased the restrictions on 'outsiders'. No-one was to draw lead for a '*forrener*'.¹⁹³ The 1s fee due to the guild upon the indenture of the sons of freemen was to be waived if the master was poor, but if he took on a 'stranger' the fee was more than double at 2s 6d, irrespective of his ability to pay.¹⁹⁴ This suggests a craft under some pressure, requiring a 'closed shop', thereby restricting the pool from which masters could draw to the established workshops and families, but equally one keen to maintain standards and, by extension, its reputation. The apparent switch, therefore, between the employment of one workshop and another may be less clear-cut than a simple account entry would suggest. Apprentices trained up in one workshop could then set up on their own, taking their experience and craft skills (and possibly some employees) with them, or later return to take over. This may have inhibited innovation and the introduction of new ideas, but does suggest a much greater continuity in practice across the craft in York than the surviving documents make clear. The sliding scale of quality for the raw materials listed in the statutes was openly aligned with the need for honesty in financial dealing, suggesting profits were tight and businesses were being tempted to illicit cost-cutting. If the use of Normandy glass was specified in a contract, the cheaper Burgundy or Esse glasses were not to be substituted; likewise, Esse glass was not to be substituted for Burgundy glass on pain of a fine of 13s 4d (one mark) for each infringement.¹⁹⁵ This was a craft under some financial pressure, perhaps from competition within the city, but certainly not in terminal decline.

¹⁹² *York Guild of Glaziers and Plumbers Ordinance Book.*

¹⁹³ *Ibid*, Statute 10.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid*, Statute 13.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid*, Statute 19.

The workshop of the Crosby family, 1621-1639

The emergence of the workshop

The dominant role of the Thompsons in the care of the Minster glazing might have been expected to continue, given that the workshop did with Roger's son George, but their association with the Minster appears to have ended with the death of Robert Thompson in 1620.¹⁹⁶ Their role at the Minster was filled by another family firm, the Crosbys, with whom a new working relationship was forged. The evidence for (and nature of) that relationship challenges the accepted view of a decline in craft skills and practice across this period and marks the continued growth of evidence for the Minster authorities valuing the medieval glass for its own sake. It may also represent evidence of a specialism within a wider network or workshop structure.

The fragmentary nature of record survival means it is not always possible to be precise about when relationships began or ended. The account for 1611 made no mention of any Crosby at all; the Thompson workshop and Robert Thompson were still firmly at the helm. But following the death of Robert Thompson in 1620, it appears that the surviving members of the Thompson family were either unwilling or (perhaps more interestingly) potentially unable to continue to supply the Minster's needs.¹⁹⁷ Given Robert's skills with painting and enamelling discussed above, his death may have meant the loss of that facility from the workshop, but such skills may also have been passed on to an apprentice who then struck out on his own, as will be explored below. If the demand for such skills was limited, Roger and George may have opted to focus on the more sustainable and lucrative market for domestic glazing with white glass and been content to let the sporadic and uncertain world of glass painting fall out of their personal repertoire. This created an opening into which the first recorded member of the Crosby family stepped.

The Crosby name first appeared in the fabric roll for 1623, in the person of glazier Marmaduke Crosby.¹⁹⁸ This was the start of a long relationship

¹⁹⁶ Knowles, "Glass Painters of York viii: The Thompson Family", 165.

¹⁹⁷ E3/62/2.

¹⁹⁸ E3/62/3.

between the Dean and Chapter and the Crosby family, interrupted (but not ended) by the Civil War and Commonwealth period. More intriguingly, in the church records for the parishes of York too, it was as if they appeared from nowhere. There is no record in any of the city parishes, nor of parishes immediately surrounding York, of Marmaduke's baptism or marriage, nor that of any of his children. The burial of his wife, Marabell, was recorded in the register of St. Michael le Belfrey as 23 June 1650 and that of Marmaduke on 2 April 1666, so they were of that parish by then, as might be expected of Minster workmen, but their original parish is unknown.¹⁹⁹ The same register recorded five children of an Edward Crosby being baptised between 1622 and 1645, but again not his baptism or marriage. This may be Marmaduke's brother; Edward is a name which appears alongside Marmaduke's in the fabric rolls. The absence of baptismal records could be accounted for if the Crosbys were Roman Catholics, although they do not appear in the recusant lists compiled by Aveling, but the absence of marriage records (for which there was no recognised alternative) is harder to reconcile.²⁰⁰ The Guild of Glaziers statutes contained no requirement to swear any religious oaths, so being a Catholic (if they were) would not appear to have been a bar to membership.

As the records for the period 1612-1622 are not extant it is impossible to say when Marmaduke Crosby was first employed, but it was probably immediately after the death of Robert Thompson in 1620. His name appeared in the Glaziers' Guild register [Figure 20] in 1621, but this record is also fragmentary.²⁰¹ The preceding list for 1598 contains the names of no Crosbys, but frustratingly there is then a gap for the very period when Crosby emerges. There is no direct evidence to show that Marmaduke was part of the Thompson workshop, or was trained by them, but the coincidence of dates between the death of Robert Thompson in 1620 and the Guild register entry of Marmaduke Crosby in 1621 raises the strong possibility that Crosby was another of Thompson's apprentices, becoming a guild member and master shortly after

¹⁹⁹ YMA St.M le B.

²⁰⁰ J. C. H. Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy in the City of York, 1558-1791*, Publications of the Catholic Record Society. Monograph Series (Catholic Record Society, 1970).

²⁰¹ *York Guild of Glaziers and Plumbers Ordinance Book*.

Thompson's death, and trained specifically in the skills of glass paintings and staining. He became a freeman in 1620 but unlike his sons, Edward and George who were made free by patrimony in 1637/8 and 1650/1 respectively, Marmaduke applied on his own account.²⁰² If Marmaduke was trained by Robert Thompson (perhaps he was the apprentice listed in the roll for 1611?), he may have been schooled in Robert's specialist skills in glass painting and after Robert's death naturally succeeded his former master in the Minster role, but as a master in his own right. If this hypothesis is correct, it suggests that established workshops like the Thompson's were subdividing into smaller units concentrating on specific types of work: Roger and George perhaps to the less demanding but more reliable domestic glazing market, the new Crosby nucleus to the more precarious but higher-tariff specialist work for a limited but prestigious clientele.²⁰³

Marmaduke Crosby, master glazier and glass-painter

On 27 June 1623, payment was recorded to Marmaduke Crosby for sixteen days' work "*in the window aisle towards the palace*" [the north nave aisle].²⁰⁴ This faced the remains of the archbishop's palace and the newly-built home of Sir Arthur Ingram, known as Ingram's Mansion.²⁰⁵ In window n28 is a fragmentary coat of arms of the Ingram family with the date 1623, probably painted by Crosby, but whether originally for this window or for the mansion is open to debate [Figure 21]. The relationship between Sir Thomas Ingram and the Crosbys is discussed in detail in Chapter Three, but it is worth noting here that Marmaduke Crosby was paid 10d per day, the same rate as Robert Thompson had earned, suggesting he was already providing a comparable standard of work. Already a master able to employ others, his apprentice was paid 6d per day for the same job, while Richard [probably Thurman, named later], his labourer, was paid 7d per day. This clearly demonstrates that Crosby, like the Thompsons

²⁰² *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*, Surtees Society 102, 71. The entries for Edward and George are on pages 91 and 110.

²⁰³ The Crosbys' patrons are discussed in Chapter Three.

²⁰⁴ YMA E3/62/3.

²⁰⁵ For details of Ingram's mansion, see Stefania Perring, "The Cathedral Landscape of York: the Minster Close c.1500-1642" (University of York, PhD thesis, 2010).

before him, was operating with a structured workshop with defined roles and rates. The same roll recorded a further payment on 26th July, "*To the sayd Duke*" for twenty-four days on the same job, but now with two apprentices: this is important evidence for the hierarchical structure of the workshop (or perhaps even only Marmaduke's 'department' within it) and the health of the craft, in contrast to earlier assessment by scholars.²⁰⁶ Marmaduke was able to draw upon the resources of a labourer and two apprentices, indicating that he was able to command sufficient work to support at least four craftsmen, perhaps still part of an even larger structure retaining some relationship with Roger and George Thompson.

Guild regulations generally did not permit a master to have more than one apprentice at the same stage of training, so Crosby must have been financially able to take on his first apprentice within a very short time of his being made free, and this may also be an indication of his desire to build his capacity and reputation quickly. On 30th August further payment was made "*To the sayd Duke*" for thirty days' work with two apprentices and a labourer, but this time working on the Great West Window. The reference to him as 'Duke', presumably an abbreviated form of Marmaduke, is unusual. Once a person's name had been given in full, the most common shortening thereafter was to their surname only, as indeed happened in the roll for 1627 when Marmaduke became 'Crosby'.²⁰⁷ However, if Marmaduke had been Thompson's apprentice (never named in the records) as I contend, he could have been known to the clerk in this junior capacity by this nickname which was initially continued. In later records, the same clerk used his surname, so this initial familiarity was 'corrected' without explanation. This suggests recognition by the clerk (albeit somewhat belated) of a change in Crosby's status, from apprentice or journeyman to master, and a concomitant change in the protocol of addressing him.

²⁰⁶ See Sarah Brown, *Glass-Painters* (London: British Museum Press, 1991) for an overview.

²⁰⁷ YMA E3/63/2.

The structure and operation of the Crosby workshop

After the brief change of job title to 'plumber glazier' experienced by Robert Thompson, the role of glazier continued to be a distinct craft specified in the accounts, with lead work associated with the windows being undertaken by another craftsman. It is not certain that the plumber (in this roll, Simon Wheriton) was also formally part of the Crosby workshop, although the amount of lead work which glazing repair would require would suggest at least some sort of regular relationship. No glass purchases were recorded in 1627, most of this work was repair, possibly using glass already held in stock by the workshop, and re-leading, hence the employment of the plumber. The purchases of lead recorded at this period do not distinguish between lead for the glaziers' work and lead for roofs and other uses, so it is not possible to be precise about the work being carried out, but does show the same plumbers were undertaking all the various kinds of lead work. If, as seems likely, the plumbers were part of the Crosby workshop, this extended their range of services even if within that structure the socially superior craft, and therefore that of the workshop head, was glazing. Marmaduke's succession to Robert Thompson's position was made even more explicit as the relationship developed: in the rolls for 1623/4 and 1627, despite there being no payment for glazing work and no purchases of glass, Marmaduke received the annual retainer fee of 20s which had first been paid to Robert Thompson in 1587.²⁰⁸ It appears he had negotiated the same status of retained glazier at the same rate.

However, viewed across a national economic comparison, the value of this salary in 1623 was some 10%-25% lower than it had been in 1587.²⁰⁹ Although Marmaduke had been able to negotiate the same employment status, he does not appear to have been able to command any increase either in salary or in his daily rate. Calculating the real value of wages between years is notoriously fraught with complexity and regional variation and cannot be an absolute indicator. Studies by Stone, Grassby and Wrightson have shown that

²⁰⁸ YMA E3/63/1 and 2.

²⁰⁹ Value calculated through the mechanism provided on www.measuringworth.com, a website which uses historical data to provide a range of comparisons for income value, purchasing power etc.

the economic profiles of towns and cities in the early decades of the seventeenth century were subject to enormous variation across trades and economic sectors.²¹⁰ Whilst generally the period was one of economic expansion, in York the control of the city by a narrowly defined elite created a degree of stagnation and reduction in social and economic mobility which is likely to have had an impact on the wages which could be commanded.²¹¹ A review of the wages paid to the other craftsmen employed by the Minster in the same year shows a similar stagnation of rates between the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, so whilst glazing specifically was not being devalued, the economic power as a regional hub which York had once had, and on which the late-medieval glaziers had capitalised, was in decline.

For a period of almost thirty years (1611-1639), only three fabric rolls survive and in only the last of these was any work on the glass, as opposed to the payment of Crosby's retainer, recorded. This is far too small a sample from which to draw meaningful conclusions about the pattern of work, but it is noteworthy that this period coincided with a difficult time in the Dean and Chapter's finances. The rents which supported expenditure on the fabric remained static at between £151 4s and £151 9s throughout the period 1623 to 1639, but expenses were rising. The problems caused by the severe winter of 1623/4 had used almost all the fabric fund income, undoubtedly affecting the upkeep of the rest of the building.²¹² Nevertheless, in 1639 the maintenance of the glass was still able to command a significant proportion, £6 2s 3d or around 15%, of the expenditure.²¹³ Marmaduke Crosby was still 'glazier', with a team of three under him, namely his son [Edward], 'George' and a 'man'. At this stage Edward was unnamed in the record, simply being referred to as 'his sonne', which supports the earlier hypothesis that as an apprentice Marmaduke would

²¹⁰ Lawrence Stone, "Social Mobility in England 1500-1700" in Paul S. Seaver, ed. *Seventeenth-Century England: Society in an Age of Revolution* (New York: New Viewpoints, 1976), 26-64; Richard Grassby, *The Business Community of Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 156; Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain, 1470-1750*.

²¹¹ Stone, "Social Mobility in England 1500-1700", 41.

²¹² YMA E3/63/1 The payments were dated 10th and 23rd January, 3rd and 14th February and 3rd March. They were for the two named men 'with other labourers' of an unspecified number. Pay was 6d per day.

²¹³ YMA E3/64.

not have been named individually when he was apprenticed to Robert Thompson. However, this creates a potential problem with confirming the identification of 'George'. Edward, Marmaduke's son, had a younger brother George, so if the 'George' in the account roll was also Marmaduke's son, why was he not so identified?²¹⁴ One possibility is that Edward, as the elder son, took precedence in this way, but George, perhaps known as familiarly to the clerk as his father 'Duke' had been before him, could simply be identified by his Christian name without further explanation. This glimpse of apparent familiarity and informality in what are otherwise precise and somewhat summary annual accounts suggests a close relationship between the Crosby family and the Minster administration. This longevity of employment of a local family firm, as had been the case with the Thompsons before them, would certainly have contributed to the continuity of the craft in York in this post-Reformation period.

In the same roll (1639) Marmaduke Crosby was also paid 6s for coloured glass and a total of 6s 6d for white glass (no quantities given), small amounts relating to minor repairs. However, payments recorded in the miscellaneous expenses for this year included 20s 11d for turves for the glaziers and 4d 9d for lime for the tilers and glaziers, suggesting the work went beyond the simple patch replacement of pieces of glass. This level of expenditure on turves is consistent with the glaziers fuelling a glass kiln for firing painting or enamelling. This is perhaps further evidence that Marmaduke Crosby had inherited Robert Thompson's specialism and that was a feature of his Minster work. Such work required good-quality glass, so where was Crosby acquiring his glass on which to paint or enamel?

The changing nature of glass supply 1550-1650

The 1598 ordinances of the Glaziers contain strict injunctions against the use of Burgundy (also written in the fabric rolls as Burgoyne) glass and Esse glass, imposing a fine of 13s 4d (or one mark) for each infringement.²¹⁵ This prohibition

²¹⁴ George is given as father to Marmaduke jnr (1651), John (1657) and Henry (1663) in the baptism register of St. Michael le Belfrey, see BIHR PR Y/MB 3.

²¹⁵ *York Guild of Glaziers and Plumbers Ordinance Book*, 18.

was intended to support the English glass-making industry and protect the government income which was derived from the taxation on the glass furnaces. The grant in 1567 of glassmaking patents to Jean Carré of Antwerp and Giacomo Verzelini of Venice, to encourage them to set up glassworks in England [Figure 22] and bring in continental workers to teach the English the craft, was intended to end the reliance on continental glass.²¹⁶ Initially, this had little impact on the north of England as most of the wood-fired furnaces had been set up in the Weald, then later in the Midlands.²¹⁷ However, as Smith Godfrey explains, the depletion of the woodlands to feed the new furnaces led to the 'Proclamation touching Glass' of 1615 in which the burning of wood for glass furnaces was forbidden, and coal stipulated as the only alternative. The rights governing the regulation of glass furnaces for glass making and the importation of glass had initially been covered by a royal patent granted to the diplomat Sir Edward Zouche, whose estates were in Northamptonshire, but this was not exclusive and he was unable to create a monopoly position, notably due to the activities of his rival Sir Robert Mansell, a prominent figure at court and MP.²¹⁸ This caused ongoing objections to the differences in levies by the London glaziers who were also facing the continuing challenge of cheap imports from the continent. However, the purchase of Zouche's patent soon after 1615 by Sir Robert Mansell gave Mansell a total monopoly of glass production patents in England. This lasted until 1642 when difficulties with administering the whole system and the disadvantage created for native production led to their withdrawal.²¹⁹

It may be assumed that Crosby's glass in 1639 would have come from one of Mansell's producers: the plentiful supply of coal in south Yorkshire made it a seemingly-natural area for glass furnaces. In 1631 the Earl of Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, permitted the establishment of a glassworks on his land at Wentworth Woodhouse after lengthy petitioning by Mansell.²²⁰ Although the

²¹⁶ Lane, "'A World Turned Upside Down'", 45-75

²¹⁷ Eleanor Smith Godfrey, *The Development of English Glassmaking 1560-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975), 16-28.

²¹⁸ Ibid.

²¹⁹ Denis Ashurst, *The History of South Yorkshire Glass* (Sheffield: J.R. Collis, 1992), 9-10.

²²⁰ Ibid, 19-20.

venture was short-lived, the furnace did produce window glass.²²¹ Given Wentworth's close associations with the Minster, it is possible that the Earl supplied the Minster directly, either as a gift or by private treaty, which could account for the lack of glass purchases in the accounts. However, analysis of the glass itself would be necessary to establish whether this furnace did in fact supply the Minster, and this would only be possible if firm identification of Crosby's work can be made in the extant glass. The only reference to the location of any of the work in this entry was that it included "*four days work upon the Register Office*" (the former Minster library of 1414, currently the Minster Shop).²²² No other locations were given to account for the time, but the arrangement of the account gives a better impression of the nature and timetable of the work, and thus some clue as to the pattern if not the actual focus for the work:

<i>Paid Marmaduke Crosby 8 days</i>	<i>8s</i>
<i>To his son 8 days</i>	<i>4s</i>
<i>*****</i>	
<i>Another to Marmaduke Crosby 8 days</i>	<i>8s</i>
<i>Edward Crosby 3 days 2s 6d and to George for 6 days</i>	<i>3s</i>
<i>*****</i>	
<i>Marmaduke Crosby a further 22 days, also for 4 days work on the Register Office</i>	<i>26s</i>
<i>His man 3 days</i>	
<i>*****</i>	
<i>Marmaduke Crosby another 43.5 days,</i>	<i>43s 6d</i>
<i>his son 12 more days</i>	<i>6s</i>

²²¹ Ibid, 20. Ashurst cites the analysis (p.137) by Sheffield University of samples found at the site showing window glass was being made "but of dubious quality".

²²² This building retained its heraldic stained glass until the 1730s: Sarah Brown essay 'The Medieval Glazing of the Minster Library' within the project *1414: John Newton and the Re-foundation of the Minster Library*, accessed at <http://hoaportal.york.ac.uk/hoaportal/yml1414essay.jsp?id=21>.

As most of the work was for short periods and occupied only Marmaduke at any one time, it was probably fairly small-scale, but widespread, minor repair work. Exceptionally, Marmaduke was paid two annual fees that year: 20s as glazier and 40s as plumber. This clearly now put the emphasis on lead working and appeared to value the craft of plumbing at twice that of glazier. However, this may more accurately reflect the amount of routine work which each craftsman could be expected to undertake without incurring additional costs. His actual daily pay was entirely recorded under the glaziers' section, suggesting all this lead work was on the windows and that this was a planned campaign of maintenance.

Crosby's work coincided with the primacy of Archbishop Neile, a supporter of Archbishop Laud and a proponent of the ideas of 'the beauty of holiness', in which the good maintenance of glass played a role.²²³ Neile's primacy and his influence on Chapter resulted in a considerable increase in interest in the appearance and care of the Minster, as discussed in Chapter Three. This interest was not shared by the city, however, and the doctrinal divide between cathedral and city was widening in the 1630s. As Professor Claire Cross put it so succinctly "*At a time when the dean and chapter were making an exceptional effort to beautify the Minster, no member of the Corporation made a gift.*"²²⁴ All the money for the organ, the textiles, the plate and the ornamentation came from a £1000 fine which the King granted to the Chapter for the purpose.²²⁵

The impact of the Civil War and Commonwealth

No Dean and Chapter fabric accounts survive for the period immediately before the Civil War, and any records created during the Commonwealth were not kept with the Minster's archives. What is clear, however, is that the Crosbys were not retained by the City to work at the Minster during this period. Given the state of relations and the doctrinal differences between the Corporation and

²²³ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 227-274.

²²⁴ Cross, "From Reformation to Restoration.", 212.

²²⁵ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 232.

the Chapter this is perhaps not surprising. According to Hildyard, Edmund Gyles was appointed overseer in 1654 to two plumbers, Edward Dawson and John Hey, who had been employed by the City to repair the fabric of the Minster.²²⁶ Edmund Gyles was a glazier, made freeman by patrimony of his father Nicholas in 1634, and by 1659 was an alderman.²²⁷ One trace of Gyles' work, now lost, was captured by James Torre in c.1685. The St. Katherine window (CHniv) [Figure 23] now contains a date of 1768 recording a repair or restoration by William Peckitt, but in James Torre's meticulous record of the glazing it contained a date '1658' in gold glass on an azure ground.²²⁸ Despite the Chapter House being deemed superfluous to requirements under the Commonwealth and offered for sale, Edmund Gyles was taking care of the glazing beyond the most basic requirements of weatherproofing.²²⁹ Brighton, in his work on the Gyles family, stated "*There is no evidence Edmund Gyles ever practised glass-painting*", but this entry in Torre could provide evidence to the contrary: the number may have been cut out and set into blue glass, or it could have been painted: with no idea of scale it is hard to favour one over the other.²³⁰ It is hardly conceivable that the city authorities would have sanctioned expenditure on painted or coloured glass by an external contractor, so the date must have been the work of Gyles. Whilst it was hardly a work of artistic brilliance, it does suggest that skills in artistic glasswork carried on in a small way through this period in York and the answer to the long-standing question as to who trained Henry Gyles, the glass painter employed after the Restoration, may be his father.

There are no records of Edmund or Nicholas Gyles being employed by the Minster before the Civil War and the decision by the city not to employ the glaziers most familiar with the state of the Minster's glazing, i.e. the Crosbys, seems deliberate. Perhaps the Crosbys were indeed too closely associated with the membership and work of the Neile-appointed Chapter to be acceptable to

²²⁶ Christopher Hildyard, *The Antiquities of York City* (York, 1719), 69.

²²⁷ *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*. Surtees Society 102, 86 and 122.

²²⁸ YMA L1/7 p.120.

²²⁹ Withington "Views from the Bridge: Revolution and Restoration in Seventeenth-Century York", 121-151.

²³⁰ J. Trevor Brighton, "Henry Gyles, Virtuoso and Glasspainter of York 1645-1709" *York Historian* 4 (1984), 4.

the extreme Protestants now responsible for the upkeep of the Minster? As will be discussed in Chapter Three, the evidence cited by Sprakes demonstrates that the Crosbys had already secured regular work on the principal Ingram Yorkshire estates at Temple Newsam which lasted until 1659, so perhaps they could see that little new work would be required on the Minster and opted instead to go for a more lucrative and artistically rewarding contract. In the person of Sir Arthur Ingram, however, they were connecting with “*a protestant of puritan tendencies*” and a man infamous for his parsimony and grasping nature.²³¹ It looked more akin to a move born of economic necessity than ideologically-driven choice.

A craft and workshop re-emerges: the Crosbys 1660-1703

With the Restoration in 1660 the Dean and Chapter regained control of the Minster and its finances. More importantly, they immediately resumed the pattern of employment and retention of glaziers on an annual fee (held at 20s per annum) from before the Commonwealth.²³² The draft Chapter Act book for 1663 records the involvement of a Mr. Gyles in the work on the windows, the same Edmund Gyles who was appointed to oversee the plumbers Edward Dawson and John Hey in their repair work around the Minster in 1654.²³³ There is no detail in the Chapter Act book as to what he was being paid for, but evidence from Hildyard's *Antiquities of York City* identifies the windows of the south transept: “*there is a window in the Minster over the South Door which the said John Petty Glazed, and wherein he is depicted in an Alderman's Gown: the same Window has since been Renewed by the Edmund Gyles Glazier anno 1662*” [Figure 24].²³⁴ Despite Gyles' association with the Commonwealth, the Dean and Chapter were willing to retain a good craftsman.

²³¹ Anthony Frederick Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram, c.1565-1642: A Study of the Origins of an English Landed Family* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 262.

²³² YMA E3/65/1 These accounts, one year per membrane, are strung together on a leather thong, with the latest on the top, covering the period 1660-1693. Although now difficult to access, this method of storage has ensured that even the smallest account sheets are well preserved, the sequence being unbroken for this span of thirty-three years.

²³³ Raine *Commonwealth Committee* f.59b, entry for 7th August 1654.

²³⁴ Hildyard *Antiquities of York City*, 69. He also records a great storm in 1660 “*which did much hurt to the City and to the Minster*”, probably necessitating repairs to the glass.

The Crosby family were immediately re-employed, but without Marmaduke at the head of the firm. He was still listed in the 1660 roll as working, but he was advancing in years by this date, possibly in his late sixties, so was perhaps less able to manage a physically demanding job. Edward was now named as the glazier and employing his younger brother George. Edward had been admitted both as a freeman and to the Glaziers' Guild in 1639 by patrimony and George followed suit in 1651, evidence that the Commonwealth in no way resulted in the cessation of the craft.²³⁵ The same pattern of work, occupying both Edward and George Crosby with a labourer steadily through the year, also resumed, with the Minster work occupying around 30% of their time.²³⁶ This pattern and the 1s 6d per day rate is consistent with routine repair work rather than any major campaigns and suggests that there was enough other work available to continue to maintain a structured workshop. It also indicates the glass had been reasonably well maintained during the Commonwealth period. But the chance survival of a small bundle of three quarterly accounts or bills shows an apparent discrepancy in the records that amply demonstrates how incomplete our picture of the glazing work, its funding and the extent of survival (even flourishing) of the craft really is.²³⁷

In 1661, according to the fabric rolls, only Christopher Crosby (Edward's eldest son, born c.1626) was employed on the Minster glazing, undertaking 42 days' work at the usual rate of 1s 6d per day.²³⁸ But the survival of these stray quarterly records reveals a quite different picture, including the otherwise unrecorded payment of 2s to George Crosby for coloured glass. It is likely that this was pot-metal glass, routinely bought by the Crosbys as stock for their workshop and being sold on as needed to the Minster. The main accounts regularly included the phrase 'and his man' indicating an apprentice, or (more usually) a journeyman from the workshop: financially, the Minster's relationship was with the workshop, not the individuals on their own account, so the

²³⁵ In the register for *York Guild of Glaziers and Plumbers*, the sheet is headed 'Glaziers this yeare 1627' but gives the dates of entry to the Guild both prior to and post this.

²³⁶ YMA E3/65/1 et seq.

²³⁷ YMA E3M/1-3/1661.

²³⁸ BIHR PR Y/MB3 Baptism register of St Michael-le-Belfrey.

payments recorded the expenditure accordingly. The contents of the additional accounts, in contrast, recorded the number of days worked by each man in three four-month periods from March 1661 – February 1661/2 and listed any materials purchased, such as ‘glaziers’ oil 5s 8d’, at the end. Totals and notes are written roughly: these were tally sheets to show to the clerk to get paid. These vouchers show that 621 days were worked, compared to the 42 recorded in the main account rolls, a discrepancy which requires explanation.

This reinforces the fact that the fabric accounts give a very partial picture, being very specific to expenditure from the Fabric fund as opposed to other sources. Other sources of funding for glazing could have included personal patronage, but this would have been more usually directed to a personal, distinct project such as a memorial window, and there is no evidence that such a project was underway in this area of the Minster. The alternative sources of (not altogether) unrestricted funds were the Common Fund, from which the canons drew additional income for duties and expenses, and the rentals recorded in the Chamberlain's accounts. One or other of these must have been being used to pay these bills as they were the only other sources of sufficient income, although in neither instance was this expenditure recorded.²³⁹ The Chapter House and its vestibule, areas considered superfluous by the Commonwealth authorities, were undoubtedly the area most in need of symbolic ‘reclamation’ by the Dean and Chapter, and the newly-appointed dean, Richard Marsh, “*worked tirelessly... determined to that all at the Minster should be exactly as it used to be*”.²⁴⁰ The 1663 Visitation by Archbishop Frewen expressed concern that Chapter “*in their enthusiasm might have misappropriated the funds of the cathedral*”: this project may have been one such example.²⁴¹

Although the workshop had survived the Civil War and Commonwealth, it appears that in 1662 it required either re-equipping or expansion of its capacity and that such items could reasonably be charged to the Dean and Chapter:²⁴²

²³⁹ YMA E1.

²⁴⁰ Cross, "From Reformation to Restoration.", 216.

²⁴¹ Ibid.

²⁴² YMA E3/65/4.

<i>A parcell of coloured glass</i>	<i>10s</i>
<i>Oil for the glazier</i>	<i>4s 7d</i>
<i>For 2 hammers 4 files and 1 pair of shears for the Glaziers</i>	<i>6s 6d</i>
<i>For a brush and a large melting pan</i>	<i>2s</i>
<i>For coloured glass to a widow woman</i>	<i>7s</i>

The term ‘parcell’ was not a standard unit of measurement for glass like ‘case’ or ‘table’. This suggests it was a small part of a larger consignment and the lack of a named supplier, in contrast to the entry for ‘*a widow woman*’, indicates the purchase was from the Crosby workshop. The secondary purchase of coloured glass from a widow is intriguing. In this immediately post-Commonwealth period it is conceivable (albeit unlikely) that this was an impecunious Parliamentarian widow selling coloured glass from her own windows, but it did not specify ‘old glass’, an important distinction made in previous rolls. It is most likely she was the widow of either a glass merchant or a glass-maker continuing her husband’s business, as was common practice.

Although, as discussed above, glass manufacture had been fostered in the north of England from the 1630s, there is no conclusive evidence that this included the production of coloured window glasses at this early date. The 1698 probate inventory of Abigail Pilmay, widow of glass-maker John Pilmay of south Yorkshire, listed ‘*blew powder*’ which Ashurst suggested was a cobalt compound for producing blue glass, but whether for window or vessel glass cannot be determined.²⁴³ It could also refer to ground up blue glass, or unused enamel pigment for painting. Whilst the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, if this were the source of this glass it seems unlikely that more detail, such as the widow’s name or that of the glass-house, would not have been supplied. This appears to be a widow either carrying on or winding down a merchant’s business and supplying continental coloured glass already imported.

The payments for oil in both quarters relate to the purchase of linseed oil. This is both a component of the waterproof cement necessary for the

²⁴³ Dennis Ashurst, *The History of South Yorkshire Glass* (Sheffield: J.R. Collis Publications, 1992), 23. Ashurst describes the local, small-scale production of the south Yorkshire glass houses which combined glass production with farming.

installation of glass and a key ingredient in the manufacture of the stable oil-based paints which can be used in glass painting.²⁴⁴ The 1598 statutes of the Glaziers' Guild specify the use of linseed oil in all work on pain of a fine of one mark:

*"Item, that none of the brethren of the sayd companye or occupacion shall from henceforthe worke or suffer to be wrought in his house by himselfe his servants or Apprentices, anye Trayne oyle, Cinel oyle, or whalle oyle, nor with anye other oyle, saving onelye with Linseed oyle..."*²⁴⁵

The substitution of these other oils for linseed would have been on grounds of both quality and cost, as the statute goes on to refer to such use being '*for the symoninge of anye worke, to the deceit of the Quenes people*'.²⁴⁶ Quality control and the maintenance of standards across practitioners in the city were still important in the continuation of York's reputation as a glazing centre.

The quantities of oil purchased were not listed, but even allowing for linseed oil being a relatively expensive commodity the sums expended indicate that it was being bought in bulk.²⁴⁷ The purchase of a brush and '*large melting pan*' (possibly for lead) as well as other equipment do hint at a variety of processes being undertaken, but if it is assumed that the oil was principally, if not solely, for the making of cement, then this was for a substantial programme of work. If it was indeed for glazing cement then that has implications for the introduction of lead mills earlier than is currently thought.²⁴⁸ The oil may also be

²⁴⁴ My thanks to Sarah Brown, Director of the York Glaziers Trust, for her explanation of this continuing use of linseed in modern glazing practice.

²⁴⁵ Trayne (modern 'train') oil is made from the blubber of whales, seals, walrus or similar marine animals and was Dutch in origin. I have assumed that 'cinel oil' refers to cineole, a type of water-soluble turpentine.

²⁴⁶ It is assumed here that 'symoninge' is derived from 'simony' and therefore means false profit. The allusion this makes to the sale of sacred items or religious benefits for profit is of interest whether it was intentional or not.

²⁴⁷ For a discussion of the relative price of linseed oil in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries see Andrea Feeser, Maureen Daly Goggin and Beth Fowkes Tobin, *The Materiality of Color: The Production, Circulation, and Application of Dyes and Pigments, 1400-1800* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2012), 69.

²⁴⁸ Cement is only required once glaziers switch from cast lead for the comes to forming the lead from rods passed through lead mills or 'turning machines', the earliest known in York being that of Edmund Gyles. (Conversation with Sarah Brown 17th October 2016). See also the entry under 'Lead' in A. Bettesworth A. and C. Hitch, *The Builder's Dictionary: Or, Gentleman and Architect's Companion. Explaining Not Only the Terms of Art in All the Several Parts of Architecture, but Also Containing the Theory and Practice of the Various Branches Thereof, Requisite to Be Known by Masons, Carpenters, Joiners, Bricklayers,*

for cold-painting, despite the impermanence of this being an issue within the craft regarding clients being cheated (as implied in the statute above). The purchase of these materials in these quantities suggest preparation for a significant campaign of work far beyond simple maintenance. As the later rolls show, this was the start of a prolonged programme of work around the Chapter House, part of Dean Marsh's work to restore the symbol of Chapter's authority to its full glory in which significant work to the glass was an important part.

The restoration of the Chapter House glass

Although there was some iconoclastic damage in the Chapter House and vestibule during the Commonwealth, there is no indication that the windows were a particular target or indeed suffered much at all. According to Lehmberg, the Minster was "*less heavily damaged during the eleven-week siege of York in 1644* [compared to other cathedrals during the Civil War]" and "*damage to the windows was minimal*".²⁴⁹ Samuel Gale referred to the damage wrought in the cathedral by the Puritans and specifically mentioned the damage to the statue of the Virgin and Child at the entrance to the Chapter House, but said nothing of any damage to the glass.²⁵⁰ Nevertheless, the restoration of this area of the Minster was of symbolic significance to Chapter as an affirmation of the re-assertion of their control, and no expense was spared.

Plasterers, Painters, Glaziers, Smiths, Turners, Carvers, Statuaries, Plumbers, &C. Also Necessary Problems in Arithmetic, Geometry, Mechanics, Perspective, Hydraulics, and Other Mathematical Sciences. Together with the Quantities, Proportions, and Prices of All Kinds of Materials Used in Building; with Directions for Chusing, Preparing, and Using Them: The Several Proportions of the Five Orders of Architecture, and All Their Members, According to Vitruvius, Palladio, Scamozzi, Vignola, M. Le Clerc, &C. With Rules for the Valuation of Houses, and the Expence Calculated of Erecting Any Fabrick, Great or Small. The Whole Illustrated with More Than Two Hundred Figures, Many of Them Curiously Engraven on Copper-Plates: Being a Work of Great Use, Not Only to Artificers, but Likewise to Gentlemen, and Others, Concerned in Building, &C. Faithfully Digested from the Most Approved Writers on These Subjects. In Two Volumes (London: printed for A. Bettesworth and C. Hitch, at the Red-Lion in Pater-Noster-Row; and S. Austen, at the Angel and Bible in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1734).

²⁴⁹ Lehmberg, *English Cathedrals*, 193.

²⁵⁰ YMA AddMSS 43. The 'Brief History of York Cathedral' (1700) written by Samuel Gale, son of the dean, draws heavily on Torre's manuscript and is not entirely reliable. However, when dealing with events closer to Gale's own lifetime or personal experiences the tone changes and the account becomes more factual. He refers to the silver statues formerly in the niches in the Chapter House, but also states that the only damage done in the vestibule during the Civil War was the defacing of the statue of the Virgin and Child.

The rolls for 1667 and 1668 recorded a large amount of work about the Chapter House “*ordered by the Dean and Chapter*”, as well as the payment of £9 7s 11d for “*building the turret upon the Lantern*”.²⁵¹ Edward Crosby's bill “in part” came to £6 1s, but separate payments were listed as follows:

14oz of solder for glazier *3s Also old lead bought*
For 2 metes [measures] of coal and carriage for the glazier *2s 11d*
For a brush for dressing glass *8d*

Exactly what he was doing becomes slightly clearer in the account for 1669 when 7d was paid for “*Turves and carriage for the plumber and glazier when they worke on the southe syde and elsewhere was in hand in October last*”.²⁵² Evidently the south front (significantly, the façade facing the city) was receiving attention in addition to the major work on the Chapter House, an undertaking of some considerable cost to the Dean and Chapter.

Edward Crosby presented three bills for work on the Chapter House in 1669-70 which give a flavour of the extent of the work required.²⁵³ The bill recorded in 1669 was for 28s, but the other two, listed in 1670 under “For Repairs 1669”, were for 33s and £6 18s 8d. The stonework of the windows continued under repair at a cost of £11 10s for workmen, but as well as the 1669 arrears, the glazing of the windows account for bills totalling a further £11 18s 1d provides an insight into how such work was undertaken and what materials were required:

For materials for the Glazier as solder, turves &c. and other necessaries about the church [amount blank]

<i>Solder for the Glazier</i>	<i>15s 8d</i>
<i>For one firkin of glass which came from Newcastle</i> ²⁵⁴	<i>17s 6d</i>
<i>George Haynes for window bars etc.</i>	<i>6s 6d</i>
<i>To Edward Crosby for work about the Chapter House windows</i>	<i>£7 12s 4d</i>
<i>Edward Haggis for mason work about the windows</i>	<i>40s 6d</i>
<i>For one Moyley for drawing up Articles concerning that work</i>	<i>2s 6d</i>

²⁵¹ YMA ref E3/65/10.

²⁵² YMA ref E3/65/12.

²⁵³ YMA ref E3/65/13.

²⁵⁴ A firkin is a small barrel, capacity 9 gallons, presumably packed with glass for transport.

*For 18 ½ lb of lead for the side windows in the passage to the
Chapter House which was for the Glazier's use*

3s 1d

The amount paid out for solder is exceptional and suggests extensive re-leading. In addition, repairs to the stonework probably required the temporary removal of some of the glass and the quantities of lead purchased speak of extensive re-leading in addition to the repairs requiring the '*one firkin of glass from Newcastle*'.

The specific identification of the supply of Newcastle glass is one of the few occasions when the source of the glass is recorded that does not name a middle-man. If the Crosbys were buying their glass direct from the manufacturer, it may suggest that the supply chains which had operated before the War and Interregnum had not yet been re-established, but more probably that the Crosbys were exercising their own quality control. The De Hennezel glass-making family had come to England in the seventeenth century from Lorraine and established works in Stourbridge and Newcastle and it may be assumed that this glass was a consignment from their manufactory.²⁵⁵ Their glass was of good quality and the purchase indicates a deliberate selection of Newcastle glass, as opposed to the 'usual' sources which are not given geographic locators. Care was being taken to acquire good glass, not simply to purchase the cheapest, or most readily available regardless of quality. The glass manufactories of south Yorkshire, such as that owned by the Pilmay family, were still producing glass, albeit often in small quantities, so other glass was available: the choice of Newcastle glass was deliberate and based on quality.²⁵⁶

The reference to Articles being drawn up is the first direct and specific mention of separate legal contracts being negotiated for larger projects since the Thornton contract of 1405 (now extant only in later copies). However, it is clear, from work known to have been done for which no written record survives, that they were standard practice, as hinted at in the 1663 draft Chapter Acts. The survival of some 1690s vouchers and a contract, discussed below, give further insight into what must have been common documents. These provide a rare

²⁵⁵ Brighton, "Henry Gyles, Virtuoso and Glasspainter of York 1645-1709", 40.

²⁵⁶ Ashurst, *The History of South Yorkshire Glass*, 24.

insight into how such contracts were negotiated and the relative costs of the various elements needed to complete the commission, taking us behind the scenes in the workshop. Perhaps the post-Commonwealth change in accounting style reflected other changes in practice which necessitated someone outside the normal purview of the Dean and Chapter, '*one Moyles*', being paid to draw up a contract and thus its creation was recorded, where previously it would have been done 'in house'. In contrast, the seemingly-more informal practices of Mr. Edward Gyles were recorded in 1671: *To Mr. Edward Gyles by verball note as may appear £3.*²⁵⁷

In addition to the 'routine' expenses of nails etc. total of £23 18s 3d was expended on glass and glass 'supplies', which suggests quite extensive areas of glass replacement

*Paid to Thos. Buckton*²⁵⁸ *for coloured glass 5s*

For three tables of white glass and several pieces of coloured glass 10s

Extraordinary expenses: to Edward Crosby, glazier £16 4d

As none of the glass purchased is described as old or painted, these were either plain pieces which were being inserted where replacement is necessary, or that further work, such as painting or enamelling, was done under the Articles already agreed or by Mr Gyles' 'verball note'. Two further firkins of glass were purchased in 1672 at a cost of 14s each.²⁵⁹ In 1674, however, Edward Crosby received a payment of 20d "*for one day taking downe glass when like to fall*" as well as his bill for £15 13s 4d.²⁶⁰ The location of the dangerous glass is not given, but obviously at least one of the windows was in a very poor state.²⁶¹ Edward's

²⁵⁷ Aside from the obvious interest of how a verbal note may subsequently appear, the Christian name given to Mr. Gyles is also apparently incorrect: the York glass painter named Gyles was Edmund, not Edward. It could be a simple error on the part of the accountant, perhaps expanding an abbreviation using the more common name, or simply misreading a hasty note. However, as there is no hint as to what the payment was for beyond its listing under Glaziers Expenses, it is possible this is another member of the Gyles family altogether.

²⁵⁸ Presumably a general glass merchant, but I can find no other trace of him.

²⁵⁹ YMA E3/65/15 The unit of measurement, that of a small barrel, and the generality of the description not distinguishing whether plain or coloured, suggests an assortment of small pieces, possibly bought for small repairs.

²⁶⁰ YMA E3/65/17

²⁶¹ Further evidence of the poor state of repair of some of the windows can be found in the Chamberlain's account for 1677 ref. E2/22; "*To a mason who came to view ye window yt was fallen, and to advise about it 2s 6d*".

son (unnamed, but probably Charles) was paid 13s 6d for nine days' work and £11 7s 3d was spent on "*glass and solder for the glaziers*". In the next eleven years, to 1685, only the glaziers' totals are given.²⁶² They appear every year except 1678 and 1679 and the total expenditure recorded in that time was £78 16s 2d, plus 26s for coloured glass in 1676, but with no detail.²⁶³ It is reasonable to assume, however, that some of this work was in the Chapter House vestibule, or the 'passage' as it was described in 1670, part of a long campaign of repair that culminated in the 1693-1695 contract for work in the Chapter House itself.

In 1686 Charles Crosby took over from his father as the named glazier in receipt of an annual salary. Edward made one further appearance in 1693 as the plumber to Charles, but in 1686 and 1687 summary bills were presented in Charles' name for a total of £19 3s 7d.²⁶⁴ In 1688 "*120 foot of Odd pieces of thick glass at 2 ½ d per foot, £1 5s*" were purchased in addition to the glaziers' bill for £5 15s 3d.²⁶⁵ The specification of 'thick' glass may simply be intended to indicate cheap quality, most likely the edges of the crown glass: at 2½ d per foot, it was certainly not top of the range. However, it is also possible that such a large quantity of thick glass was specifically required, perhaps to make new strong borders of a consistent weight, or to fill very vulnerable areas. It evidently kept the glaziers busy in 1689 because the yearly bill was for £18 8s, the highest for five years. The 1690 account included 20 feet of painted glass for £1, considerably more expensive at 1s per foot than the thick glass bought previously.²⁶⁶ The source is not named, which suggests it was not specially painted as an external commission, but done either in-house or bought 'off the shelf'. As there is no description of the glass itself it is not possible to say how ambitious the painting was, but it constituted a large amount of glass at twice the usual rate (other entries for painted glass were at 6d per foot). The price suggests either higher quality, more detailed work, or a supplier whose expertise could command a higher rate than the Crosbys – perhaps Henry Gyles? This

²⁶² YMA E3/65/18-28.

²⁶³ YMA E3/65/19.

²⁶⁴ YMA E3/65/29, 30.

²⁶⁵ YMA E3/65/31.

²⁶⁶ YMA E3/65/32, 33.

could be the first hint that, within the craft of glass-painting in York, there was beginning to be a distinction in quality between different artists, which would ultimately lead to the separation of the craft from that of glazing. In 1693 Edward Crosby and Charles were paid £20 9s 9d for “*mending and setting anew a window in the Chapter House according to Covenant*”.²⁶⁷ Exceptionally amongst the records at York, this covenant and its attendant detailed bills have survived [Figure 25].

A glimpse into the administration in the Crosby’s workshop 1693-1695

The small bundle consisting of two sets of bills for 1693-1695 and the articles of agreement between “*Charles Crosby of the City of York, Glazier and Robert Oates Notary Public and the Clerk of Works of the Cathedral Church of York dated 2nd January 1692/3*” give a glimpse behind-the-scenes into how such workshops operated, were organised and managed their finances.²⁶⁸ The bills account for work on the Chapter House and elsewhere in the Minster, the first of which is headed “*A bill of Glass Worke done by Charles Crosby – Ye Minster bill No: ye 4th 92*”. The work recorded actually covered the period 24 April – 18 September 1693, so “ye 4th 92” probably meant they were billing in arrears for work contracted for in 1692. Three workmen were named: Charles Crosby, rated at 1s 8d per day, Joseph Burton rated at 1s 6d per day and Thomas Allanson rated at 1s 3d per day. The precise nature of the relationship between the three men is not described, although the slight variation in their rates of pay clearly indicates a hierarchy of expertise with Charles at the top, but with Joseph not far behind. As far as can be ascertained the junior two were not members of the Crosby family, nor were they listed or paid as apprentices would be, so it is likely they were journeymen, with Joseph the more advanced of the two.²⁶⁹

This not only gives an indication of the size of the Crosby’s enterprise, but also confirms the continuity of a workshop structure able to support and develop craftsmen at different stages of their training. This hypothesis is supported by

²⁶⁷ YMA E3/65/36.

²⁶⁸ YMA B3/1/1-3.

²⁶⁹ It is possible they were related in some way by marriage, but no evidence to support this idea has so far come to light.

the evidence of the register of the Guild of Glaziers: Charles Crosby had joined in 1692, at the point of his taking over the workshop from his father Edward and undertaking this contract; Joseph Burton signed in 1695 and Thomas in 1702.²⁷⁰ This pattern of guild membership continued the working practices identified above and is evidence for the continuity of a more substantial craft base in York in this period than has previously been supposed. In his study of the career of Henry Gyles, Brighton interpreted the small number (36) of glaziers' names in the register for the period 1645-1709 as evidence of decline in the craft, but if the practice was that only masters of workshops became members, then the picture is much more nuanced and there may have been many more craftsmen involved.²⁷¹

In addition to the combined labour costs of £18 6s, Crosby's account contained the following bills for different types and qualities of glass, including painted glass, which provides valuable insight into how such differences were reflected in the price and the methods of measurement:

<i>"Delivered white glass for the Chapter House Window that I did by greatt²⁷² and the Litle window at the West End six tables²⁷³</i>	
<i>at 18 pence per table</i>	<i>9s</i>
<i>For painted glass for that work 9 foot at 6 pence per foot</i>	<i>4s 6d</i>
<i>April ye 24th: More a 11 and a halfe tables of white glass at 18d per table</i>	<i>17s 3d</i>
<i>For 17 foot of painted glass at 6 pence per foot</i>	<i>8s 6d</i>

The measurement of white glass in 'tables' indicates the purchase of raw glass from the manufactory; a table is the result of the basic production method for glass with no further refinement or trimming. In contrast, the painted glass, costed at so much per foot, is being assessed as a craft output, payment for a skill not simply a product.

²⁷⁰ *York Guild of Glaziers and Plumbers Ordinance Book.*

²⁷¹ Brighton, "Henry Gyles, Virtuoso and Glasspainter of York 1645-1709", 6.

²⁷² A now obsolete use of 'great' derived from 'agreement' meaning to undertake a whole task for a fixed amount previously agreed.

²⁷³ A 'table' of glass is the single sheet created by unrolling and flattening the tube of glass blown from the rod, on average 18 inches x 18 inches.

The identification of *'the Little window at the West End'* is somewhat problematic: there are no west windows in the Chapter House itself. The western wall is taken up with the doorway and the blind tracery above. Whilst this could be payment for a minor repair to a window at the west end of the nave, only one of those (w2) [Figure 26] could reasonably be described as *'Little'*, and all the other work is in and around the Chapter House. The lack of any description of w2 in Torre's manuscript suggests it was completely clear glass in the late seventeenth century, and O'Connor and French suggested it was re-glazed as part of unspecified glazing work at the west end by Thomas Sanderson in 1768.²⁷⁴ If Crosby re-glazed w2, this would have meant a small, recessed window needed completely re-glazing after only about seventy to eighty years, which seems unlikely. A tentative identification may therefore be made with CHn9 [Figure 27]. This is the southernmost window at the entrance to the Chapter House vestibule, but it is on the west wall and it is smaller than the other windows, being only two lights wide. The glass as it appeared in a photograph taken c.1958, before conservation [Figure 28], had been heavily repaired and contained several pieces of painted glass which were not as accomplished as the surviving main figures. Torre noted in his description of this window that the letters of the name of the sainted king *'Osvaldus'* had been transposed, indicating the window had already been subject to intervention.²⁷⁵ These areas may, therefore, be the remains of the work of Charles Crosby undertaken in 1692.

The commissioning and contractual processes behind the work

The *'greatt'* mentioned in the 1692 bill survives and gives a vivid glimpse of the way such work was commissioned. The Articles also hint at the relative status of the glazier compared to the pointer of the stonework, although the stipulation that Charles Crosby should assist with the movement of ladders near

²⁷⁴ YMA L1/7. Thomas French, *York Minster: A Catalogue of Medieval Stained Glass Fascicle 1 the West Windows of the Nave Wi, Wii, Nxxx, Sxxxvi* (Oxford; New York: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1987), 10 and 67.

²⁷⁵ YMA L1/7 f.117.

the window may have been to preclude the possibility of the window being damaged (or the accusation of damage being levied).

“Charles Crosby of the City of York, Glazier and Robert Oates Notary Public and the Clerk of Works of the Cathedral Church of York dated 2nd January 1692/3: the said Charles Crosby shall take downe a certaine window in the Chapter house (now in decay and ruinous) next adjoyneing southward on ye window lately new sett up and amended containeing five lights and the Tracery work, And shall well and carefully amend and sett all ye said Glass in ye said window anew in a very good and substantiall manner – and as well as ye window aforesaid was and is done. And further that ye said window shall be soe repaired amended and sett up againe at or before the twenty-fifth day of March now next ensueing.²⁷⁶ Item it is further covenanted and agreed upon by and between the parties aforesaid that the said Charles Crosby shall help and assist the Pointer in setting up and taking downe the Ladders and other things requisite and necessary to be used in pointing the said window. Further covenanted that after the said window is amended and sett up and alsoe pointed and fixed as aforesaid and [the?] work allowed to be well and sufficiently done by the said Dean and Chapter that he the said Robert Oates shall and will well and truly pay or cause to be paid to the said Charles Crosby or his Assigns the whole and just sune of thirteen pounds and fifteen shillings of lawfull English money and further that all things requisite and necessary for ye doing amending and repairing the Window as aforesd shall be found by ye said Rob^t Oates or at his Cost and Charge. In witness whereof and for ye true performance of ye promises the parties aforesaid doe bind themselves unto each other in ye Sune of twenty pounds and interchangeably sett their hands and seales this second daye of January Anno Dmi 1692

*Witness whereof Oswald Langwith Sig. Rob^t Oates [seal lost]
Thomas Richardson*

²⁷⁶ Lady Day, the first one of the year's Quarter Days from which contracts would commence and financial business would be accounted.

There is no signature or seal of Charles Crosby on this agreement, which suggests this was Crosby's own copy which he inadvertently handed over with his bill for payment. The agreement was for the restoration of a single window immediately following similar recently completed: "*next adjoyneing southward on ye window lately new sett up*". If 'southward' is correct, the window "*lately new sett up*" must refer to CH1, the east window. All other windows in the octagonal Chapter House are in a relationship either east or west of each other, not north or south. This may therefore account for the high levels of expenditure recorded in 1689 and 1690 and the purchase of the 20 feet of painted glass at the higher rate of 1s per foot. It is clear from the stipulation that the quality of the work needed to be as good as the window "*lately new sett up*" that this was at least the second such agreement, and more likely one in a series of such agreements previously entered into that covered the work on the vestibule and Chapter House. It is interesting to compare the 'payment on satisfaction' clause with the similar clause in the famous Thornton contract of 1405, although Crosby did not stand to benefit from the bonus payments that were offered to Thornton for early completion.²⁷⁷ The problem of seeing exactly where the large quantities of painted glass listed in this bill and the 1690 account (totally 46 feet) were accommodated remains unresolved. The restoration of 1845 and the extensive interventions of Dean Milner-White in the 1950s and 1960s have removed much of the evidence of this seventeenth-century work, but it included the creation and installation of painted elements and the Crosbys were the family firm entrusted with this work.²⁷⁸

The second bill covered the period 17 June – 7 October 1695.²⁷⁹ The first entry was "*for setting one window anew in ye Chapter house per Agreement £12 10s*". This was clearly a new agreement as the one given above was to have been fulfilled by Lady Day 1692/3 and continued the programme of repair. But the Chapter House was not the only area of the Minster in need of glazing repair.

²⁷⁷ The original does not survive, but the text was transcribed from a now lost Chapter Act book by James Torre in 1691. YMA L1/7 f.11.

²⁷⁸ Owen Chadwick, "From 1822-1916," in *A History of York Minster*, ed. Aylmer and Cant, 292 and n.461.

²⁷⁹ YMA B3/1/3.

The bill includes details of work done elsewhere in the Minster and the glass purchased for it:

<i>Ten foot of new glass over the Clocke</i>	<i>23 5s</i>
<i>Three new paines on ye south side of the East End</i>	
<i>[requiring] 25 foot of new glass</i>	<i>12s 6d</i>
<i>For 8 tables of glass</i>	<i>12s</i>
<i>For 4 foot of painted glass</i>	<i>2s</i>

The reference to a payment for painted glass as a lump sum, rather than so much per foot, suggests it was being bought in, not being undertaken in the workshop. If so, this is an important development which may be further evidence that glass painting was becoming a separate craft, or at least that the best quality practitioners did not feel the need to be part of a structured workshop. The total bill for glazing for the quarter June to October 1695 was £28 1s 2d, a substantial sum which reflected the importance the Chapter placed on putting the Minster back into good order aesthetically as well as practically. Painted glass offers no better weather protection than plain, so the purchase of it was evidently an aesthetic judgement.

A note appears on this bill regarding the source of the lead:

*“Memo that there was 3 of piggs mark **R** used by the Glasers this year”.*

The use of lead bearing the king’s mark suggests it may have been supplied in the 1630s as part of the gift of Charles I to the Chapter. It is possible that the lead may have originally come from a dissolved religious house, perhaps St. Mary’s or even Rievaulx, as pigs bearing this mark have been excavated on site there, presumably stored ready to transport, but never recovered.²⁸⁰ It is the only entry of this kind in the records for the whole period of this study, despite the extensive amount of lead used, so clearly was worthy of note. As the provision of all things necessary for the work in the earlier contract was to be at the charge of Mr. Oates, this marked lead was supplied to the glaziers [Figure 29] from ‘central supplies’ by the Dean and Chapter.

²⁸⁰ According to the cartulary (Surtees Society vol.83, 334), the window glass at Rievaulx was to be sorted and the poorest quality glass “*taken out of the lede and the lede moltem*” for subsequent sale. A lead pig with this mark is on display at the museum at Rievaulx.

This small bundle of papers is a chance survival of what must have been hundreds of such bills and agreements, discarded after the sums had been enrolled in the annual accounts and the work completed. The random chance of their survival gives them an historical usefulness often lost when 'special' records are kept of exceptional events and projects, as they represent the typical rather than the atypical arrangement. The whole programme of work on the Chapter House and vestibule may have been unusual in its extent and duration, when compared to the entries in earlier years where work is dotted around the Minster, but the nature of the work and the episodes covered by these three separate documents were not inherently unusual. They may be taken as a fair picture of working arrangements pertaining to the care of the glass in the late seventeenth century and the continuity of the craft structure which continued to undertake it.

The disappearance of the Crosbys

One of the unsolved mysteries of this period is the complete disappearance of the Crosby family from the records of the Minster and city after 1703. Their work was apparently supplemented in 1696/7 by James Ward who was paid £4 2s 6d for "*repairing the high north window next the Lantern*", although he did not appear again.²⁸¹ £8 4s was Glass was bought from Thomas Roote in 1699 (£8 4s), and from 'Mr. Gyles' (£3) in 1700, but no itemised work was listed to which these purchases can be related. The considerable sum of £60 12s 4d was spent across 1701-1703, but with no detail beyond the sums and a note of 'Charles Crosby, Glazier'.²⁸² This was the last time Charles, or any Crosby, appeared in the accounts. Charles may have died, although he was probably only in his fifties, but all the other younger members of the Crosby family also disappear from the records. Importantly, the connection with the workshop's skilled workforce continued, however, as 1704 followed a similar buoyant trend with expenditure of £34 8s 9d paid to Joseph Burton, Thomas Allanson (former

²⁸¹ YMA E3M/4.

²⁸² YMA E4a f.28r and 29r.

employees of Charles Crosby) and Edmond Barker.²⁸³ As had happened with the transfer of leadership on Minster projects from Alman to the Thompsons and from them to the Crosbys, the relationship with the skills of the workshop continued as new craftsmen emerged. It appears the men trained up under the Crosbys could continue their 'firm's' relationship with the Minster after 1703 and after the Crosbys themselves cease to be involved.

The Crosbys disappear from the historical record as suddenly as they had appeared some eighty years earlier, but their importance in preserving the glass, especially of the Chapter House, and of continuing the craft of glazing and glass-painting in York cannot be overestimated. The network of familial and employment affiliation, and the continuity of craftsmanship between the workshops of the Pettys, John Alman, the Thompsons and the Crosbys, is a vital part of the story of the glass, demonstrated by the active investment not only in the acquisition of new glass, but in sensitive and extensive repair not previously understood. This continuity of employment of a single glazing workshop under the control of a single family equipped with all the necessary skills, including glass-painting, survived the fractures of the Reformation and the Civil War relatively unscathed, but changes which had begun to appear in the 1690s began to gather pace at the turn of the eighteenth century. Although the broad range of repair and maintenance work undertaken by the glaziers continued, the specific supply of painted glass was increasingly given over to individuals who were not members of the guild and who operated alone. The first of these was Henry Gyles.

The separation of glass-painting as an 'art' 1690-1750

As discussed above, the first glimmers of separation of glass-painting may be seen in the differentiation of pay rates in the 1690s. The involvement of Edmund Gyles in the care of the Minster's glass and his possible craft skills in glass painting are discussed above, but despite this lineage, Henry's name does

²⁸³ YMA E4a, entry for 1704.

not appear in either register.²⁸⁴ Whilst it is possible that the requirement to be a freeman to practise the craft as a master within the city was simply not being enforced, it is more likely that glass-painting, perhaps under influence from London, was starting to be identified as a separate skill, moreover as an ‘art’ and not a ‘craft’ and therefore beyond the purview of the guild.²⁸⁵

This is an important and new distinction between two skills which hitherto had been under the one craft umbrella and controlled by one guild. The register of the guild of glaziers continued to 1742, but it appears that the separation of glass-painting from the wider craft of glazing contributed to its demise.²⁸⁶ If the guild could no longer control the quality of output or working practices of the most prominent or specialist of craftsmen (who, it would appear, now worked alone and not within a workshop structure), its function simply withered away.

The long-held assumption that the disappearance of glass-painting from York occurred sometime in the early seventeenth century and was ‘rediscovered’ has, I hope, been proved wrong; what the evidence for this later period does show is that there was starting to be a separation within the broad craft structure between the art and the craft instigated by Henry Gyles and later taken up by William Peckitt in the latter half of the eighteenth century. The career of Henry Gyles is discussed in Chapter Three, as it was principally the nature of patronage for glass-painting which defined his career. For the purposes of exploring his role within the development of the crafts, the key feature is his determination to be identified principally as a glass-painter and maker, not a glazier in the sense of a retained maintenance man.

²⁸⁴ *York Guild of Glaziers and Plumbers Ordinance Book; Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759.*

²⁸⁵ For the changing practices of London glaziers and glass painters, see Geoffrey Lane, “Adding Beauty to Light: London Glass-Painters 1660-1710”, *Journal of Stained Glass* 34 (2009), 50-61; For a wider discussion of the separation of art from craft, see Ayres, *Art, Artisans and Apprentices*.

²⁸⁶ This the date of the last entries in the register, although of course the craftsmen themselves continued.

Henry Gyles

Gyles elected to pursue the precarious life of a glass-painter as a specialism, but he was not attached to, or master of, a glazing workshop as had been the case with the painters amongst the Thompsons or the Crosbys. He was never employed by the Dean and Chapter as glazier, only ever as an occasional supplier of glass. This may have been part of Gyles' desire to define himself and promote his work as that of an 'artist', putting the emphasis on the 'painter' element of glass-painting and anxious to distinguish his working practices from those of the guild-ruled glaziers (like his father) who had gone before him. As Shawe-Taylor has noted "*All arts in the period aspired to the status of a 'liberal art', which means, in Dr. Johnson's words, an art 'worthy of a gentleman'... more intellectual than manual: to involve more thinking work.... than real work ...*".²⁸⁷

For Henry Gyles, this required the cultivation of sufficient patrons to allow him to concentrate solely on the 'higher calling' of painting on glass, an ambition he sadly never achieved. His lack of success in making glass-painting his sole occupation is perhaps not surprising, as the situation in London was equally parlous.²⁸⁸ Gyles was aware of the London glass-painters, particularly William Price. As Geoffrey Lane noted, Francis Place, the York engraver and sometime member of the York Virtuosi, visited Price in Holborn and, perhaps fearful of the competition, reported back to Gyles that by Price's reckoning there were only four glass painters in London "*but not work enough to Imploy one, if he did nothing Else.*"²⁸⁹ It is a mark of the continuing centrality of York as a northern hub of such crafts that Gyles could even consider such a venture. It is likewise a mark of Gyles' skill that the production of the elusive true red glass, which would prove to be such a quest for William Peckitt a hundred years later, was apparently achieved by Gyles in his flashed-ruby glass for University College Chapel: the noted diarist Robert Hooke wrote in 1689, "*one Giles of York glass-painter makes the true red glasse*".²⁹⁰ Henry Gyles' independent status, coupled

²⁸⁷ Desmond Shawe-Taylor, *The Georgian: Eighteenth-Century Portraiture & Society* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1990), 3.

²⁸⁸ Lane, "Adding 'Beauty to Light'", 50-61.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid*, 17.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid*, 58.

with the limited market for glass-painting, would have made it uneconomic for a glazing workshop to continue to invest in training for that skill and compete for that aspect of the work.

Apart from the purchases of glass for £1 2s 6d from Mr. Gyles again in 1707 and from Mr. Denton in 1719 (£7 15s 5d) and 1721 (£1 14s), the accounts between 1705 and 1730 consist mostly of single line entries of payments “To the glaziers” or “The Glaziers bill”. They give no detail but are for consistently large sums of up to £42 2s 11d (1720).²⁹¹ The total expenditure (including glass) in this twenty-five-year period of £550 6s 7d, a considerable increase on the amount for the preceding twenty-five years. The separation in the accounts between payments for glass and payments to the glaziers indicates that this work was principally repair, perhaps cleaning and re-leading, rather than new work. The relative consistency of the amounts is commensurate with a concerted, planned programme of repair, not new schemes. This interpretation supported by the patronage patterns of the relevant deans which are discussed in Chapter Three. This hypothesis is further supported by the lack of impact on the costs of the programme of the death of Henry Gyles in 1709. The loss of (apparently) York’s only remaining glass painter could reasonably have been expected to result in a decline in expenditure, but the unchanged nature of the accounts strongly suggests that little if any new stained or painted glass was being bought. It also underlines the reality of the distinction between the suppliers of glass (whether as a raw material or painted) and the lead glaziers installing it.

The brevity of the account entries in this period was fleshed out in three instances by additional notes of expenses entered in the Day Book. A note for a payment made 19th September 1706 to Thomas Allanson, glazier, for £10 may have been included in the total glaziers’ sum, but the purchase of the “*Plain and painted glass brought from the East window of St. Martin Coney Street £16 5s*” in February 1723/4 (which will be discussed in Chapter Three) and the further purchase of “*blue and purple glass bought from Robert Blackburne of Bolsterstone £8*” on 2nd March 1724/5 were not included.²⁹² This latter entry is

²⁹¹ YMA E3/75, 87, 89, 88 respectively.

²⁹² YMA E4/b f.22v and 23v.

highly significant for what it tells us about the early years of production of coloured window glass in England.

The changing nature of glass supply: Yorkshire glass production 1651-1758

As discussed above, the best quality glass in England in the late seventeenth century was made in Newcastle. Attempts to match the quality of, and thus replace, continental imports with English-made glass had been encouraged by the royal patents issued to Zouche and Mansell and numerous small manufactories had sprung up as a result. One such was in Bolsterstone, a village near Sheffield, which was a centre for glass and glaze production, having a furnace periodically in use from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries.²⁹³ The furnace, owned in 1724 by Robert Blackburne, is known from archaeological and documentary dating to have been in use for glass production (as opposed to firing of glazed ceramics) from the mid-to-late seventeenth century until c.1758.²⁹⁴ The scientific report on the excavated site does not contain any mineral analysis which might have confirmed whether the furnace was used to produce blue or purple window glass (as opposed to the blue vessel glass spoil found on the site in the nineteenth century), but the date range for the furnace operation as a glass furnace is consistent with the date of the acquisition of this glass by Thomas Allanson in 1724.

The glasshouse was founded by George Fox (born 1643) sometime after the Restoration and concentrated initially on ceramic glazes with some work in vessel glass.²⁹⁵ This suggests they lacked the technical expertise to produce the purity of even, flat sheets necessary for use in window glazing. Following his death (1690 x 1701), the glasshouse passed to Robert Blackburne on his marriage to Fox's widow in 1702. At this point (from the surviving examples) it

²⁹³ Ian Bailiff, "Bolsterstone Glass House, Stocksbridge, Sheffield, South Yorkshire: Luminescence Dating Report" Research Department Report Series No.98-2010 (London: English Heritage, 2010).

²⁹⁴ Ibid, 14-15.

²⁹⁵ Joseph Kenworthy, *Handbook no 6 to 'The Early History of Stocksbridge and District': Subject - The Bolsterstone Glasshouse and its place in English Glassmaking* (Sheffield: published by the author, 1914), 20-21.

appears expertise in the production of good-quality glass increased. Fox's son, John (born 1682), was later referred to as 'glassmaker', having taken on the Bolsterstone glasshouse after Blackburne's death in 1727. John Fox's widow died in 1757 followed by their son, Michael in 1758, at which point production abruptly ceased.²⁹⁶ This is important evidence for the production of coloured glass in this area, and a unique instance of being able to identify the specific place of manufacture of glass being used before the nineteenth century. The Bolsterstone furnace opened up opportunities for glass painting and design using locally-sourced glass. Whilst the glasshouse itself would have kept its recipes a closely-guarded secret, it would have been possible for York stained glass artists and glaziers to source their materials directly from the manufacturer and perhaps even discuss the production of specific colours or effects for individual projects.

York glass painting in the eighteenth century

William Peckitt

Following on from the influx of continental stained-glass artists in the early seventeenth century, London had remained a centre for post-Reformation glass-painting in England, but as this chapter has shown, not the only centre.²⁹⁷ Until the death of William Price the Younger in 1765, the pre-eminent figures in London glass-painting were those of the Price family. William Price the Elder died in 1709, the same year as Henry Gyles, and was succeeded by his son Joshua. He in turn was succeeded by his son, William the Younger (born between 1702 and 1707, died 1765), a contemporary of the York glass-painter William Peckitt's for at least the first decade or so of Peckitt's career.²⁹⁸ William Peckitt's career is discussed in Chapter Three, and there is no doubt that he was a prominent exponent of his art, yet seemingly disconnected from the long tradition of glass-painting in York. Knowles' speculation that Peckitt had trained under Gyles was rightly dismissed by Brighton and others on the grounds that Gyles' death in

²⁹⁶ Ibid, 17-19.

²⁹⁷ Lane, "A World Turned Upside Down", 45-75; "Adding 'Beauty to Light'", 50-61.

²⁹⁸ J.A. Knowles, "The Price Family of Glass-Painters," *Antiquaries Journal* 33 (1953), 184-192.

1709 pre-dated Peckitt's birth by more than twenty years; likewise, his dismissal of Knowles' 'suspicion' that he might have trained under Price on the grounds of 'no evidence' appears to support Peckitt's assertion that he had trained himself.²⁹⁹ Whilst there certainly is no evidence that Peckitt went to London to be apprenticed to Price or to be trained in a formal sense, it is possible that Peckitt could have had some informal contact with Price and probable that he would have been influenced by him or his work, not least as they shared some of the same patrons, including Horace Walpole.³⁰⁰ He would probably have been aware of Price's work at Turner's Hospital, Kirkleatham (installed 1742), and the circulation of information via the press discussed in Chapter Four would mean Peckitt could have had access to news of Price's work, or seen his advertisements.³⁰¹

The reproduction in the January 1758 edition of *The Gentleman's Magazine* of a 1616 treatise on "*The Manner how to Anneile, or Paint in Glass, the True Receptes of the Cullors...* in the collection of Sir Peter Thompson" [Figure 30] would certainly have been of some use to Peckitt then and quite possibly earlier if he somehow had access to a copy of the treatise.³⁰² Sir Peter Thompson was a wealthy merchant turned antiquarian and collector, a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries and his collection was known amongst his fellow antiquaries.³⁰³ It is also possible that Peckitt worked with Jeffrey Linton, a glazier who appears in the Minster accounts and who worked on the east window of St

²⁹⁹ Brighton and Sprakes, "Medieval and Georgian Stained Glass in Oxford and Yorkshire ", 381.

³⁰⁰ The patronage of Peckitt is discussed in Chapter Three.

³⁰¹ Knowles, "The Price Family of Glass-Painters."; William Price, *Glass-Painting Reviv'd* (London, 1720).

³⁰² "The manner how to anneile, or paint in glass, the true receptes of the cullors, the or-..'" (January 1758). *The Gentleman's Magazine: And Historical Chronicle, Jan. 1736-Dec. 1833*, 28, 9-11. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/8285415?accountid=15181>. This was an extract from the original work by W. Geddes, ed. *A Booke of Sundry Draughtes (Leaded Glass), Principally Serving for Glasiers and Not Impertinent for Plasterers, and Gardiners: Besides Sundry Other Professions Whereunto Is Annexed the Manner How to Annile in Glas: And Also the True Forme of the Furnace and the Secretes Thereof. By Wa. Gedde*, Facsimile ed. (London: The Leadenhall Press, 1615; reprint, 1898). The identity of Walter Geddes is discussed in Anthony Wells-Cole, "Who was Walter Geddes?", *Furniture History* XXVI, (1990), 183-190.

³⁰³ <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1715-1754/member/thompson-sir-peter-1698-1770>; Sir Peter Thompson's antiquarian activities are also discussed in Sweet, *Antiquaries*, 18 & 42.

Michael-le-Belfrey in 1746 [Figure 31].³⁰⁴ Linton signed his St Michael-le-Belfrey work, which it may be presumed would have had an associated contract, but this does not survive. Crucially, however, it was painted glass he inserted, only five years before William Peckitt began his career.

In 1751, Peckitt asserted that he had rediscovered the art of glass-painting and staining and his surviving glass certainly indicates continuous experimentation.³⁰⁵ In 1793, Peckitt wrote a treatise "*The Principals of Introduction into that rare but fine and elegant art of painting and staining of glass*" in which he set out the various recipes and methods he had learned or discerned for making different colours, including the elusive good-quality red.³⁰⁶ The difficulty of producing a long-lasting deep red which was not so dark as to appear black had long been the holy grail of post-medieval glass painting and Peckitt's treatise described a variety of approaches including a way of creating a red stain as an alternative to the more conventional red 'flash', the principle of applying a very thin layer of red glass to a clear substrate.³⁰⁷ The pieces of red glass Peckitt installed in the tracery of n27, dated 1779, are red stain: the variation in the depth of colour (some do appear almost black) demonstrates the difficulty Peckitt had in mastering this process. From this it is obvious that he took a very practical, experimental approach to perfecting his art, laying great emphasis on the scientific nature of the work, but with practical notes clearly born of experience. The title of his treatise combines both scientific terminology (*Principals*) with a clear steer that this is a "*fine and elegant art*", not a craft.

Despite his self-promotion as the single-handed saviour of the art of glass painting in York, Peckitt was not the only supplier of painted glass to the Minster. Painted glass was bought in 1755 from Edward Matterson: at 12d per foot the expenditure of £1 16s represented 36 feet of painted glass, but no destination for the glass within the Minster was given, nor the nature of the

³⁰⁴ Linton paid to become a freeman as a plumber and glazier in 1733, but does not appear in the guild register. *Register of the Freeman of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*, Surtees Society 102, 237.

³⁰⁵ Brighton and Sprakes, "Medieval and Georgian Stained Glass in Oxford and Yorkshire", 381.

³⁰⁶ Transcribed in Brighton, *The Enamel Glass-painters of York*, Appendix III.

³⁰⁷ J. Trevor Brighton and Roy Newton, "Unravelling an 18th Century Mystery: Peckitt's Red Glasses," *Stained Glass Quarterly: The Stained Glass Association of America* 81, no. 3 (1986), 214-220.

painting.³⁰⁸ The identity and status of Matterson is intriguing. A York man named Edward Matterson was admitted as a freeman in 1749/50 and described as 'plum. & glazier'.³⁰⁹ By this date this would indicate he was not particularly also a glass-painter, although he may have undertaken simple black line decoration. Although he would have been 75, he may be the same man who was a Common Council-man for the Micklegate ward in 1803 and was described at the time of his death in 1810 as 'gent'.³¹⁰ There is no information as to how Matterson would be in possession of 36 feet of painted glass, or where it came from if he was not the creator. However, given the price charged, it is likely that the Matterson purchase was either of old scrap glass for repairs, or new, but very simply painted, glass rather than new figurative glass. In the latter instance, it may be that Matterson was acting as a middle-man, not painting the glass himself. Nevertheless, it does suggest that the pool of suppliers of glass from which the Minster could and did draw in this period was wider than has sometimes been suggested and certainly spread beyond William Peckitt. Whether it spread beyond York to London is debatable, but the cost and complexity of transporting complete panels, as evidenced by the 1804 acquisition of the sixteenth-century glass from Herkenrode Abbey by Lichfield cathedral, suggest local sources are more likely.³¹¹

In the 1770s, the routine work of caring for the integrity of the windows and installing the work of others continued to be undertaken by family firms, notably the Clarkes, accorded the title 'glazier', but the nature of the work was limited.³¹² The transfer of the title 'glazier' from Mr. Clarke to his widow in 1790, and the presentation of bills for glass from Mrs. Peckitt in 1796 and 1797 (see Chapter Three) added an interesting socio-economic note to the accounts, which would merit further investigation as they were both clearly continuing their

³⁰⁸ YMA E3/123.

³⁰⁹ *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*, 271.

³¹⁰ William Southeran's *York Guide*, 1803 lists Matterson as a Common Council-man. The register entry for the granting of probate for Matterson's will is in The National Archives (IR/26/433)

³¹¹ Yvette vanden Bemden, *The Sixteenth-Century Glass from Herkenrode Abbey, Belgium, in Lichfield Cathedral [and Elsewhere]*, ed. Jill Kerr, et al. (London: Adlard, 1986); Marie Groll, "The Installation and Restoration History of the Sixteenth Century Herkenrode Glass at Lichfield Cathedral (1795 -1945)," (University of York: MA thesis, 2011). The glass is the subject of a forthcoming CVMA volume by vanden Bemden and Groll.

³¹² YMA E4d.

husbands' businesses as widows, but it is beyond the scope of this thesis to explore this further. By 1799 Mrs Clarke had become simply 'Clark the Glazier' again - perhaps there was a son now old enough to take on the business?³¹³ The eighteenth century had seen the resurgence of York to a position of dominance in the field of glass painting and a renewed (but not new) pattern of care. It also, as will be discussed in Chapter Four saw the windows take centre stage in the growth of secular interest in the Minster as a historic monument.

Conclusion

York has long been recognised as a regional hub for the specialist skills of glass staining and painting in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but this did not fall away at the Reformation as has been supposed. The established workshop structures, which allowed specialist skills to be preserved and nurtured, contracted but survived and adapted to new circumstances, passing skills on through the network of the long-standing apprenticeship system. This ensured glass painting and staining did not die out in York from the mid-sixteenth century until its 'revival' by Peckitt, but continued unbroken under the Thompsons and the Crosbys as part of the repertoire of a glazier's workshop team. It was the changing attitudes of the eighteenth century to art and craft which appears to have accelerated the separation of the artistic arm from the more prosaic manual labour of leadwork and repair, resulting in independent glass painters operating outside the workshop system. This hastened the demise of the glaziers' guild, but the seeds of this had already been sown in the 1690s.

This separation was most clearly expressed by William Peckitt, who was at great pains to emphasise his distance from those around him and what had gone before, even to the point of making claims which were at best disingenuous. This resurgence of interest in glass-painting and staining and its reframing as an 'art' ironically broke a link which had existed for over four hundred years and which had ensured the preservation of those skills through most testing times. It was a link which was to be restored gradually in the

³¹³ YMA E3/164 and paper accounts E4a f.81-84v.

workshops of London and Birmingham in the second half nineteenth century, but not in York until the latter part of the twentieth century and the establishment of the York Glaziers Trust.

CHAPTER THREE: - PATRONAGE

Introduction

The late medieval patronage of stained glass in York, as well as other cities and in Europe, has been widely studied.³¹⁴ David King has explored the patronage patterns of a Norwich workshop which was in operation for at least one hundred and fifty years to 1500, while Richard Marks dealt with questions of donors and patronage as the first chapter in his 1993 work on the stained glass of England.³¹⁵ In York, schemes initiated by archbishops, such as Archbishop Thoresby's completion of the eastern arm in the mid-fourteenth century, had stimulated a century of personal patronage from senior clerics and the wealthy laity in a well-established pattern of donation or bequest repeated in cathedrals and large churches across the country.³¹⁶ Such relationships had funded major windows in planned schemes, such as the Great East Window (I), paid for by Bishop Walter Skirlaw of Durham, and the spectacular St William window (n7) bankrolled by the Roos family of Masham.³¹⁷

By the late fifteenth century, however, these major glazing schemes were complete: the windows were now effectively 'full' and thus the opportunities for patrons to be associated with prestigious and conspicuous acts of piety were severely limited. What did this mean for the maintenance of the traditional patterns of organised patronage which had underpinned such *grands projets*? The shields which completed the fifteenth-century Lantern tower glazing (LTN1-4 and LTS1-4), barely visible from the ground, were entirely those of the Dean and Chapter, the crossed keys of St Peter against variously coloured grounds, and not

³¹⁴ Richard Marks, "A Will Casts Light: Robert Hunt and the West Window of St Margaret's Church, Westminster," in *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Paul Binski and Elizabeth New (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2012), 366-385.

³¹⁵ David King, "Glass-Painting in Late-Medieval Norwich: Continuity and Patronage in the John Wighton Workshop," in *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Paul Binski and Elizabeth New (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2012); Marks, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages*.

³¹⁶ Sarah Brown, "*Our Magnificent Fabrick*": *York Minster: An Architectural History, c.1220-1500* (London: English Heritage, 2003); Richard Marks, "Windows, Wills and Words: The Language of Instruction and Inscription in Late Medieval Glazing Bequests" in *Word and Image Corpus Vitrearum 27th International Colloquium 7-11 July 2014* (York, 2014), 59-65.

³¹⁷ Sarah Brown, Brown, *Apocalypse: The Great East Window of York Minster*; French, *York Minster: The Great East Window*; Thomas French, *York Minster, the St William Window*, (Oxford; New York: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1999), 12-13.

those of aristocratic patrons: was this a deliberate choice by Chapter, or did it mark a decline in their ability to secure patronage from the nobility?

The chapter begins with a discussion of the rare example of a window commemorating a glazier, Mayor John Petty, and the questions around the donation of a memorial window to Archbishop Rotherham. The last late-medieval example of organised patronage by the Dean and Chapter, the rebuilding of St Michael le Belfrey church 1527-1532, came on the eve of the Reformation, but what does this project tell us about how concepts of patronage networks were already changing? The Dissolution and Reformation not only destroyed a significant market for stained glass, but also removed one of the principal motivations for personal patronage in that medium, that of invoking prayers for the dead.

This chapter explores those religious changes and considers to what extent it is possible to connect the programme of payments for repair or renewal discussed in Chapter Two with the personalities and religious leanings of the members of Chapter either individually or as a collegiate body, before moving onto an assessment and analysis of the evidence for later sixteenth-century patronage within the glazing of the Minster and what impact that had on the programme of work.

A study of the dominating influence on Minster affairs of the seventeenth-century archbishops includes questioning the significance of the Arminian faction on attitudes to the glass and a consideration of the climate in which the first post-Reformation memorial in glass was created, that of Archbishop Lamplugh (died 1691). The reassertion of diaconal authority in the eighteenth century particularly under Dean Finch and Dean Fountayne had a demonstrable impact on the appearance of the Minster interior, but what were the motivations behind some of the changes in the glass and how did those decisions in particular relate to the latter's foundational patronage of William Peckitt?

Memorial glass of the early sixteenth century

The glazier John Petty's memorial window

The record of payments of 24s 6d for “*vitriator cum vitri*” to William Petty in 1507/8 and 16s to Robert in 1509/10 within the fabric rolls and what these payments may have been for is discussed in Chapter Two; here I will consider the context in which such a window was permissible.³¹⁸ Knowles first noted that John Petty (d. 1508) was once featured kneeling at a prayer desk in window s18 [Figure 24], taking his information from antiquarian sources and suggesting the link between the payments and the glazing of these windows.³¹⁹ The memorial window to John Petty was discussed by O'Connor in an essay in 2004 and set in the broader context of the history of the glazing of the south front of the Minster.³²⁰ He posited that the Petty family were responsible for the re-glazing of all these windows as part of a modernisation scheme which began with the installation of the Tudor rose glass in the gable window c.1490 and ended with the installation of the memorial window to John Petty c.1510.

The inclusion of a privately-funded secular donor window in such a prominent location (the south transept was the civic entrance and conceived by the thirteenth-century Archbishop Walter Gray as a piece of spatial theatre), and payment for its installation, was interpreted by O'Connor as a mark of the esteem in which Petty and his family workshop was held by the Minster authorities. In allowing the installation of this non-noble layman's memorial glass in the south front, however, were the Dean and Chapter recognising the contribution of a master craftsman, or were they being forced to cast the patronage net ever wider to fund the replacement of the thirteenth-century grisaille with more contemporary figurative work? In terms of an iconographically-coherent scheme for the central section, however, it could be interpreted as an attempt to reinforce the hierarchical relationship of the church over the city. If the gable window (S16, the Rose window) was re-glazed with the

³¹⁸ YMA E3/34 and 35: “*Et in vadio fabri custodi horilogium et lez chyem ac faciendum Instrumentum fferis ad facta perine 4s 4d*”.

³¹⁹ John A Knowles, "Glass-Painters of York - Sir John Petty," *Notes and Queries* S IX, no. 12 (1921), 61-64.

³²⁰ O'Connor, "John Petty, Glazier and Mayor of York", 254.

roses reputedly representing the union of the houses of York and Lancaster and the tier below glazed with Saints Peter and Paul alongside key northern sainted bishops, the placing of the kneeling figure of the mayor of the city in the row below neatly reminded the civic dignitaries leaving by the south door, or approaching via Stonegate, of whose territory they were entering and their status within it.³²¹ Whilst the window afforded the Petty family both a shop window for their skills and (as noted by O'Connor) the 'exceptionally rare' opportunity to depict a glazier in glass, it nevertheless depicted the leading civic authority kneeling beneath leading figures of the church.³²²

Archbishop Rotherham's window

It is possible to conceive of the Petty panel being inserted here because the whole façade of the south transept as recorded by these antiquarian writers (as distinct from the central section discussed above) does not appear to have had a single coherent and overarching iconographic scheme. Large figures of saints associated with the Minster occupied the lights below the rose window [Figure 32], but the other windows (s16, s18, s23, s25) were occupied variously by clear glazing or apparently isolated images including a now-lost memorial window to Archbishop Rotherham discussed below. In this regard the aisles of the south transept, despite flanking the principal entrance from the city and the civic entrance, were seemingly treated no differently from the nave. Glazing was inserted either as donors or their relatives funded it, or as the Minster authorities were willing to pay for it, depicting whatever the donor chose. The

³²¹ This interpretation of the red and white colouration cannot be traced in eighteenth-century printed sources. I have been unable to identify a precise origin date, but the tentative speculation by Canon Harrison in his 1927 *Painted Glass of York* (p.15) that this might help to date the glass suggests it is a twentieth-century interpretation.

³²² O'Connor notes on p.257 that this Petty memorial window was one of only three known representations of a glazier in stained glass, only one of which now survives. This now-lost glass featuring Petty was drawn and the inscription noted by the antiquarian Henry Johnston (see Bodleian Library MS Top Yorks C14 f.94r) and the details of the image and inscription recorded by the antiquarian James Torre, both in the seventeenth century. When both Torre and Johnston recorded the glass, it had already been repaired by Edmund and Henry Gyles (see Hildyard *Antiquities of York City*, 69) who in 1662 had inserted a Renaissance-style strapwork cartouche above the figure, replacing simple quarries. The significance of this piece in the career of Henry Gyles, being only sixteen years old when it was installed, is discussed by O'Connor (p.260) and his career is further explored in Chapter 2. These are the earliest records of this image as no workshop records survive.

continuation of the medieval tradition which had glazed the nave, that of individual windows being donated by whoever could afford it whilst not necessarily conforming to a pre-determined schema, contrasted with the very clear plan for the major windows of the eastern arm. This had created the environment within which Petty's window could be permitted, but does not so readily explain the creation of the memorial window to Archbishop Thomas Rotherham.

With some exceptions, most earlier archbishops buried in the Minster had chosen either the south transept (de Grey, de Ludham, de Bovil) or somewhere in the eastern arm (Thoresby, Bowet, Savage, Scrope) once the south transept had become 'full'. Rotherham had also elected to be buried at the east end, on the north side of the Lady Chapel, although this area too was becoming somewhat congested.³²³ Some were also represented in glass, either heraldically or as figures (e.g. Melton and de Bovil in w1), but none of these was created as a memorial, nor depicted the archbishop in the pose of Melton, that of a supplicant donor before a saint. The presence of his glass in the south transept in this pose suggests there may have been a new intention to develop this area as a place of archiepiscopal commemoration in glass, connecting this later archbishop with his sainted predecessors, William and Wilfrid, depicted to the east (s20 and s22) and reinforcing the visual message to the city.³²⁴

Rotherham died of the plague in 1500 at the archiepiscopal palace at Cawood, although his tomb was not erected in the Minster until 1506.³²⁵ None of his memorial window survives, but Torre described a window in the west aisle of the south transept (s25) containing a coat of arms and the figure of an archbishop kneeling in the attitude of a donor:

'3 roebucks tripped A attered O a large image of a saint archbishop robed azure & O glory of azure with a prayer book and a crozier and mitre O.

³²³ His tomb chest was moved after the 1829 fire and now serves as the altar in St Nicholas Chapel in the north transept. Ian Pattison and Hugh Murray, *Monuments in York Minster: An Illustrated Inventory*, 2nd edn. (York: The Friends of York Minster, 2001), entry 19.

³²⁴ The arms of Rotherham's successor, Archbishop Thomas Savage (d.1507), are also present in s22 although Savage himself chose to be commemorated in the splendid tomb in the north quire aisle.

³²⁵ E. B. Fryde and Diana Eleanor Greenway, *Handbook of British Chronology*, 3rd edn., reproduced with corrections (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 282.

At the bottom kneels an Archbishop with a prayer book before him robed B&A, having an escarole also turned about his head'.

This kneeling figure can be identified as Rotherham, as only his arms appear in the window. The 'saint archbishop' before whom Rotherham knelt may have been St. William, Thomas' twelfth-century predecessor whose tomb in the east end of the nave was visible from the window's location. It is also possible it was Thomas Becket, Rotherham's name saint, although the antiquarian James Torre was usually careful to record images of Becket as 'a certain archbishop' rather than a 'saint archbishop'. Other Minster images of Becket, notably in the Parker window in the north quire aisle (n9) [Figure 33], show him with red robes and holding a primatial cross, not a crozier as here, so the identification is uncertain. Rotherham did not leave a bequest for a window in his will, although that is in no way uncommon, as specific bequests for glass are very rare.³²⁶ Rotherham's executors included the Dean of York Geoffrey Blythe, the Treasurer Hugh Trotter, the Archdeacon of York Henry Canebull, as well as Edmund Carter, the keeper of the Chapel of St Mary and All Angels which adjoined the north nave aisle.³²⁷ Rotherham may have made separate provision with them for funding the window, however, no costs associated with its installation are mentioned in the surviving fabric accounts for the years immediately before or after Rotherham's tomb was installed in 1506, which suggests that it was not originally conceived as part of a memorial scheme by Rotherham.³²⁸ Nor does it appear to have been associated with the establishment of an altar or chantry: the two nearest were an altar to St John of Beverley by the south door and an altar to St. William "on the north-west side of the south-west pillar of the lantern".³²⁹ Whilst it is possible that the window was visible from this latter altar at certain angles, perhaps favouring the sainted figure being William, the physical distance between the two meant the window could not have served any

³²⁶ *Testamenta Eboracensia: A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Vol. IV*, 145.

³²⁷ *Ibid*, 148.

³²⁸ There are two surviving fabric rolls for the period 1500-1509, YMA E3/33 and 34, dated 1504 and 1507-08 respectively. The period of the installation of Rotherham's tomb would be a likely date for the window, but the rolls for that year do not survive.

³²⁹ Raine, *The Fabric Rolls of York Minster*, 288 (St John of Beverley) and 305 (St. William).

devotional or liturgical function in relation to the altar. If the sainted archbishop were Thomas Becket, however, then it would be referencing both Rotherham and the archbishop of the time, Cardinal Thomas Wolsey.

It is very likely that the creation of the commemorative glass for Archbishop Rotherham was the project for which the expensive glass and specialist skills of John Dothwaite and John Dere, members of John Alman's workshop were purchased in 1529/30, after Rotherham's death, as discussed in Chapter Two.³³⁰ The glass as described by Torre contained rich colours: dark blue, light blue, yellow (for gold).³³¹ The blues used for the robes of the saint and the archbishop would certainly have been continental imports.³³² The payment for the design and setting up would have been a separate contract, if they were following usual practice, but it is perhaps surprising that the project was not identified in the fabric accounts if this was the sole purpose of the purchase. It is conceivable that glass was bought in bulk for more than one project, but the purchase does raise the interesting possibility that the memorial window was paid for by the Dean and Chapter some thirty years after Rotherham's death.³³³ Why might this have been the case?

This purchase was recorded in the final two years of the archbishopric of the entirely absent Cardinal Wolsey: as Claire Cross has noted "*...Wolsey never resided and performed all his archiepiscopal duties in the north through deputies*", one of whom was Dean Bryan Hygdon.³³⁴ Wolsey had become archbishop in 1514 and by 1529 held the office in plurality with Durham and Winchester, although he would shortly be stripped of all his honours except that of archbishop. His involvement in the affairs of the Minster itself was entirely vicarious through his deputy, Dean Hygdon. The creation of this window therefore suggests the Dean and Chapter, most particularly the dean, were making a point in continuing a programme of refurbishment of the south front glazing by commemorating a former archbishop who had been noted for his

³³⁰ YMA E3/39.

³³¹ YMA L7/1 f.42.

³³² Marks, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages*, 30-31.

³³³ The lost contract for Rotherham's window would, of course, clarify all.

³³⁴ Cross, "From Reformation to Restoration", 193.

loyalty to the crown and who was especially conscientious in his local episcopal duties.³³⁵

The dean in question was Brian Hygdon [also Higden] (1516-1539). A protégé and vicar-general of Wolsey, Hygdon was a conscientious dean: living in York and presiding at most Chapter meetings, he took a keen interest in the affairs and well-being of the Minster.³³⁶ His income from the twenty or so estates attached to his office and his share of the common fund was considerable and he would certainly have been able to afford to pay for a window.³³⁷ He may have wished to balance the inclusion of the secular figure of John Petty with that of Thomas Rotherham, the namesake of his patron, or to boost Wolsey's image in York, perhaps guided by Wolsey himself. This may also strengthen the argument that the saint depicted was Thomas Becket. Although Wolsey himself never planned to be buried in the Minster, having arranged for a magnificent tomb at Windsor, the south transept had been a place of memorialisation for the archbishops in the thirteenth century and it is conceivable that Hygdon was building on that tradition by visibly reconnecting archiepiscopal authority with the city.³³⁸ In his will dated 4th June 1539 (he died on 5th June) he left £13 6s 8d to works in the Minster, a relatively modest sum given the extent of his other bequests, but one which demonstrated his ongoing support for work to the fabric to which it seems he had already contributed both personally and as Wolsey's representative in York.³³⁹

³³⁵ A. Tindal Hart, *Ebor: A History of the Archbishops of York from Paulinus to Maclagan, 627-1908* (York: William Sessions, Ebor Press, 1986), 87-91.

³³⁶ David Palliser, *Tudor York* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 214, 216; A. G. Dickens, *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York 1509-1588*, 2nd edn. (London: The Hambledon Press, 1982), 18, 26, 159; Peter Gwyn, *The King's Cardinal: the Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1990), 301. Gwyn describes him as "one of Wolsey's most active ecclesiastical administrators", 319.

³³⁷ Cross, "From Reformation to Restoration", 193-4.

³³⁸ For comment on the south transept see Eric Gee, "Architectural History until 1290," in *A History of York Minster*, ed. Aylmer and Cant, 145

Wolsey's tomb, carved by Benedetto da Rovezzano, was eventually used for Admiral Lord Nelson and moved to St. Paul's. <http://collections.rmg.co.uk/collections/objects/119543.html>.

³³⁹ TNA: PROB 11/26, f.114r-v.

The pre-Reformation Dean and Chapter as patrons: the St Michael-le-Belfrey project

If the pattern of glazing expenditure in the first half of the sixteenth century could be characterised as one of general maintenance with a few small projects, that did not mean the Dean and Chapter lacked ambition or artistic vision. From the late fifteenth-century onwards the parish church of St Michael-le-Belfrey, for which the Minster was responsible, had fallen into a ruinous state and was beyond repair; the regular and formal complaints of the parishioners detailed a list of deficiencies far worse than the 1519 Presentment of the Minster's dusty reredos!³⁴⁰ As Saunders noted, the majority of the funding for the rebuilding project came from the Chapter, both as a body corporate and individually.³⁴¹ After years of neglect, it was a remarkable change in the Chapter's attitude to the church, which overnight became a focus for an outpouring of patronage.

This too might be explained by Hygdon acting in a dual capacity as both dean and as Wolsey's deputy and agent in York. While there is no suggestion that Wolsey himself was ever to be involved in the direction or expense of the project, the striking design of the rebuilt church and some of the stained glass could be interpreted as Hygdon bringing some of the cardinal's glamour to York at a time when Wolsey's star was still in the ascendant. Dean Hygdon, acting as former archbishops had done, was able to generate patronage on the model of the great Minster schemes, notably here including a set of windows which depicted the life and death of Thomas Becket. Politically astute Chapter members as well as parishioners took the opportunity to be patrons associated with the project.

Where the costs were to be met from the fabric funds, the expenses for work on St Michael's were usually noted specifically: for example, in 1527/8 workmen were paid to work explicitly on '*ecclesia Sancti Michaelis de Berefrido*'.³⁴² But the use of the same workmen and some materials on both the

³⁴⁰ Saunders, "Minster and Parish ", 10-11.

³⁴¹ Ibid, 17-18.

³⁴² YMA E3/39.

Minster and the St Michael project sometimes blurred the boundaries. For example, in 1535/6 twenty-two wisps of coloured and eight wisps of white Burgundy glass were purchased from William Matthewson of Hull, a dealer who does not otherwise feature in the Minster accounts. These were not listed as being St. Michael-le-Belfrey expenses, but it was a large amount of specialist glass and its proposed destination was not given.³⁴³ If these were supplies for John Alman's workshop to make the series of St Thomas windows in St Michael's, discussed above and in Chapter Two, this may account for why their 'repossession' to repair the St Cuthbert window in 1581 was considered acceptable, and says something about boundaries between ideas of patronage and ownership.³⁴⁴

That a series of Becket panels depicting the life and martyrdom of a saint of whom imagery had been prohibited since 1536 was still intact in a parish church in 1581 to be 'repossessed' and re-used indicates the post-Reformation religious leanings of both the parishioners and more broadly the Dean and Chapter who continued to be responsible for the church and its fabric. If Hygdon's original impetus for the rebuilding had been an attempt to evoke the archbishop's presence in York, Wolsey's downfall and death in 1529/30 meant that association was now politically dangerous for Hygdon and for York. Did the installation of the memorial glass to Archbishop Thomas Rotherham in 1530, with its associated image of Thomas Becket, in the façade facing the Belfrey church provide a convenient 'alternative' archbishop Thomas with which to associate the patronage and some of the iconography of this project? In any event, this was the last significant example of collective patronage of stained glass organised by the Dean and Chapter until the modern era.

The immediate impact of the Reformation on Minster patronage

In a Minster now full of stained glass, the opportunities for new work were necessarily limited, irrespective of the new religious landscape, but even

³⁴³ YMA E3/43.

³⁴⁴ Saunders, "Minster and Parish", 28-29; Koopmans, "Early Sixteenth-Century Stained Glass at St Michael-Le-Belfrey and the Commemoration of Thomas Becket in Late Medieval York", 1058.

the desire to maintain all the stained glass not simply in good repair, but with complete and coherent iconography, would have been viewed with some distrust by the first truly Protestant archbishop of York, Robert Holgate. Holgate had been a member of the Gilbertine order, but had accepted Henry VIII's supremacy and embraced, albeit more for pragmatism than ideological conviction, the Protestant reforms.³⁴⁵ The dean in 1547 was Nicholas Wotton, a career diplomat who successfully navigated the changing religious landscape, serving under all four Tudor monarchs. Largely absent from the Minster and from the conduct of its business, Wotton held the deanship in plurality with that of Canterbury, where he is buried.³⁴⁶ Wotton was the opposite of the conscientious Hygdon: he left the care and management of the Minster to his Chapter colleagues, particularly Precentor John Rokeby, whom Holgate had found to be conservative in the extreme.³⁴⁷ In this new environment, and with religiously conservative canons in charge of the finances, collegiate patronage evolved into a new model, that of maintaining the old glass as completely and coherently as possible. There was neither scope nor appetite for any new projects, but clergy like Rokeby could ensure that what was there already remained beautiful and visually complete.

The deposition and imprisonment of Mary, Queen of Scots, in 1567 threw Catholic sympathies into a harsher light however, and the Minster clergy were anxious to distance themselves from the unrest fomenting amongst the Catholic northern aristocracy which would result in the Northern Rebellion of 1569.³⁴⁸ Having been caught politically somewhat unawares by the arrival in York of the rebellious Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536, Chapter may have considered how their care and embellishment of the Minster expressed their commitment to Elizabeth's Protestant church.³⁴⁹ How could purely aesthetic considerations be

³⁴⁵ A.G. Dickens, "The Marriage and Character of Archbishop Holgate", *The English Historical Review*, 52 no.207 (London: 1937), 428-442.

³⁴⁶ Edward Hasted, "Canterbury Cathedral: The Deans (from the Reformation to 1672)," in *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent: Volume 12* (Canterbury: W. Bristow, 1801), 1-7.

³⁴⁷ Cross, "From Reformation to Restoration", 202.

³⁴⁸ K. J. Kesselring, *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics and Protest in Elizabethan England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

³⁴⁹ Geoffrey Moorhouse, *The Pilgrimage of Grace: The Rebellion That Shook Henry VIII's Throne* (London: Weidenfield & Nicholson, 2002), 112-113.

justified over and above the simple maintenance of a weather-proof building envelope? How this affected the repair to the St Cuthbert window in 1581 is currently part of doctoral work being undertaken by Katie Harrison (History of Art, York), because here the primary consideration seems to have been how the window looked as a single entity, even if the coherence of the narrative could not be maintained. But the installation of glass chosen for its aesthetic qualities, if less certainly for its iconography, was done under the tenure of Dean Matthew Hutton, a man whose religious inclinations throughout his career were decidedly Puritan.³⁵⁰ This suggests both that 'pictours' in glass were not a controversial issue (unlike other forms of imagery) within a religiously diverse Chapter, and that collectively they were still prepared to expend significant sums from their common maintenance fund on occasion to preserve the overall appearance of the Minster's windows. Such projects still required access to the specialist skills and workforce of glaziers' workshops like that led by Robert Thompson and his seventeenth-century successors as discussed in Chapter Two, but this new, reduced and reimagined form of Minster patronage could not sustain a whole workshop on its own. For workshops to survive, they needed new patrons.

The Crosby workshop and their patrons in the seventeenth century

Although the role of the Dean and Chapter as patrons had significantly declined, there is evidence that the Minster continued to serve as a 'shop window' for the skills of glass-painters and glaziers and assisted them in securing new patrons not only from outside ecclesiastical circles but for entirely secular projects. This provides an insight into post-Reformation models of patronage for stained glass, and the breadth of work a glass-painter could now expect to undertake. This can be demonstrated in the relationship secured between the Crosby workshop and Sir Arthur Ingram.

Sir Arthur Ingram was, amongst other lucrative appointments, Secretary to the Council of the North from 1612, a position he ruthlessly exploited to

³⁵⁰ Peter Lake, "Moving the Goalposts? Modified Subscription and the Construction of Conformity in the Early Stuart Church," in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*, ed. Peter Lake and Michael Questier, (Woodbridge: The Boydell press, 2000), 179-205.

amass a considerable fortune.³⁵¹ He had built a York mansion known as 'Ingram's Palace', in the ruins of the archiepiscopal palace on the north side of the Minster. Ingram felt it was incumbent upon him to build a house suited to his station in life, although he professed little personal interest in its appearance.³⁵² Whilst York was still the place to come to find skilled craftsmen of all kinds, and glaziers in particular, Ingram may well have been aware of the Crosby's work in the Minster, particularly the 1623 work to the aisle windows facing his property described in Chapter Two; indeed, it is possible that Ingram had already employed Crosby to work on glass for his York mansion. This closeness of association probably helped Marmaduke secure the Ingram contract for Temple Newsam, perhaps in competition with other glaziers in the city.

In 1622 the manor house and estate of Temple Newsam, on the outskirts of Leeds, were purchased by Ingram from the crown following their surrender by the impoverished Duke of Lennox for £12,000.³⁵³ This astute purchase enabled him to amass an estate of considerable size and value, which he proceeded to consolidate and improve.³⁵⁴ In the 1630s, Ingram began a programme of radical alteration and rebuilding to transform Temple Newsam into his principal country residence, and it was on this work that the Crosbys were employed from 1637.³⁵⁵ The records of work undertaken at Temple Newsam throughout the seventeenth century show payments to both Marmaduke and, later (1690), Christopher Crosby.³⁵⁶ The Crosbys worked for Ingram whilst continuing to be paid an annual salary by the Minster, and undertaking significant projects there.³⁵⁷ The Ingram contract was probably one of several which the Crosby workshop managed in parallel, although it is the only one for which records survive. The first of the Temple Newsam entries for Marmaduke Crosby was dated August 1637, two years after a major fire had gutted much of the house and significant restoration was required. Crosby arrived only a few months after a consignment of plain

³⁵¹ Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram, C.1565-1642: A Study of the Origins of an English Landed Family*, 161-171.

³⁵² *Ibid.*, 148-149.

³⁵³ *Ibid.*, 155.

³⁵⁴ Temple Newsam is the subject of Chapter 6 of Upton.

³⁵⁵ Ingram owned several country houses, including former Greville property in Warwickshire and Sheriff Hutton.

³⁵⁶ Brian Sprakes, "The Armorial Stained Glass at Temple Newsam," *Leeds Arts Calendar* 92 (1983), 22.

³⁵⁷ YMA E3/64.

glass from York, but it is my contention that Ingram employed him as a glass painter, not simply a glazier.³⁵⁸

Bernard Dininckhof (aka Dininhof, Dinickhoff, Dininckhoff), the Bohemian glazier and glass painter who had undertaken most of the work on the armorial glass at Temple Newsam is thought to have died early in 1637 necessitating the engagement of a new master glazier and glass painter.³⁵⁹ Dininckhof was an extremely accomplished glass-painter who had also worked at Gilling Castle, the home of the Fairfax family, making amongst other items a glass sundial [Figure 34]. Any successor would have to have been of a comparable standard, and Crosby may have collaborated on some projects with Dininckhof before the latter's death.³⁶⁰ Ingram's steward, John Mattison, oversaw all Ingram's building projects, but Ingram's abiding belief (articulated by Upton) that all his contractors were out to cheat him make it unlikely that the decision to hire the Crosbys was Mattison's alone.³⁶¹ Although Marmaduke Crosby continued working on Temple Newsam until 1659, the sequence of the creation of armorial glass is contemporary with the oversight of Sir Arthur himself: the attribution by Sprakes of a series of armorials and inscriptions [Figures 35 & 36] to the period 1637-1642 strongly suggests Marmaduke Crosby was hired as a glass painter as well as a glazier and that his engagement at Temple Newsam was because Ingram already knew of his skills from previous York contracts.³⁶² The workshop's relationship with Ingram continued until 1659, crucially (for the workshop) covering the period of the Commonwealth when they were no longer employed on the Minster work and were entirely reliant on secular patronage.³⁶³ It is clear that their previous relationship with the Dean and Chapter did not prejudice clients like Ingram against them – they were not tainted by association – his relationship was with

³⁵⁸ Sprakes, "The Armorial Stained Glass at Temple Newsam.", 18.

³⁵⁹ Ibid.

³⁶⁰ Hugh M. A. Murray, *The Great Chamber at Gilling Castle*, St Laurence Papers viii (York: Ampleforth Abbey Archives, 1996).

³⁶¹ Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram*, 184.

³⁶² A comparison between the shields in the north nave aisle (n28) dated 1623 and this unattributed glass from Temple Newsam, does show some similarities, although the (very fragmentary) 1623 shields are less confident and accomplished.

³⁶³ Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram*, 156.

the skills they could offer. Equally, on the restoration of the Dean and Chapter in 1660, the workshop's connections with Ingram, a staunch Parliamentarian, had not lost them the favour of their former patrons. Sought-after skills, it appears, could transcend questions of partisan loyalty.

The Dean and Chapter as patrons 1600-1700

From the late sixteenth century until the installation of the memorial to Archbishop Thomas Lamplugh in the 1690s, there is no surviving evidence, either in the glass or in the archival record, of any personal patrons paying for significant work on the windows, or of commissioning new projects within the Minster. The medieval model of planned patronage eliciting donations from a network of clerical and aristocratic donors had ceased at the Reformation and had not been replaced. The detailed record by the antiquarian James Torre made between 1675 and 1691 does not list any more shields from this period than are extant today, so this absence does not appear to be losses; the material was simply not there.³⁶⁴ Whilst it is possible that unknown individual donors were funding some of the work, there is a question as to what extent the Dean and Chapter as a body determined the nature of the work beyond the necessity of simple weatherproofing, and what role the allegiances and religious preferences of individual clergy played in the patronage of the glass.

Internal patronage 1600 - 1650

By 1550 York had lost six of its prebends, including its richest, that of Masham.³⁶⁵ The remaining thirty prebends were filled by appointees of the archbishops or, in the case of the deanship, the Crown, with several holding the posts in plurality or treating them as sinecures. The Chapter Act books and Visitation articles show that seldom did more than three or four of the thirty canons attend a Chapter meeting and in the early decades of the seventeenth

³⁶⁴ YMA L1/7.

³⁶⁵ These values and losses of these are detailed in Torre's 'Minster volume, YMA L1/4.

century this did not always include the dean.³⁶⁶ The most regular attendees were the senior residentiaries, usually the precentor, the chancellor and the Archdeacon of York, but as there were typically only three, sometimes four meetings each year, if they did not coincide with a period of residence, they had little compunction in staying away. The dean, as *primus inter pares*, would have had the most direct ability to steer the opinion of those present and for resident and active deans like Brian Hygdon and, later John Fountayne, the evidence suggests that they did so, but with the power of almost all prebendal appointments in the hands of the archbishop or the crown, the composition of Chapter was determined from outside the collegiate body.

The complex web of ecclesiastical patronage, where prebends were rewards for service, or given to support sons or nephews, became more acute in the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as married clergy provided preferment for their relations some of whom were not even ordained.³⁶⁷

Although Archbishops like Samuel Harsnet (1629-1631) and Richard Neile (1631-1640) were of a very distinct faction within the church, that of Arminianism, and undoubtedly appointed those from their own circle, it is difficult to determine to what extent this directly affected attitudes to the Minster's glass. The records of the Dean and Chapter likewise offer little insight: in the words of Claire Cross,

“Generalizations about the type of men who obtained York prebends, their attachment to the Minster, and the value to them of prebends in furthering their careers can be made with some accuracy. These generalizations, nevertheless, are limited by the nature of the records kept by the dean and chapter, for these records are almost exclusively administrative and financial. Consequently, a great deal can be known about the Minster as a corporation, singularly little about its spiritual life or the religious activities of the prebendaries.”³⁶⁸

³⁶⁶ W. H. Frere and W. W. Kennedy, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, 3 vols. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1910); Chapter Act Books YMA/H4 f.261r-519r.

³⁶⁷ YMA H4/f.225r. The sons of Archbishop Sandys were granted prebends whilst still students at Oxford in 1585.

³⁶⁸ Cross, "From Reformation to Restoration", 216-17.

In some other cathedrals, such as Durham (where the intemperate prebendary Peter Smart published detailed and inflammatory complaints about the behaviour of his fellow Durham canon John Cosin), it is possible to determine the churchmanship and attitudes of the Chapter members from their own published works and the cathedral records, but this is not the case in York.³⁶⁹ The few sermons published by prebendaries between 1600 and 1700 are limited to loyal addresses or commentaries on the nature of the judiciary for the Assizes and there are no theological tracts or polemical works attributable to them.³⁷⁰ Whilst this can be interpreted as an indication that they were moderate, even indifferent, in their churchmanship and any physical expression of it, changes did indeed take place in the ornamentation and decoration of the Minster in this period. It must, therefore, be from the sources of their preferment that conclusions are drawn.

The Arminian style of churchmanship favoured by Laud had strong pockets of clerical support in the north, with Richard Neile, Bishop of Durham (1617-1631), a keen follower of Laud, succeeding the reactionary and fervently anti-Puritan Samuel Harsnet as archbishop of York. Laud's interpretation of Arminianism in art and ornament favoured richness and flamboyance, as in the new chapels St. John's and Peterhouse Colleges, Cambridge, with "the most sumptuous decoration of chapel interiors".³⁷¹ Here Archbishop Laud and his followers (notably John Cosin, later Bishop of Durham, and College Master Matthew Wren) created the chapel of Peterhouse as an Arminian enclave at the heart of the university, with details in the imagery which strayed dangerously close to depicting former Catholic ritual.³⁷² The window at Peterhouse was designed as a five-light window of the crucifixion. By having a central light in which to depict the crucified body of Christ, this part of the scene was a natural

³⁶⁹ Peter Smart, *A catalogue of superstitious innovations in the change of services and ceremonies, of presumptuous irregularities, and transgressions, against the Articles of Religion*, (London, 1642), 5.

³⁷⁰ A detailed search of EEBO and other sources has produced no publications by York prebendaries in this period which give any insight into their churchmanship beyond loyalty to the Crown.

³⁷¹ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 230. For a detailed discussion of college chapels and the use and significance of imagery across the religious spectrum see Jago, "The Dissemination and Reassessment of Private Religious Space in Early Modern England 1600-1660". In particular, see Ch 3 "The Collegiate Chapel in Early Modern Oxford, c.1620-c.1660".

³⁷² Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud 1573-1645*, 206.

focus for attention and provided a central point below which the consecration of the Host could be performed [Figure 37]. Peterhouse chapel used the imagery in the windows to augment the more extreme aspects of Laudian doctrine: as Fincham and Tyacke note regarding the part of the image showing Longinus' spear piercing Christ's side, "Though the glass does not show the blood streaming from Christ's side, its association with the consecrated wine at the altar directly below this image is quite clear." [Figure 38].³⁷³ This may be contrasted with the portrayal of the crucifixion scene in the east window of Wadham College by Bernard van Linge, dated to 1621. This is likewise a five-light window, but there is no blood or spear in Christ's side [Figure 39] and the scene is only one of a series depicting scenes from the life of Christ: there is no implicit relationship to the Eucharist here. Whilst the chapel in Lincoln College, Oxford, also had extensive schemes of stained glass installed at this time, which it largely retains, the College opted for a four-light east window, which had no central point of focus, and which had texts beneath each scene stating the Bible passage depicted [Figure 40]. Here, the imagery was explicitly didactic, quite unlike Peterhouse's glass. As both Fincham, and Tyacke, and Parry have discussed in depth it was not only the Laudian party which favoured figurative stained glass, but it did form an important element with the wider concept of 'the beauty of holiness, particularly within cathedrals and (experimentally) in college chapels.'³⁷⁴ Controversy lay in the detail of representation, as in the positioning and spatial relationships of Peterhouse and Wadham's two crucifixion scenes, not the medium itself.³⁷⁵

If the university colleges were "experimenting with imagery and ritualism, testing to the limits what was acceptable in protestant worship", the same could not be said of the York Chapter.³⁷⁶ Following his appointment as archbishop in 1632, Neile had the opportunity to encourage the spread of

³⁷³ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 230.

³⁷⁴ Ibid, 227-273; Parry, *Glory, Laud and Honour*, 43-58; the wider role of cathedrals in relation to the introduction of Laudian practices is discussed in Atherton, "Cathedrals, Laudianism, and the British Churches."

³⁷⁵ For an in-depth discussion of these chapels in this period, see Jago, "The Dissemination and Reassessment of Private Religious Space in Early Modern England 1600-1660" (York, 2012).

³⁷⁶ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 231.

Arminianism through prebendal appointments. According to Durham's Canon Peter Smart's accusations, these views already existed amongst members of York's Chapter, in contrast to the more strongly Puritan style of the largely-absent dean, John Scott.³⁷⁷ If so, in Scott's absence, it is reasonable to suppose that the prevailing senior clerical attitude towards the medieval sacramental imagery in the stained glass of the Minster would have been one of admiration and celebration.³⁷⁸ The employment, therefore, of the Crosby workshop in this period to maintain the windows not simply on utilitarian grounds, but as beautiful and iconographically-legible parts of the fabric, as discussed above and articulated in Chapter Two, reflect this attitude. Neile's prominence within the Arminian circle, and his appointment to York in the same period as Laud's appointment to Canterbury, demonstrated the predilection the crown had for this style of churchmanship and thus set the taste for many of the socially and politically ambitious at court. The Earl of Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, was closely associated with Laud, a personal adviser to the king and deeply involved in the affairs of the Minster, possibly even a supplier of glass as discussed in Chapter Two.³⁷⁹ Gentlemen who wished to be looked upon with favour shared the interests and opinions of the king and kept pace with the changing tastes and policies. For those who were ordained and seeking advancement in the church, an aesthetic sensibility and knowledge of history were required to avoid falling into error in Laud's complex world of reinvented sacramental liturgy, ornamentation and ceremonial. The significance of this for questions of patronage and glass were brought into sharp focus during a royal visit to York in 1633.

³⁷⁷ Smart, *A catalogue of superstitions*.

³⁷⁸ Scott had a serious gambling habit and his absences were due to his being imprisoned for debt for long periods. Andrew Foster, "Archbishop Richard Neile Revisited," in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*, ed. Lake and Questier, 159-178.

³⁷⁹ Brian Quintrell, "The Church Triumphant?: the emergence of a spiritual Lord Treasurer, 1635-36," in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl Strafford 1621-1641* ed. J. F. Merritt, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 86-91.

The visit of Charles I and the Great East Window

The Arminian influence exerted by Bishop Lancelot Andrewes on the religious development of the young prince (later King) Charles I was considerable and this was reflected in the preparations for and outcomes of Charles' visit to the Minster in May 1633.³⁸⁰ Following a Latin oration he was taken on a tour of the Minster, but unlike the occasion of the visit of his father James I in 1603 he did not attend a service, there being none scheduled as it was not a Sunday. The visit may be considered more in the manner of an inspection, ensuring that the cathedral was following Charles' preferred principles. Part of this was the reclamation or reaffirmation of the sacred nature of spaces long regarded as public - the nave and transepts. The business of the diocese, its consistory court and legal business had gradually encroached on the floor of the Minster, with small wooden booths having been built to accommodate various officials necessary to conduct business.³⁸¹ In common with parish churches of the period, the nave and aisles of the Minster were a place of common resort where much of the local business of the area, including the payment of rentals to the Vicars Choral was conducted.³⁸² Following this 'inspection' the king ordered the Dean and Chapter to move the organ (the size of which is unknown) from the top of the pulpitum to the north side of the quire, on the grounds that it obscured the view of the east window.³⁸³ This is the first written record of the Great East Window being singled out for attention since its creation in 1405-08 and is an extraordinary privileging of the 'view' over the performance of the liturgy.

Whilst the monarch would have sat in the quire area when attending divine service, where the view of the east window would not have been a problem, Charles' orders appear to concern the view from the nave as experienced by him as a visitor. He also ordered the removal of '*unsightly pews*' (the location not specified, but probably set up as additional seating in the quire) and the small houses which were built up against the outside walls of the

³⁸⁰ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* (London: Allen Lane, 2004), 516.

³⁸¹ Drake, *Eboracum*, 532.

³⁸² Nigel J. Tringham, *Charters of the Vicars Choral of York Minster II: County of Yorkshire and Appropriated Churches to 1538* (Leeds; Woodbridge: Yorkshire Archaeological Society & The Boydell Press, 2002).

³⁸³ Drake, *Eboracum*, 521.

Minster, even a small lodging built into the cross aisle.³⁸⁴ His concern was not primarily with the practical convenience or otherwise of conducting worship in a seemly fashion, but with the *appearance* of the cathedral as a sacred space: moving the organ actually made the conduct of worship harder as the acoustic was altered and sight-lines to the choir removed, but it improved the view from the nave. In this one may see some of the roots of the antiquarian interest in the Minster which began to flourish in the latter part of the seventeenth century, and which is explored in Chapter Four, but in the 1630s the emphasis was on the clear demarcation and appearance of sacred space.³⁸⁵ This was not so much a return to a 'holier' time, more an artificial construct of how the Minster ought to look, but in fact had never looked before.³⁸⁶ As it is almost impossible to discern any detail of the window's imagery when viewed from the nave, and only the upper registers would be visible even after the removal of the organ, any supposed didactic benefit could only have been derived from a pre-existing or supplied knowledge of the iconography. Charles' concern was for the impression which was created, the vista, a concern which had never been explicitly expressed before, but which would be of increasing importance from now on.

The years before the Civil War

Any growing Arminian influence over Chapter which might have flowered into new examples of individual or collegiate patronage on a grander scale ended abruptly with the death of Richard Neile in 1640 and the impeachment of Laud in 1641. Although, as discussed, the creation of stained glass was by no means exclusively Laudian, the nature of the restoration of the pre-Reformation stained glass in the chapel at the archiepiscopal palace at Lambeth was a component of one of the charges levied against Laud, that of promoting popish superstitious idolatry.³⁸⁷ The attainting and execution of the Earl of Strafford in

³⁸⁴ Lehmborg, *Cathedrals under Siege: Cathedrals in English Society 1600-1700*.198; Perring, "The Cathedral Landscape of York".

³⁸⁵ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 227-273.

³⁸⁶ Ibid, 198 and footnote 16.

³⁸⁷ Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud 1573-1645*, 420; Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 338.

1641 (an event which caused Laud great distress) was also an event that would have sent a clear message to Chapter.³⁸⁸ Neile's successor, the politically and liturgically moderate John Williams, had been imprisoned by Laud's Star Chamber between 1636 and 1640 for his leniency towards Puritans, so his appointment to the archbishopric of York marked a complete change. He had been a favourite of James I but was disliked by Charles, so his influence and power were very limited; consequently, he appears to have had no influence on the make-up or direction of Chapter and there is no evidence that he tried to have any. He remained Archbishop until 1650, but spent little time in York after 1642 when he fled back to Wales, his moderate Anglicanism and Royalist sympathies out of favour.³⁸⁹

William's one reference within the Minster is his shield, which appears in window s6 [Figure 41], but it is an insertion of 1953 by Dean Milner-White.³⁹⁰ Its inclusion here is because it may be evidence of the geographical range of patronage enjoyed by Marmaduke Crosby. It is internally dated 1626 and depicts Williams' arms as Bishop of Lincoln, a post he had obtained in 1621. Trevor Brighton describes Williams as a 'promoter of glass-painting' and suggests the glass-painter Bernhard Dininckhof as a possible creator of both this shield and the neighbouring achievement of arms of Princess Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia and daughter of James I, which may mean Williams himself had them made to celebrate his elevation and her coronation in 1619.³⁹¹ Given the date, and some stylistic points of comparisons with the Ingram shields in n28 and at Temple Newsam [Figures 21 & 35], it is also possible that the Williams shield was the work of Marmaduke Crosby, but for where? It is conceivable it was made originally for Ingram's mansion, but why Sir Arthur Ingram would choose to celebrate Williams (or indeed any archbishop) in this way is hard to imagine. The

³⁸⁸ Terence Kilburn and Anthony Milton, "Public Context of Strafford's Trial and Execution," in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl Strafford 1621-1641*, ed. J. F. Merritt, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 242.

³⁸⁹ Elizabeth Dew Williams, *Mitre & Musket: John Williams, Lord Keeper, Archbishop of York, 1582-1650* (London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1938), 188.

³⁹⁰ Peter Gibson, *The Stained and Painted Glass of York Minster*, 9th edn. (Norwich: Jarrold Publishing for the Dean and Chapter of York, 1979; repr., 1992), 27.

³⁹¹ Brighton, "The Enamel Glass-Painters of York: 1585-1795", 71; this attribution is disputed by Sprakes on stylistic grounds: conversation in York Minster with Brian Sprakes 3.11.2016.

portability of glass panels makes the original recipients of Williams' patronage and their subsequent fate uncertain; perhaps they were both intended for the medieval episcopal palace at Lincoln, somehow surviving the destruction of the Civil War?³⁹² What the Williams shield suggests, albeit highly conjecturally, is that York was still acting as a hub to which patrons would be drawn not just from the immediate locality, but from further afield (in this case perhaps Lincoln) in search of specialist skills.

The years of the Civil War and Commonwealth, as discussed in Chapter Two, were by contrast remarkably favourable to the Minster's glass. The City took a business-like and organised approach to their custodianship of the windows and the building in general, even if the iconography was irrelevant to their worship. As discussed in Chapter Two, a City Husbandman was appointed, Edmund Gyles, the term itself imbued with a sense of care, oversight and good management. This was a form of patronage which can be contrasted with the lack of coherent planning for care which had characterised the Dean and Chapter's approach for much of the preceding century, where work had been somewhat ad hoc and reactive. This was set to change as the Restoration brought a new attitude and a definite sense of the importance of the glass to the re-establishment of the Dean and Chapter's identity.

The Dean and Chapter as patrons 1660-1700

The Restoration of the monarchy in 1660 brought with it the restoration of Anglicanism with a distinctly Laudian flavour. It also reignited the interest in collegiate patronage and in ideas of the Minster itself being a physical expression of the status and beliefs of those who ran it, about which more is said in Chapter Four. The old financial systems were re-imposed, Chapter reconstructed and the Liberty of St. Peter regained: it was as if the clock had been turned back twenty years.³⁹³ John Neile, the nephew of the strongly Laudian Archbishop Richard Neile, took up the prebend of Strensall in the new Chapter and the seats were

³⁹² Glyn Coppack, *Medieval Bishop's Palace, Lincoln* (London: English Heritage, 2000), 21-24.

³⁹³ The period immediately after the Restoration is discussed by Dorothy Owen, "From the Restoration until 1822," in Aylmer and Cant, eds. *A History of York Minster*, 233-242.

soon filled with the relatives of former occupants.³⁹⁴ The Dean, Richard Marsh, was the same man nominated by Charles I in 1645 (although he could not take up his post) and the Vicars Choral returned to occupy their houses and properties in Bedern and resume their duties as before. The separation once more from the city, both legally and in terms of churchmanship was profound and complete. The Minster reverted to being at the forefront of Anglicanism whilst the city tried in vain to retain the services of the preaching ministers they had appointed. Not one of them remained in any capacity at the Minster. The Minster became once more the church of the religiously conservative families of the Ridings, whilst the city reverted to its individual parishes. The claims by the Chapter that £2000 was needed to repair the Minster at the Restoration were largely politically and propaganda driven: although money was spent on the Chapter House and south front, the fabric rolls show little evidence of such vast sums being spent or needing to be spent in the Minster generally or the glass specifically.³⁹⁵

The husbandry of Edmund Gyles, discussed in Chapter Two, had been conscientious and the Minster was probably in sound physical repair, if not ornamented or adorned as the Chapter would wish. Despite his being a dyed-in-the-wool republican, as Withington notes "*a veteran of the New Model Army, a common councilman, an officer in the City's militia, and in 1659 served as city chamberlain*", Gyles continued to appear in the Minster accounts for glazing work in the south transept (see Chapter Two), so his work must have been of a sufficiently high standard to overcome any animosity.³⁹⁶ Certainly there was nothing like the expenditure recorded in the fabric accounts for Ripon, where the damage caused in 1643 by Sir Thomas Maulever's forces which "*entered the church, broke the old glass in the windows and defaced the monuments*" was considerable.³⁹⁷ A new font was purchased and installed at the south western

³⁹⁴ YMA H8/8 Draft Chapter Act Book 1663.

³⁹⁵ YMA E 3/65/1-36, for 1660.

³⁹⁶ Withington, "Views from the Bridge: Revolution and Restoration in Seventeenth-Century York", 136-137.

³⁹⁷ Jean E. Mortimer, "Ripon Minster Fabric Accounts 1661-1676", in Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series CXVIII (1951), *Miscellanea vol. VI*, edited by C. E. Whiting (Leeds: 1953), 86. Several pieces of new glass are painted by 'Mr. Gyles', but the bulk of the work is carried out by William Carnaby.

end of the Minster, restoring the status of the west end as the liturgical entrance to the Minster. The south transept entrance had been the focus for connection with the city, especially during the Interregnum, so this was a conscious return to what was considered to have been the principal festal processional entrance from the Close during the pre-Reformation and pre-war periods.

The monies expended on the restoration of the Chapter House, especially the glass, show a Dean and Chapter who were prepared to spend money on restoring, rather than simply repairing, the part of the Minster which embodied the governance of their institution. They did not replace decayed old coloured glass with plain white, but paid for coloured and painted glass, even if not the finest quality at only at 6d per foot.³⁹⁸ This vividly demonstrates that the visual appearance of the windows mattered to them and the overall integrity of the design (in terms of the use of coloured and painted glass) was deemed in some measure to be worthy of preservation. The iconography of several of the windows in both the vestibule and the Chapter House itself spoke of the continuity of kingship and ecclesiastical authority: whether the imagery of the righteous being executed in CHn4 (the St Catherine window), CHs3 (the St Paul window), or CHs4 (St John beheaded in prison; martyrdom of St Edmund), formed part of this decision is debatable, but it was certainly a visually potent space which served as an emblem of the pedigree of their authority.

The post-Restoration role of the archbishops

The Restoration of the monarchy in 1660 also brought a restoration of archiepiscopal authority and their involvement in Chapter appointments. A protégé of, and later chaplain to, Archbishop Laud, Richard Sterne (1664-1683) was translated to the archbishopric from bishopric of Carlisle as part of his preferment after the Restoration.³⁹⁹ His strong allegiance to the Duke of York gave rise to the accusation of having papist sympathies, although this was from

³⁹⁸ YMA E3/65/18-28. See Chapter 2.

³⁹⁹ Sterne attended Laud in the Tower before his execution and was closely associated with Laud's published works: see William Laud, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud D.D., Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, vol. VI part I (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1857).

such a partisan source that it may reasonably be discounted.⁴⁰⁰ However, Sterne's clear association with Laud make it clear that he was an archbishop who would not only have permitted but would have preferred a more iconographic and nuanced interpretation of imagery in glass and encouraged its recording, care and celebration.⁴⁰¹ Whilst the direct involvement of the archbishops in the conduct of Minster affairs was on the cusp of declining, as the dominance of the deans was re-asserted by a succession of powerful office-holders, the presence of such a royal favourite with pronounced views and the power to appoint canons to Chapter cannot have been without influence on the cultural and social atmosphere of the Minster, or the re-emerging sense of collegiate patronage as demonstrated by the restoration work to the Chapter House. Sterne was succeeded by John Dolben (1683-1686) who in turn was succeeded by Thomas Lamplugh, (1688-1691). Lamplugh was a generous benefactor to the ornamentation of the Minster: he paid for a gold-embroidered velvet frontal for the Communion Table as well as Laudian-style rails and tapestries of Old Testament scenes [Figure 42].⁴⁰² His two memorials in the Minster are a monument paid for by his son and a painted window by Henry Gyles, possibly paid for by Chapter (discussed below). As already established, the correlation between a liking for ornament and churchmanship is not a simple one, but following Sterne, each of these somewhat short-lived archbishops would not have been unsympathetic to a Chapter wanting to enhance the setting of its worship with stained glass.

The 'Chapter' decision to spend money restoring the Chapter House glass in the period from the 1660s to the 1690s was almost certainly simply the decision of the few senior residentiaries who attended meetings. However, as will become apparent, such decisions became increasingly those of the dean alone. Whilst this work was undertaken by the retained glaziers, the Crosby family workshop, it is clear (not least from the evidence of the Lamplugh

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁰¹ Tindal Hart, *Ebor: the Archbishops of York*, 127-130.

⁴⁰² Lamplugh's benefactions to the Minster sanctuary area are recorded in Drake, *Eboracum*, 284, illustrated on 287-8.

memorial) there were other glass-painters and glaziers operating in York and competing for Chapter's patronage and that of others.

Wider circles of patronage: Henry Gyles' glass-painting business

While the Crosby workshop was enjoying once again the benefits of regular work and contracts from the Dean and Chapter post-Restoration, Henry Gyles was not. He was drawing on a wider circle of patrons from a cross the north of England and the lack of Minster patronage does not seem to have affected his reputation: Gyles' window at Denton-in-Wharfedale (1700) [Figure 43] was described by the Leeds antiquarian Ralph Thoresby (1658-1725) as "*the noblest painted glass in the North of England*" and Gyles himself as "*the famousest painter of glass perhaps in the world*".⁴⁰³ If this were truly the case, why were the Dean and Chapter not using him? The answer may lie in part in the strength retained by the Guild of Glaziers, of which the Crosbys were still prominent members, and the control exerted over supplies and working practices.⁴⁰⁴ Gyles' name does not appear in the Guild register, nor in the Register of York Freemen.⁴⁰⁵ Although, as discussed in Chapter Two, the separate status of the Liberty of St Peter had allowed non-Guild members like John Thornton to operate with impunity, if the Minster contracts were recognised as 'belonging' to the Crosby workshop, it may have been difficult or unwise for other glaziers to try and compete for the work. This suggests that the balance of power between craft and patron within the area controlled by the guild was an unequal one in favour of the craft. The Dean and Chapter's willingness, even ability, to use non-guild craftsmen on a regular basis if members of sufficient quality were available may have been limited.

Thoresby was a highly-respected antiquarian who amassed a considerable collection of antiquities which he arranged into a 'museum' much admired by visitors to his home town of Leeds, but he was also a Non-Conformist

⁴⁰³ O'Connor and Haselock, "The Stained and Painted Glass", 387.

⁴⁰⁴ *York Guild of Glaziers and Plumbers Ordinance Book*

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid*; *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City Records ... 1272-1759*.

and Gyles' decision, for whatever reason, to operate beyond the guild and city control may have appealed.⁴⁰⁶ The collection of Thoresby's personal letters which include those between Gyles and his friend Thoresby, acting as his quasi-agent, are the only records of Gyles' business.⁴⁰⁷ They cast considerable light on the precarious nature of the personal patronage network upon which he relied, particularly his relationship with the York Virtuosi. This group, a forerunner of the York Philosophical Society, met between 1670 and 1683 and was composed of local antiquarians, artists and natural philosophers (although interestingly James Torre, the York antiquarian, was not a member).⁴⁰⁸ They met at Gyles' house in Micklegate, York, and (as Brighton notes) his generosity earned him the affectionate and familiar epithets of 'Good Mr Gyles', 'Harry' and 'Honest Hal'.⁴⁰⁹ The other Virtuosi were reasonably well-off, whereas Gyles was not, and the cost of entertaining them was an ongoing source of concern to Gyles' wife, although it may be viewed as an early form of corporate hospitality necessary to maintain the easy social climate for personal patronage upon which Gyles relied for work. That none of the group were members of Chapter may have been due to the somewhat dominant Non-Conformist influence within the group afforded by Thoresby, the son of a Parliamentarian officer who served under General Fairfax in the Civil War.⁴¹⁰ Gyles' letters show how dependent he was upon Thoresby to secure patronage for his work and how precarious an existence it was having gentlemen patrons who seldom paid on time (if at all).⁴¹¹ As Brighton observes, Gyles practised what was regarded by most as an antiquarian art, the production

⁴⁰⁶ Laura Sangha, "The Thoresby Society's Ducatus Tercentenary Volume I, Miscellany: A Celebration of Ralph Thoresby," *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 88, no. 1 (2016), 256-257. This book review of the Thoresby Society volume summarises the relevant information.

⁴⁰⁷ William Thomas Lancaster, ed. *Letters Addressed to Ralph Thoresby F.R.S. Printed from the Originals in the Possession of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society* (Leeds: printed by J. Whitehead and Son, for the Thoresby Society, 1912).

⁴⁰⁸ Ann-Marie Akehurst, *The very best of its kind out of the Metropolis: The Foundation of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society, the Yorkshire Museum and its Gardens in the early Nineteenth Century*. Institute for the Public Understanding of the Past, University of York, <https://web.archive.org/web/20110605080132/http://www.york.ac.uk/ipup/projects/york/stories/papers/akehurst.html> (2012) accessed October 20th 2016.

⁴⁰⁹ Brighton, "Henry Gyles, Virtuoso and Glasspainter of York 1645-1709", 8.

⁴¹⁰ This Parliamentarian connection between his father and Henry's father Edmund Gyles, the 'dyed in the wool Republican', may have been the source of Thoresby's friendship with Gyles.

⁴¹¹ Brighton, "Henry Gyles, Virtuoso and Glasspainter of York 1645-1709", 8-12.

of ornamental items of polite intellectual interest.⁴¹² His work was mostly undertaken within an extraordinarily tight circle of patronage, relying on friends to secure him commissions or purchase his work “*for its curiosity value*”. The volume was therefore too small for him to make a living solely from glass-painting; his wealthier friends regarded it as a polite hobby.⁴¹³ In this patronage relationship, the power lay most definitely with the patron.

Henry Gyles styled himself a glass-painter, and did not seek Minster employment principally as the kind of a glazier who did more general repairs. Comparisons may be drawn with Robert Thompson’s disdainful distinction in the use of glass for ‘botching’ discussed above. Gyles’ primary interest appears to have been in the glass he painted and leaded up, the work of interest to the circle of patronage he cultivated through the Virtuosi. He studied art and wrote a treatise on paints and techniques *The Art of Limning, either by the Life, Landscape or Histories* and studied drawing - all necessary skills for a glass-painter, but there is little hard evidence for his seeking to establish a role within the recognised craft structure discussed in Chapter Two.⁴¹⁴ As part of this repositioning of his skills within the ambit of the liberal arts, Gyles (like several members of the Virtuosi) cultivated an interest in natural sciences which drew patronage from a wider circle.⁴¹⁵ He gained a reputation for the painting of glass sundials (a fashion of the time), of which at least four known examples survive: Nun Appleton Hall, Yorks.; University College, Oxford; Tong Hall, Bradford [Figure 44]; Grays Court, York.⁴¹⁶ Tong Hall was rebuilt in 1702 by Sir George Tempest, a contact probably cultivated for Gyles by John Lambert, a member of the York Virtuosi and friend of Pierce Tempest, Sir George’s son.⁴¹⁷ Sundials needed scientific and mathematical skills to calibrate the design to each location and to position the gnomon accurately, so more than simple artistic flair was required. The scientific expertise of the group may well have been drawn upon, or their

⁴¹² Ibid, 24.

⁴¹³ Brighton, "Henry Gyles, Virtuoso and Glasspainter of York 1645-1709", 24.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid, 6-7.

⁴¹⁵ Ann-Marie Akehurst, *The Very Best of Its Kind out of the Metropolis*.

⁴¹⁶ Brighton, "Henry Gyles, Virtuoso and Glasspainter of York 1645-1709", 9 and 15, Plates 3, 7a&b, 9b.

⁴¹⁷ Ibid, 9. For Tong Hall dates see <http://www.britishlistedbuildings.co.uk/en-337209-tong-hall> accessed 10.11.2016.

interests may even steered Gyles into this type of product and encouraged him to see a new future for glass-painting. For the care and repair of the Minster glass, however, this crucial separation of the two skill-sets of glass-painting and lead glazing happened at a point when expenditure was rising and the importance of the glazing was starting to come to the fore.

Gyles did undertake limited pieces of work for the Dean and Chapter: the armorial inserted into the Petty window in 1662 was his earliest contribution, discussed above.⁴¹⁸ Thereafter he appears to have supplied glass and specific pieces of work, but always as an external contractor. The Minster's records for much of Gyles' work or goods supplied are brief to the point of opacity: for example, the entry for 1696 simply reads "*Mr. Gyles for coloured Glass £4 16s 3d*", with no indication of quantity, colour, nor any clue as to where this glass was to be used.⁴¹⁹ Allowing for the gaps between the date of presentation of the bill, its entry into the accounts and the actual date of the work being done or glass supplied, two possible locations for this work are apparent in the glass today. Both shed some light on the nature of relationships operating beyond that of the direct employment by the Dean and Chapter and into the triangular relationship of patron, craftsman and Minster as location/host for the commissioned work.

The first is in respect of the very fragmentary arms attributed to Holloway in the tracery of window s2 [Figure 17]. The design is not obviously in Gyles' style, but it has been heavily restored, so this may be misleading.⁴²⁰ There is no recorded association between any of the several noble families called Holloway and the Minster, but this may be the only later seventeenth-century example of private patronage extant in the Minster glass.

The second possibility is that this entry refers in some way to the supply by Gyles of the memorial glass to Archbishop Thomas Lamplugh [Figure 45] in the south quire aisle (window s6). It is somewhat surprising that no mention of

⁴¹⁸ O'Connor, "John Petty, Glazier and Mayor of York", 254.

⁴¹⁹ YMA E3/M4.

⁴²⁰ Canon John Toy tentatively attributed this to Henry Gyles in his *A Guide and Index to the Windows of York Minster* (York: The Dean and Chapter of York, 1985), but principally on grounds of date rather than style.

the purpose was made, if this was the case, but the date is about right and the payment may refer to the pieces of coloured (particularly yellow) glass required for the completion and setting of the painted work. If so, this may be another example of the separation of the commission and payment of the painted elements from the rest of the glass and its physical installation and contract for painted work. The window may have been paid for collegiately, but separately from the fabric fund, by the Dean and Chapter, but the lack of documentation by Gyles and the practice of disposing of the bills and vouchers by the Dean and Chapter have destroyed any documentation to support this hypothesis.⁴²¹

Lamplugh was the first archbishop since the Reformation to be commemorated in glass in the Minster, which is indicative of the importance of stained glass as a medium of artistic expression within the context of the Minster in this period. However, there is also a large altar tomb with superstructure beneath the window, paid for by his son, and the visual relationship between the two is a slightly awkward one, which suggests they were not conceived as a piece and therefore are unlikely to have been commissioned by a single patron who, we may presume, would have had an overall scheme in mind. The design of the glass, which uses devices such as the scrolled cartouche in the style of a stone ornament, is further evidence that it was conceived and commissioned separately from the monument, perhaps paid for by a grateful Chapter ahead of the neighbouring monument by Grinling Gibbons being completed. If the commission for the stone monument was known of, it had no significant influence on the design or positioning of either piece. There was no Dean and Chapter plan or policy for internal or external patronage in this period, it simply ‘happened’ as opportunities arose, with the building a passive recipient.

The Lamplugh memorial

Thomas Lamplugh died in 1691 at Bishopthorpe after a vigorous but short archiepiscopate of three years.⁴²² His son, also Thomas, paid Gibbons £100 to carve the large and impressive monument which is just to the east of the

⁴²¹ Owen, "From the Restoration until 1822", 255.

⁴²² Tindal Hart, *Ebor: the Archbishops of York*, 131-135.

panel in s6 [Figure 46].⁴²³ The glass is heraldic with Italianate ornament. The central motif is an oval (rather than a shield shape) of the arms of Lamplugh impaling those of the See of York. This oval is set into a cartouche with furling scrolls, which in turn is set on a device of crossed crosiers with ropes and tassels. The choice of crosiers rather than the archiepiscopal primatial cross may refer to Lamplugh's time as Bishop of Exeter (1676-1688), just as John William's memorial commemorated his Lincoln days, but equally may have been considered by Gyles to be more in-keeping with the flowing lines of the design.⁴²⁴ This suggests the 'artist' felt able to exert some power in the relationship with his client/patron, having input into the final product driven by his choices, not necessarily derived from the original client voice. This delicate power balance between artist and patron is considered by Ayres with regard to changing patronage relationships in other media, but this would be a relatively new development in heraldic glass.⁴²⁵

This composition is separated from side panels, composed of Classical motifs including putti and laurel wreaths, by a solid border of yellow glass set into a ladder of lead. The heraldry and motifs are set above a text panel which dominates the panel with its bold black lettering: "*Thomas Lamplugh Archiepiscopus Eboracensis Obijt v^{to} Die Maij A^o 1691*". The brevity and style are reminiscent of a ledger slab and the oval design of the coat of arms is very similar to the design some of the later ledger slabs in the east end. Lamplugh had spent considerable sums on the interior fittings of the Minster and it would have been appropriate to mark his death with adornment in more than one medium, although the visual and spatial relationship between the monument and the glass suggests the two were not conceived as two halves of a single design unit [Figure 47]. The Lamplugh panel is at the bottom of the central light, a position which pre-dates the twentieth-century installation of the armorial glass of Williams and Elizabeth of Bohemia by Dean Milner-White and it may be

⁴²³ Pattison and Murray, *Monuments in York Minster: An Illustrated Inventory*, 68.

⁴²⁴ The monument also shows Lamplugh holding a crosier rather than the primatial cross. The distinction of primate indicated by the cross rather than the crosier does not appear to have been as strictly observed in the 18th century.

⁴²⁵ Ayres, *Art, Artisans & Apprentices*.

supposed is the original location, with the monument offset to the left.⁴²⁶ The panel was set into the base of a window which contained various fragmentary elements compiled from at least two windows and included two medieval representations of an archbishop elevating the Host.⁴²⁷

The Italianate styling of the ornament in the Gyles panel is broadly sympathetic to the Classical form and details of the Gibbons carving, but does not draw any direct motifs from it. In addition, the strong colouring of some part of the glass are in stark contrast to the restrained use of grey and white marble in the monochrome palette of the monument. This supports the contention that the panel was not conceived as an integral part of the monument assemblage, but rather was installed as an additional element, independently designed and executed, albeit with an awareness of the monument and its intended position. It is possible that the glass was installed before the monument, although as Gibbons was heavily engaged with Wren on St. Paul's in the years 1694-97 and Lamplugh died in 1691, it is most likely the monument was installed before 1694.⁴²⁸ The overall choice of bay for the monument may have been governed by space constraints. The next bay further to the east had a table tomb to Thomas Ennys in front of it and the next one again was utterly occupied by the Wentworth family as the entrance to their vault had been built directly in front of the wall in 1686 and a large memorial erected in 1695.⁴²⁹ However, the choice of a south quire aisle location may also have been influenced by work that Lamplugh himself had undertaken. No other memorial installed in this period was conceived or executed with accompanying glass, but oddly this unique work was installed in what appeared to be a singularly lacklustre position.⁴³⁰ Window s6, as Harrison noted, was recorded by Torre as a disparate assemblage of fragments, including at least one scene almost certainly not original to the

⁴²⁶ Gibson, *The Stained and Painted Glass of York Minster*, 27.

⁴²⁷ Harrison, *The Painted Glass of York: An Account of the Medieval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches*, 217.

⁴²⁸ Entry for Grinling Gibbons in *A Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain, 1660-1851* hosted by the Henry Moore Foundation at <http://217.204.55.158/henrymoore/sculptor/browserecord.php?action=browse&-recid=1062> . Accessed 18.11.2014.

⁴²⁹ Pattison and Murray, *Monuments in York Minster: An Illustrated Inventory*, 29 entry 27 for Ennys, 70 entry 72 for Wentworth.

⁴³⁰ This window also contains the arms of Archbishop Williams, so there is a visual balance, but no sense of any other connection.

Minster.⁴³¹ It was definitely not a coherent iconographic scheme and the date of assembly of the various elements can only be guessed at. Harrison's assertion that the "*lower part of a figure of St. Christopher*" [Figure 48], which he saw in the first light, probably came "*from a York parish church*" strongly suggests a post-Reformation acquisition.⁴³² Perhaps the assembling of these disparate panels was one of the unspecified glazing jobs of the Crosbys after the Restoration, possibly undertaken at Lamplugh's instigation? If so, the preservation of two depictions of an archbishop elevating the host at Mass, at least one of which can confidently be identified as St Thomas Becket, is surprising, unless the iconography of Becket had fallen so far out of mind that all Lamplugh saw was an image that could be understood as depicting a moment in the Eucharist? Perhaps Lamplugh was 'improving' a window which could be understood as celebrating both his role and the importance of the Communion, adding the part of St Christopher panel containing the fish to recall Christian symbolism from the early church. Thus, the location of Lamplugh's memorial glass may have been a particularly apposite combination of medium and location marking in glass an otherwise unrecorded piece of 'beautifying' by the prelate. The position of his memorial adjacent to this window may therefore be further recognition of a project close to Lamplugh's heart, but otherwise unrecorded.

An intriguing separate piece of Lamplugh glass is a simple monochrome painted glass panel bearing Lamplugh's portrait [Figure 49]. It is currently housed in the Minster Library's Old Palace Reading Room, but the authorship, date and original location are unknown. The small scale and style is like an engraving or woodcut, perhaps suggesting it was intended for a domestic situation rather than as part of a larger commemoration in glass of Lamplugh. It may be by William Peckitt (1731-1796) who created some portraits of bishops on glass based on engravings [Figure 50].⁴³³ Although these are in colour and rather different in style, this monochrome piece may be an early attempt or an

⁴³¹ Harrison, *The Painted Glass of York: An Account of the Medieval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches*, 86.

⁴³² Ibid. This fifteenth-century half-figure is now in n29 having been relocated by Milner-White in 1954.

⁴³³ One of these, a portrait of Edward Willes, Bishop of Bath and Wells, is now in the V&A: Victoria & Albert Museum Collections ref C40: 1929.

experiment in sticking with the original palette. However, it is, as far as I have been able to ascertain, the first post-Reformation York archiepiscopal portrait in glass and may have been a test piece for a more elaborate commemoration in glass which was never executed. No other post-Reformation memorials of archbishops in the Minster have associated glass, which strongly suggests that the choice to create a glass memorial panel was a direct consequence of Lamplugh's antiquarian interests and in recognition of his work on the Minster fabric and fittings. Like Torre, Lamplugh's interest in the Minster and its figurative glass was extremely unusual for his time, making this memorial particularly significant. Given the comparatively low esteem in which stained glass as an 'applied art' was held in comparison to other art forms deemed 'fine art' in the wider artistic community, Lamplugh's son may have considered the idea of a tribute only in glass to be an insufficiently prestigious way of memorialising his father.⁴³⁴ His decision to commission a more elaborate and impressive memorial by a noted exponent of a fashionable craft, whether before or after the stained glass memorial was conceived and installed, may have been a deliberate attempt to ensure that his father's memory and contribution was recognised in an art form which was held in higher esteem. This raises wider questions about what was happening in other cathedrals and there is considerable potential for comparison and future research which is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Changing patterns of patronage in the eighteenth century

The start of the eighteenth century marked an apparent turning point in the conspicuous involvement of deans with the Minster fabric and glass and a commensurate decline in the prominence of the influence of the archbishops. Two of the four deans whose tenures spanned the period 1697-1802, Finch and Fountayne, played a particularly notable role in the history of patronage and their decisions give a significant insight into the relationships between them and Chapter, the building in their care, and the glaziers and glass-painters they

⁴³⁴ This distinction and its origins is explored in James Ayres, *Art, Artisans & Apprentices*, xi.

employed. The tension between Dean Fountayne and Archbishop Matthew Hutton (which played such a part in the Dr Topham affair, so sharply satirised by Laurence Sterne's *A Political Romance* of 1759) and which centred on who should appoint preachers to the Minster, demonstrates the extent to which the role of dean was now pre-eminent in the management and direction of Minster affairs.⁴³⁵ The direct intervention into the fabric undertaken by Archbishop Lamplugh would no longer be considered conceivable as the century progressed. The highly-personal nature of patronage in the eighteenth-century Minster had the potential to become something of a battleground between the dean and his Chapter, as will be discussed below. What does become clear is that for long-serving deans, like Finch and Fountayne, the Minster building itself could be moulded to their taste.

The role of Dean Finch

The appointment as dean of the noted antiquarian Thomas Gale in 1697 did mark the start of a new more curatorial attitude to the fabric, but not the glass. Elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1677, in common with many of his period Gale's scholarly interests, as noted by Sweet, lay in the Anglo-Saxon and native British past, not the medieval, but he did institute a programme of cleaning of the exterior of the south quire and the removal of lean-to buildings which must have had an impact on the light levels through the windows of the south quire aisle.⁴³⁶ The start of a significant period of glass expenditure coincided with the appointment of Henry Finch as dean (1702-1728). Like his predecessor, Dean Finch was a forceful character and continued the programme of improvement: he installed a new clock dial over the south door, removed the sermon bell to the top of the tower and rearranged the tapestries and altar rails given by Archbishop Lamplugh.⁴³⁷ This latter act was part of a comprehensive reordering of the quire furniture intended to result in the remodelling of the

⁴³⁵ Laurence Sterne, *A Political Romance*, 1759 (Menston: Scolar Press, 1971), 2.

⁴³⁶ Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, 200; Michael Hunter, *The Royal Society and Its Fellows, 1660-1700: The Morphology of an Early Scientific Institution* (Chalfont St Giles, Bucks: British Society for the History of Science, 1982).

⁴³⁷ YMA E4a Day Book. Expenses for these projects appear throughout the period.

sanctuary area into the Classical style [Figure 51].⁴³⁸ The increase in work on the glass under his stewardship was part of this varied and far-reaching programme of improvement, which may have included any damage caused during Dean Gale's exterior cleaning programme, which had been undertaken by a man swinging against the walls in a bosun's chair.⁴³⁹ The man was employed to remove the 'scurff' or smoke accumulations from the exterior stonework, as discussed by Holton, but the glass is also likely to have suffered from the sulphurous deposits which would have built up from the coal fires of the houses built against the walls.⁴⁴⁰ These acidic accumulations would certainly have blackened the windows and may possibly have caused pitting or surface damage which then required new glass insertions.

Apart from the purchases of glass for £1 2s 6d from Mr. Gyles again in 1707 and from Mr. Denton in 1719 (£7 15s 5d) and 1721 (£1 14s), the accounts between 1705 and 1730 consist mostly of single line entries of payments "To the glaziers" or "The Glaziers bill". They give no detail but are for consistently large sums of up to £42 2s 11d (1720).⁴⁴¹ The total expenditure (including glass) in this twenty-five-year period of £550 6s 7d, a considerable increase on the amount for the preceding twenty-five years. The detail of the work done is not directly explained or accounted for in the surviving records of the Dean and Chapter, there being no entries in the Chapter Act books to indicate a corporate decision to undertake what must have been an extensive programme of work around the Minster. This suggests that the dean was acting as principal arbiter, not personally funding the work, but instigating a personally-motivated programme with the tacit consent of the residentiaries. That the glazing work was in the Minster and not in another Minster property is reasonably certain: the account entries, although brief, do usually specify if the work was being undertaken elsewhere. For example, an entry in 1756 reads "*Richard Peckett the Glazier for work at Mr. Whyte's house*", and 1757 "*Richard Peckett work on Belfrey*

⁴³⁸ For the remodelled sanctuary area, see Drake, *Eboracum*, plate facing, 522.

⁴³⁹ Owen, "From the Restoration until 1822", 248.

⁴⁴⁰ Alexander Barry Holton, "The Archaeology and Conservation of the East Front of York Minster" (University of York, PhD thesis, 2010), 91.

⁴⁴¹ YMA E3/75, 87, 89, 88 respectively.

Church".⁴⁴² Whilst not conclusive, it is reasonable to assume that this is a record primarily of expenditure for repairs to the Minster itself and relates directly to Dean Finch's personal programme of 'improvement'.

The separation in the accounts between payments for glass and payments to the glaziers indicates that this work was principally repair rather than commissioning of new work: the relative consistency of the amounts is commensurate with a concerted, planned programme of repair. This hypothesis is supported by the lack of impact on the costs of the programme of the death of Henry Gyles in 1709. The loss of the man who may have been York's only remaining glass painter could reasonably have been expected to result in a decline in expenditure, but the unchanged nature of the accounts strongly suggests that little if any new stained or painted glass was being paid for. It also underlines the emerging distinction between the suppliers of glass (whether as a raw material or painted) and the lead glaziers installing it. Part of this work may have been working towards Finch's Classicisation of the Minster by replacing (perhaps irrevocably decayed) coloured glass with clear glass in the south quire aisle. Window s8, which now contains the fourteenth-century Jesse tree (formerly in New College Chapel, Oxford) installed by William Peckitt, contained different medieval glass (including images of St Thomas Becket) when it was recorded by Torre: by the time Thomas Gent published his book on the Minster in 1730 it contained clear glass.⁴⁴³ It is likely therefore that the payments for glass made to Mr Denton in 1720 were only for white glass, patronage not now being for coloured or painted glass in this area, but for glass which would (importantly) would conform to Finch's personal ideas about the nature and designation of space.

The choice of s8 is difficult to explain solely in terms of impact on the experience of worship. It would have let some more light into the quire and was

⁴⁴² YMA E3/124 and 125.

⁴⁴³ Peckitt received the Jesse window glass, valued at £30, from the west window of New College Chapel as part payment in kind for the new windows he was commissioned to do. This is discussed in Christopher Woodforde *The Stained Glass of New College, Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951), 20-21; Torre ref. YMA L1/7 f.92; Thomas Gent, *The Ancient History of Saint Peter's Magnificent Cathedral in the Famous City of York: Extracted from Records of the Church, in Three Books* (York: Thomas Gent, 1762), 156.

directly opposite the point occupied by the brass lectern, if prints of the period indicate the position of this correctly, so could have had some modest practical benefit to readers [Figure 52]. But it would seem more credible that the replacement of the medieval glass was both on grounds of condition and Finch's preferences: his personal tastes coupled with his keenness for cleanliness in the eastern arm of the cathedral, where worship took place, required clear glass. The presence of images of Becket, more particularly his martyrdom, were clearly identified by James Torre only thirty years earlier: *"In 3rd light kneels Abp Becket habited B pall A Before an altar with prayer book open before him. Behind him stand 3 knights in white armour one of whom making a stroke at the Abp with a sword & piercing his head"* would have been unacceptable to Dean Finch; indeed, their survival to that date in such a prominent location (on the principle clerical route to the vestry) is surprising.⁴⁴⁴ So even allowing for some deterioration due to smoke from the houses formerly on the south wall, or damage during the removal and cleaning, the decision to re-glaze cannot have been on grounds of condition alone. The increased light levels from the removal of the houses may have made any defects more apparent, or perhaps brought to notice the nature of the imagery the window contained! The later (c. 1765) replacement of this white glass with the richly coloured medieval glass from New College under Dean Fountayne (discussed below) gives additional weight to the argument that the installation of the white glass was not primarily for practical liturgical reasons. If the illumination levels created by the white glass were necessary for the conduct of worship in 1720 they would have been equally necessary in 1765, there having been no change to liturgical practice.

For a dean seemingly intent on transforming the Minster interior on Classical lines, the deliberate acquisition of medieval figurative panels for installation into previously clear-glazed windows in the south transept (s27 and s28) is apparently contradictory, but in 1724 a significant sequence of panels depicting the Te Deum was moved from the east window of the parish church of St Martin Coney Street into the Minster.

⁴⁴⁴ YMA L1/7 f.92.

The glass of St. Martin Coney Street

In 1722/3 the (unnamed) plumber glazier employed at the Minster was ordered by Chapter to repair dilapidations and to the east window of St Martin, Coney Street and in the process to remove "*plain and painted glass*" from the same east window for use in the Minster, being paid £16 5s for the work to this end.⁴⁴⁵ These panels are recognised now to be the Te Deum panels which are currently located in windows s27 and s28 [Figure 53], with a single panel located in s10 [Figure 54]. The original location and arrangement of these panels in St. Martin's was discussed in a recent article by Katie Harrison.⁴⁴⁶ The panels include a Trinity image, presumably on the basis of which Thomas Gent described the window as being a depiction of the Athanasian Creed, a mis-identification which caused Canon Harrison to believe in the 1920s that the St Martin's glass had subsequently been lost.⁴⁴⁷ The Athanasian Creed is primarily concerned with the unity of the Trinity and it might be thought that Gent's identification was his way of framing a potentially difficult image, a depiction of the Trinity, in a more doctrinally acceptable context. However, Gent's assertion that the window also contained elements of the life of Athanasius, which was at best imaginative, demonstrate that his attribution was determined by his own assumptions.

The Te Deum as a subject for stained glass was known from at least one other of York's parish churches: panels from a Te Deum were recorded as appearing in fragmentary form in St. Michael Spurriergate by Canon Harrison in 1927.⁴⁴⁸ Although he was unaware of the source of the Te Deum glass in the Minster, he knew these fragments in Spurriergate were not associated with them [Figure 55]. The existence of the Spurriergate panels shows that the subject matter and the manner of its depiction was not unique in York, unlike

⁴⁴⁵ YMA E3M/4. Also recorded in YMA H6 Chapter Acts 1701-28 entry dated 4 Nov 1723.

⁴⁴⁶ Katie Harrison, "There Is No Trace of It in the Minster Glass now": An Investigation into the East Window of St. Martin's Coney Street and Its Eighteenth-Century Acquisition by York Minster," *York Historian* 32 (2015), 2-29.

⁴⁴⁷ Gent, *The Ancient History of Saint Peter's Magnificent Cathedral in the Famous City of York: Extracted from Records of the Church, in Three Books*, 173.

⁴⁴⁸ Harrison, *The Painted Glass of York: An Account of the Medieval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches*, 16-17, 131, 168. Harrison's description of the Te Deum panels in s27 and s28 includes the phrase "The origin of these two windows is one of the problems of the windows of the Minster" (16) whilst his piece on the St Martin glass as misrepresented by Gent says, "There is no trace of it in the Minster glass now" (131).

panels such as the Trinity panel in Holy Trinity Goodramgate, so this argues against the Dean and Chapter acting in any kind of early curatorial capacity, i.e. acquiring unique medieval glass of York from other churches for preservation or antiquarian collecting purposes. Nevertheless, the acquisition of these particular panels does appear to have been quite intentional, which begs the question as to what motivated the Dean and Chapter to acquire them from St. Martin's.

Although there was no direct patronage relationship between St Martin's and the Minster, the church had been staffed in the fifteenth century by clergy who also served roles in the Minster. An example of this was Master Robert Semer who was minister at St. Martin's and Chamberlain of the Minster. He was commemorated in a window erected in St. Martin's on 4th October 1437; fragments of the dedicatory inscription detailing his offices still survive.⁴⁴⁹ The deployment of the Minster's plumber glazier to work on St. Martin's suggests that a connection of a sort may have been maintained, or perhaps remembered, but equally it may have been motivated by the Minster's explicit desire to obtain the Te Deum glass: the repair to 'dilapidations' was the price for acquiring the glass. This arrangement must have suited the Churchwardens of St. Martin's very well: it ensured their church was repaired and made weatherproof at no cost to the parish beyond the loss of some old-fashioned glass whose religious value had long since been nullified. Coney Street was one of the newly-fashionable streets and St Martin's was keen to embrace the Classical style: the churchwardens used stone from the relaying of the Minster floor to erect a Classical porch, now sadly lost and known only from engravings [Figure 56].⁴⁵⁰ Whilst this goes some way to explaining their willingness, even eagerness, to dispose of their medieval glass, it does not explain the Minster's eagerness to obtain it.

The glass was installed in the south transept, one of the most public areas of the Minster and the main entrance to the cathedral from the city. Whilst there was no attempt to adapt the tracery to allow the complete sequence to be installed in one window (the glass was divided across two

⁴⁴⁹ Ibid, 132.

⁴⁵⁰ Barbara Wilson and Francis Mee, *The Medieval Parish Churches of York: The Pictorial Evidence* (York: York Archaeological Trust, 1998), 108.

windows in the south transept and single panels and small pieces disposed around other windows in the Minster), the integrity of individual sections was largely retained and the arrangement of sections within s27 and s28 respected the verse order of the hymn of praise. This was not an instance of glass being obtained and broken up for patching, or treated simply as colour and pattern. The Minster acted with intent in acquiring this glass and installing it in one of the most public areas of the church: with areas of clear glass in windows in the south quire aisle and north transept, the decision to install this glass in this location is significant.

Katie Harrison has argued that the acquisition of this glass was a direct reflection of the churchmanship and personal patronage of Dean Finch who, she contends, would have seen the imagery as being usefully didactic “whether it displayed either the *Te Deum* or the Athanasian Creed”, but this interpretation is problematic.⁴⁵¹ The acquisition of the St Martin Coney Street glass and its installation in the south transept does show that Dean Finch was not averse to coloured or medieval glass, indeed he actively sought it out. This would appear to be at odds with his longer-term plan for Classicisation, unless a distinction was being deliberately made between the different areas of the Minster and what they were thought to be for. His personal tastes may have had an influence in the acquisition, but more probably as a ‘curiosity’ to be added to the Minster’s collection than a deliberate installation of didactic imagery in an area where people may encounter it without the benefit of clerical interpretation. If, as discussed in Chapter Four, the nave and transepts were regarded principally as secularised places of public resort, then pandering to the popular taste for medieval stained glass in these areas would not pose a stylistic dilemma for the dean. This appears to have stopped short of relocating glass depicting the martyrdom of Becket, but acquiring glass which was a representation of either the *Te Deum* or the Creed was acceptable.⁴⁵² If the eastern arm was principally where regular worship took place and was primarily regarded as a sacred space *not* given over to public taste, then the replacement of (perhaps unacceptable)

⁴⁵¹ Harrison, "There Is No Trace of It in the Minster Glass now", 14.

⁴⁵² The acquisition of this glass and Dean Finch’s interest in the liturgy is discussed in Harrison.

medieval glass with clear glass would be both practical and aesthetically in-keeping with Finch's larger plan and churchmanship. He was creating, in effect, two Minsters: the secular monument of curiosity value and the modernised area for the conduct of worship. As noted by Sweet, Francis Drake had been rebuffed by the Archbishop, Laurence Blackburne (1724-1748), when he was compiling his antiquarian publication on the Minster, *Eboracum*, but enthusiastically supported by the Dean and Chapter who allowed access to their records and the drawing of detailed plates of the interior.⁴⁵³ Fortunately for the Minster's glass, Finch's death in 1728 called a halt to his Classicisation of the quire and quite possibly to the further replacement of medieval figurative and coloured glass with clear in the eastern arm.

A fortunate survival?

The eighteenth century could have been disastrous for the retention of medieval glass if York had followed the path of Exeter or Hereford.⁴⁵⁴ The dean of Exeter, Dr. Charles Lyttelton, was an enthusiastic antiquarian. President of the Society of Antiquaries, he was dean 1742-1767 and during his tenure he undertook several 'improvement' projects which reflected his considerable interest in the history of the cathedral. One of these projects, begun in 1750, consisted of removing medieval glass from windows he considered 'imperfect', including those in the Chapter House, and using the assemblage to "*compleat and repair*" the Great East Window.⁴⁵⁵ He was congratulated on his work by his friend and successor, Dr. Milles and wrote that he "*rejoice to find that ye are pleased with the improvements I have made ...*".⁴⁵⁶ Dr. Milles himself went on to commission William Peckitt in 1764 to glaze the Great West Window with figurative and armorial glass which remained in place until 1904. Milles

⁴⁵³ Rosemary Sweet, "History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake's *Eboracum* (1736)," in *Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society*, ed. Mark Hallett and Jane Rendall, Borthwick Text and Calendar 30 (York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York, 2003), 20.

⁴⁵⁴ Stanford Lehmborg, *English Cathedrals: A History* (London; New York: Hambledon Continuum, 2006), 276.

⁴⁵⁵ Audrey Erskine, Hope Vyvyan, and John Lloyd, *Exeter Cathedral: A Short History and Description* (Exeter: Exeter Cathedral, 1988), 72.

⁴⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

presented a written description of his new window to the Society of Antiquaries in 1767, describing Peckitt as "*the ingenious artist Mr. Peckitt of York*".⁴⁵⁷ Other improvements had included painting the columns brown and walls yellow, all in the name of a form of modernisation.⁴⁵⁸

His antiquarian attitude in both interior decoration and the glass was to remove 'imperfections' and create a new, improved version of the cathedral which retained only the best features from the past. For the windows, their original positions and iconography was irrelevant, what mattered was that he had tidied up the interior and showed his antiquarian credentials by using the collected medieval glass to repair a medieval window. At Hereford, the glass had already been severely damaged during the Civil War when the cathedral had fallen into the hands of both sides during the conflict and been under siege, being actively bombarded with several direct hits. Under the oversight of Bishop Bisse, the damaged interior had been 'restored' and new fittings introduced, but the damaged glass had been replaced with clear glass.⁴⁵⁹ The new black and white marble Burlington pavement might have heralded the start of a similar approach at York, with its focus on the modernisation and comfort of the public, but it did not.⁴⁶⁰ On the contrary, the attitudes expressed throughout this period to both existing glass and 'new' glass (whether newly made or old glass acquired from elsewhere which was new to the Minster) show a complex and shifting dynamic between churchmanship, patronage, secular pressures, practicality and social mores. The combined effect of these in York was largely preservative which raises important questions not only about the relationship between the Minster and the parishes, but about the Minster's own attitudes to stained glass in this period.

Practical necessity would be an obvious consideration, particularly if the integrity of the building was under threat: the artistic motivation may be minimal, but weather-proofing would give the work additional importance. Other less pragmatic but no less powerful considerations could include the

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid, 74.

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid, 75.

⁴⁵⁹ The surviving medieval glass is to be found in the south quire aisle in a reconstructed window.

⁴⁶⁰ The replacement of the floor, paid for by subscription, is described in Drake, *Eboracum*, 519.

ideological desire (as exhibited at Salisbury) for “cleansing and beautifying” a cathedral interior to suit different tastes.⁴⁶¹ The offer of patronage (both in the original sense of providing a pattern or model and the modern sense of being a funder) by those of influence, but external to the Chapter, could also be a driver for change: the large donation made by Bishop Mawson towards the costs of the ‘beautifying’ of the east end of Ely cathedral in the 1750s, for example, came with the proviso that it was ‘match-funded’ by the Dean and Chapter.⁴⁶² Such patronage or donations carried political, social or religious connotations which played into the broader intellectual atmosphere in which discussions and decisions were being made, but they also required access to skilled craftsmen to execute them. It is in this period that, for the first time, some material beyond the Minster’s records survives which sheds light on two of the external craftsmen contracted to work on the glass: Henry Gyles and William Peckitt. From these we can see that patronage was central to their businesses, but was managed and obtained in quite different ways. Their fundamental changes in craft practice and deliberate attempts to alter the status and recognition of glass-painting from a craft to an art, as discussed in Chapter Two, were inextricably linked with the changing nature of patronage in this period and the new networks and relationships which were emerging.

Whilst Henry Gyles conducted his affairs principally by correspondence, Peckitt’s Commission Book provides detail of the work he was contracted to undertake. For the work in the Minster, this specified which windows he was to work on and more specifically descriptive details of what he was expected to produce for them.⁴⁶³ It also recorded commissions for individual pieces of glass and the broad range of secular work he undertook. The price of each commission, or (in the case of the ‘gifts’ Peckitt made to Dean Fountayne and the Minster) the value that he placed upon the work he had produced, demonstrates how he sought and used patronage. The book is an organised,

⁴⁶¹ Tatton-Brown and Crook, *Salisbury Cathedral: The Making of a Medieval Masterpiece*, 119.

⁴⁶² Thomas Cocke, "The Architectural History of Ely Cathedral from 1540-1840," in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Ely Cathedral*, ed. Nicola Coldstream and Peter Draper, 71-78 (Leeds: British Archaeological Association, 1976), 73.

⁴⁶³ Brighton, "William Peckitt’s Commission Book, 1751-1795".

well-maintained record with methodical entries, details of clients and descriptive summaries of the content.

This approach to record-keeping, which bears striking similarities to some of the commission books and ledgers of leading painters of this period, like Sir Joshua Reynolds, is in strong contrast to the surviving documentation of earlier glaziers and suggests a conscious attempt by Peckitt to shift the perception and possibly social status of his chosen craft by the way he conducted his business.⁴⁶⁴ Shawe-Taylor refers to the increasingly standardised work practices and production of portrait-painters who had to combine volume of work with courting patronage whilst always promoting their work as an 'art' not "this mill-horse business".⁴⁶⁵ This question of how Peckitt conceived of and defined what he did, and indeed how he was perceived by others, will be explored further below, but this matter of business practice and the management of patrons helps to shed light on the changing landscape of the commercial viability of glass painting outside London, building on the evidence discussed in Chapter Two, in the long eighteenth-century.

The influence of deans

Following Dean Finch's death in 1728, work on the glass tailed off, adding weight to the contention that such programmes were principally dean-led. The new dean, Richard Osbaldeston, (1728-1747) focused his attention and money instead on the repaving of the nave to the design of Lord Burlington and to the refurbishment by William Kent of the woodwork of the quire.⁴⁶⁶ The glass was maintained and, as discussed earlier, a glazier capable of some glass-painting, Jeffrey Linton, was briefly employed to work on St Michael le Belfrey in 1746, but it is clear Osbaldeston's interests in craft patronage lay elsewhere.⁴⁶⁷ If local glass-painters had been relying on the patronage of the Minster to maintain or

⁴⁶⁴ The business practices of painters such as Reynolds is discussed in Shawe-Taylor, *The Georgians: Eighteenth-Century Portraiture & Society*, 7-20.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid, 7.

⁴⁶⁶ Owen, "From the Restoration until 1822", 257.

⁴⁶⁷ YMA E3/114. Linton paid to become a freeman as a plumber and glazier in 1733 (*Register of the Freemen*, Surtees Society 102, 237), but does not appear in the guild register.

showcase their craft, the twenty-year tenure of Dean Osbaldeston would have been a testing time.

A new dean, Yorkshire-born John Fountayne, was appointed in 1747 having previously been appointed a canon of Salisbury in 1739 and of St. George's Chapel, Windsor in 1741 through family connections.⁴⁶⁸ His only two published works, a sermon on the Lisbon earthquake in 1755 and 'A Fast Sermon' in 1756 indicate a liberal, rational approach which Cash characterised as 'Latitudinariansim modified by Locke'.⁴⁶⁹ His time was initially taken up with a controversy concerning Jacques Sterne, the precentor, and his nephew Laurence, but Fountayne soon turned his attention to the Minster fabric and his appointment to York, the longest tenure of any dean, was the beginning of a new era in patronage of the glass.⁴⁷⁰ A variety of named glaziers and assistants (including a woman, Jane Hawkswell who was paid to clean the sills, but may also have provided general unskilled labour) reappeared: Jeffrey Linton; Edward Barker (possibly the son of Edmond Barker who had appeared in 1703) and John Myres. Their number was added to in 1754, when William Peckitt was also paid "*for painted Glass at the South Window £11 14s*".⁴⁷¹ This was William Peckitt's first appearance in the Minster accounts and it corresponds almost, but not exactly, with entry number 15 in Peckitt's Commission Book, dated November 1754: '*For the Cathedral of York – a figure of St. Peter and arms of the same £11 16s X*'.⁴⁷² His appearance in the Minster record so shortly after he advertised his skills and services in *The York Courant*, 1752, can be attributed directly to the interests and influence of Dean John Fountayne.⁴⁷³ Fountayne had already given Peckitt his first ever commission, a set of armorials for the deanery, only the year before and he was to become Peckitt's principal patron throughout his career.⁴⁷⁴

⁴⁶⁸ Arthur H. Cash, *Laurence Sterne: The Early & Middle Years* (London: Methuen, 1975), 222.

⁴⁶⁹ *Ibid*, 223.

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 225-242.

⁴⁷¹ YMA E3/122.

⁴⁷² Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 339. The 'X' has been interpreted to indicate that payment had been received.

⁴⁷³ Brighton and Sprakes, "Medieval and Georgian Stained Glass in Oxford and Yorkshire", 381.

⁴⁷⁴ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 330 entry 1 dated 1751.

Dean Fountayne and William Peckitt - 'The famous Mr Peckitt of York'

According to his own assertion on the first folio of his Commissions Book, William Peckitt (1731-1795) began making stained and painted glass in September 1751 and he immediately began to attract patrons.⁴⁷⁵ The son of a Yorkshire fellmonger, Peckitt's background and the source of his training (if any) in stained glass arts is obscure and he claimed to have taught himself.⁴⁷⁶ The Minster's payment to William Peckitt was made only three years after he started his business and in the same year he was admitted as a freeman of the city without payment, in recognition of the City's encouragement of him and his craft, and in gratitude for the glass panel he presented to them.⁴⁷⁷ This may be interpreted as evidence that the skill of glass-painting (with which, I would contend, York was still regionally associated until the early eighteenth century) had indeed died out and the city were anxious to encourage its reintroduction in order to stimulate the wider economic benefits which renewed association with a craft once again patronised by and fashionable with the upper classes might bring. An analysis of the Commission Book shows that Dean Fountayne was not only Peckitt's first patron, but continued to be a significant one. His first Minster commission was for the enamel glass figure of St Peter in s24, but the work was poorly executed and replaced within a few years. Despite this failure, Fountayne paid for several pieces of work (principally armorials) for the windows of both the old deanery and the several churches with which he was connected, including High Melton.⁴⁷⁸ His purpose in securing the work on the cathedral for Peckitt did not, however, extend to significant commissions for new work; perhaps the disappointment the St Peter figure deterred him? Peckitt seems instead to have been valued by Fountayne for his skills in dealing sensitively with the old glass. Whilst this was almost certainly a source of ongoing disappointment to Peckitt, as will be discussed below, it does indicate the level of respect and care Dean Fountayne had for the windows and his awareness of their importance in how the Minster was perceived and understood, which is

⁴⁷⁵ Brighton and Sprakes, "Medieval and Georgian Stained Glass in Oxford and Yorkshire", 381.

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁷ Ibid and note 9.

⁴⁷⁸ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 339.

discussed in Chapter Four. Whilst he seemingly did not want Peckitt's new glass, Dean Fountyane wanted the highest available quality work for repairs to the existing glass.

William Peckitt was paid for more painted glass in 1757 (£4 18s) and 1758 (£13 5s), but the greatest expense was in 1759 when he was paid £100 for stained glass and a further £94 4s was spent on the purchase and carriage of "six cases of crown glass from London".⁴⁷⁹ Although again the amounts do not match exactly, the 1757 purchases relate to the Great West Window (w1) restoration, recorded by inscription in the glass itself and by Peckitt as commission no.37 'For the Great West Window, York Minster – Several Heads for the Old Figures £4 13s'.⁴⁸⁰ This is the first recorded piece of restoration work by Peckitt for the Minster, the earlier commission having been for the new work of the St Peter figure in 1754. The restoration was extremely respectful of the original glass, with evidence of parts of heads being retained (such as in w1 panels 5a and 6a) and new sections inserted where other restorers may have simply replaced the whole head [Figure 57].⁴⁸¹ It was presumably this conservative attitude which endeared Peckitt to the dean and made him the obvious choice for the necessary repair work to the medieval glass, particularly at the west end where the fourteenth-century windows at the ends of the north and south aisles, particularly s36. This was heavily restored by Peckitt, who replaced Christ's hands and face [Figure 58], as well as parts of the cross and a figure he interpreted as St Peter, but which was more probably a donor figure (Thomas de Bouesdun or Beneston, *custos* or keeper of the Minster Fabric gave the window in 1338) [Figure 59].⁴⁸² The entry in the Commission Book refers to two figures, a St Peter and St John, each measuring "9sq feet", but no such figures remain and, as Brighton has observed, it is hard to see where they would have been

⁴⁷⁹ YMA E3/125-127. 'Crown glass' was a cheaper quality glass used for windows, as opposed to 'blown plate' or 'polished plate' which were more labour-intensive processes involving hand-polishing and used for mirror glass. The glass as blown into a globe which was then flattened and spun into a flat sheet. The thinnest, most desirable glass was at the edges, with the glass thickening to the centre point or 'bullseye'.

⁴⁸⁰ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 346.

⁴⁸¹ The restoration diagrams of w1 panels 5a and 6a, showing the location of Peckitt's insertions, are in French and O'Connor, *York Minster: A Catalogue of Medieval Stained Glass Fascicle 1 the West Windows of the Nave Wi, Wii, Nxxx, Sxxxvi*.

⁴⁸² The restoration of s36 is discussed in detail in the above.

placed.⁴⁸³ The repair is not particularly in keeping with the original glass, with apparently little attempt made to match the style or colouration, and the proportions (particularly of the hands) are very odd. The poor quality of Peckitt's draughtsmanship and the chemical instability of his early work have been much commented on by French and O'Connor and others, and Peckitt himself replaced the failing 1754 figure of St. Peter in s24 as a gift in 1768.⁴⁸⁴ Given the costs involved in producing a new figure, this gift can be considered as both 'relationship management' and a renewed attempt to promote his own glass designs to his patron.

Peckitt's patronage network and reputation outside York

Despite early technical setbacks, Peckitt's his skills improved and in his own day he was considered to have real feeling for ancient glass; his commission book contains a number of entries for repairing and resetting old glass.⁴⁸⁵ Horace Walpole, Peckitt's most prominent and socially influential patron, purchased new pieces by him as well as by Price and Pearson to supplement and complement the large consignment of Netherlandish glass acquired from Ascianti in the 1750s, but it is clear this new glass was simply to fill in gaps; the antique glass was considered superior.⁴⁸⁶ Walpole commissioned a window of seven lights "*consisting of Arms, Mosaic etc*" from Peckitt in 1761 at a cost of £34, but the lack of a cross beside the entry in the Book suggests payment was not received.⁴⁸⁷ The commission indicates that he considered Peckitt's strengths to be in the production of coloured glass, rather than figure work. Peckitt certainly devoted himself to experimentation to find good formulae for colours, as evidenced by his 1791 treatise discussed in Chapter Two, but his near-desperation to be considered a supplier of painted figures too comes through in

⁴⁸³ Ibid, 348 no.47.

⁴⁸⁴ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 339, note to entry 15.

⁴⁸⁵ Brighton and Sprakes, "Medieval and Georgian Stained Glass in Oxford and Yorkshire", 386.

⁴⁸⁶ Michael Peover, "The Stained Glass in Sir John Soane's Museum – an Overview," *Journal of Stained Glass* XXVII Special Issue "The Stained Glass Collection of Sir John Soane's Museum" (2004), 119.

⁴⁸⁷ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 355 no.77. Brighton ascribes the crosses to Harriet, Peckitt's daughter and suggests that they indicate payment received, in some cases posthumously.

the number of such gifts to his patrons.⁴⁸⁸ Walpole's love of ancient stained glass bordered on the obsessive and, although a significant patron of Peckitt, a remark in his correspondence suggested that he regarded Peckitt's glass as a necessary evil to complete a scheme rather than as a desirable acquisition in its own right:

*"My painted glass was so exhausted before I had got through any design, that I **was forced** to have the windows in the gallery painted by Peckitt".⁴⁸⁹*

Brighton noted that William Price the Younger was Walpole's preferred glass-painter, but Price's retirement in 1761 brought Peckitt to the fore.⁴⁹⁰ Walpole's remark does, nevertheless, suggest that he did not rate Peckitt's work as highly as Price's, at least early in Peckitt's career. This pattern of commissioning coloured glass, but not painting, is reflected in the commissions for the Minster in the same period: within three years, 1759-1761, almost £300 had been spent on the purchase of glass for repair, but only about £18 (depending on whether the Minster's figures or Peckitt's are used) for new painted glass.

Peckitt's Minster career

The 1754 insertion of a figure of St. Peter did not lead, as Peckitt undoubtedly hoped, to a commission for figures to fill the other windows of the south wall, or other significant figure work within the Minster.⁴⁹¹ The most significant addition to the Minster's body of stained glass in Peckitt's lifetime was the insertion in 1765 of panels from the fourteenth-century Jesse window from New College, Oxford, which Peckitt had valued at £30 and taken as part payment for the new work he was undertaking for the College Chapel [Figure 60].⁴⁹² Peckitt installed the partial Jesse into s8, the window which had been glazed with clear glass in 1720 under Dean Finch as noted above. Woodforde noted that the ruby flash backgrounds to the Jesse Tree figures had been

⁴⁸⁸ Brighton and Newton, "Unravelling an 18th Century Mystery: Peckitt's Red Glasses".

⁴⁸⁹ Ibid, 355.

⁴⁹⁰ Brighton and Sprakes, "Medieval and Georgian Stained Glass in Oxford and Yorkshire", 381.

⁴⁹¹ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 339 note to entry 15.

⁴⁹² Christopher Woodforde, *The Stained Glass of New College, Oxford* (London: Oxford University Press, 1951).

scraped off and surmised that this was necessary to “*make the glass less opaque*”, the ruby having corroded.⁴⁹³ This was most likely to make the glass look fresher and the figures clearer, rather than a practical matter of light penetration. It also gives weight to the argument that within Dean Fountayne’s planned programme of ‘improvement’ there was a deliberate policy of increasing the cathedral’s stock of medieval glass purely for decorative purposes, which was related neither to the performance of liturgy, nor to the material maintenance of the Minster fabric.

The Jesse Tree panels installed by Peckitt contained only the figures which would not have caused any Protestant concerns: principally they are Biblical kings of the lineage of David, with a John the Baptist with Agnus Dei in the tracery [Figure 61].⁴⁹⁴ If the panels depicting Christ Himself or Mary originally in the Jesse Tree were still in a state to be claimed by Peckitt they were not deployed here. Glass from New College chapel depicting Christ and Mary was installed by Peckitt in High Melton church, but those panels were from other New College chapel windows in a quite different style from the Jesse, being in the much more mannered style of the pieces employed elsewhere in the tracery of s8 [Figures 62 & 63].⁴⁹⁵ Doubts about Peckitt’s artistic skills continued to be raised: Dean Milles of Exeter cathedral advised the wardens of New College, Oxford in 1771 against using Peckitt’s own designs for the windows they were commissioning from him, “*Mr Peckitt should be consulted, though not employed as a draughtsman*”.⁴⁹⁶ However, his skills with old glass were apparently not in doubt. Fragments of the New College Jesse not used in s8 were used by Peckitt in s33 in 1789. This early fourteenth-century window, also a Jesse Tree, has Peckitt’s date of 1789 in the bottom of the third light surrounded by Oxford pieces as well as colourful sunbursts by him in the tracery lights [Figure 64]. Although heavily restored in 1950, the Peckitt tracery panels survived and are an

⁴⁹³ Ibid, 102-105.

⁴⁹⁴ The John the Baptist is not from the Jesse Tree. It is some of the New College glass from elsewhere in the chapel which is contemporary but in a very different style.

⁴⁹⁵ According to Woodforde, Peckitt also took old glass (presumably in an attempt to build up a bank from which to draw for repairs) valued at £25 in part payment for his work to the three windows on the north side of the New College chapel in 1771, so it is likely this glass relates to that exchange. Woodforde, *The Stained Glass of New College, Oxford*, 21-22.

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid, 23.

interesting example of his work at this date. They drew some colour references from the main lights, but the angular geometric shapes are not particularly sympathetic to the sinuous curves of the Jesse and the intensity of the colours with the dominant blue make for a rather unbalanced composition. Despite being in the nave, it appears that Fountayne was happy for the tracery of this medieval window not to have new figurative glass made for it, but instead to simply maintain the principle of having coloured glass rather than white. The decision to insert the Jesse panels as opposed to other pieces of the New College glass into s8 was almost certainly principally on grounds of the completeness of the design being sufficient to fill the space, but the similarity in style between the figures in the Jesse glass, being in the International Gothic style, and other figurative glass in the eastern arm (particularly the Great East Window, 1) may also have influenced the dean's choice. There is no hint that the clear glass had 'failed' or been damaged, so the replacement of it with this 'authentic' medieval glass, as opposed to new glass in a medieval style by Peckitt, was a deliberate decision to add to the amount of medieval glass in the Minster's windows. This insertion, and that of the *Te Deum* from St. Martin's Coney Street, may have been motivated by a desire to provide visual exemplars of doctrine as suggested by Katie Harrison, but this would be a very early (possibly the earliest recorded) date for the re-admission of imagery primarily as a didactic aide in a Protestant church.⁴⁹⁷ It may also have been driven by the mistaken belief that *all* the windows had once been completely glazed with coloured, figurative glass and so by installing this alien glass they were restoring the appearance of the Minster to an imagined and indeterminate (but pre-Reformation) former state of medieval perfection. Such acquisitions were certainly a deliberate choice by Dean Fountayne.

The fabric roll entries for William Peckitt: "1777 To Peckett for Glass £22 7s 6d" (some of which was possibly destined for n27) and "1781 Peckett for Glass £17 2s" were for painted glass.⁴⁹⁸ The first of these was recorded in the Commission Book as "To York Minster for Repairs - 119¾ sq. feet of ornamental

⁴⁹⁷ Harrison, "There Is No Trace of It in the Minster Glass now".

⁴⁹⁸ YMA E3/148 and 151.

pieces of painted and stained glass" while the 1781 account maps to an entry dated 1782 for *'broken pieces of stained and painted glass for repair'* as well as *'mosaic pieces'* and two types of yellow glass.⁴⁹⁹ These must relate to the work in the south nave aisle where the tracery lights of window s30 have the date 1782 and where strong yellow (one of the specified colours supplied) features prominently, as do a pair of legs of Eve [Figure 65].⁵⁰⁰ The legs and serpent were based on the same Biaggio Rebecca designs he used for the new glass commission at New College, but here they must have been amongst the *'broken pieces'* purchased for repair as their disembodied appearance is otherwise inexplicable in this window and in stark contrast the geometric designs in the tracery work of s33 discussed above. What is most noteworthy, however, is the nature of Peckitt's contributions: there are no great original schemes of his own devising, he was employed to restore the existing windows and was relied upon to supply glass of a suitable quality and appearance to do so. Whilst this must have frustrated Peckitt in his quest to use York as a showcase for his artistic talents, it does provide a measure of the skill Fountayne considered him to have in the delicate and sensitive matter of early stained-glass restoration. Dean Fountayne was prepared to spend money on preserving and repairing the medieval glass and he employed the finest available talent to supply the deficiencies. For Dean Fountayne, patronage meant preservation and restoration of the old as much as, or (in the case of his resistance to the installation of the panels presented by Peckitt as a gift) more than commissioning new work.

Dean Fountayne's patronage of Peckitt the artist

Peckitt's work can be identified in thirteen of the Minster's windows. These are mostly dated, enabling specific windows to be tied in with otherwise usually anonymous account entries. They also provide physical evidence for how

⁴⁹⁹ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 402, entry 220 and 405, entry 239.

⁵⁰⁰ The apparent discrepancy in years between the date of the transaction in the Fabric Roll and Peckitt's book occurs through the retention of Old Style dating within the Minster accounts for entries between 1st January and 25th March. Nationally, accounting years now ran across the start of the calendar year, but individual entries were most commonly recorded according to the calendar year in which they fell. The Minster, however, still recorded individual dates as if the New Year had remained as 25th March, a practice they continued into the early nineteenth century.

Peckitt's skills and techniques improved over time: 1757/8 repairs to the windows at the west end show a variety of levels of intervention, not all entirely successful, but the painted pieces inserted into s30 in 1782 and the head of St William and borders installed in s20 in 1793 [Figure 66] are technically far superior and artistically more accomplished (although the design for s20 was not drafted by Peckitt). He undertook repairs to n27 in the north nave aisle in 1779 inserting completely new glass in the tracery [Figure 67], unlike his inserted repairs to faces in w1.⁵⁰¹ His design drew upon the tracery and details of the Rose window (S16), which he also restored. The painting here is more accomplished than in s36 and he could supply a range of stained colours for the triangular insertions, including the elusive red. But it is clear from the phrasing of the entries that he was always employed to provide specific *glass*, he was never commissioned to create complete new windows from scratch.

Peckitt's original advertisement in the *York Courant*: "*....the art of painting or staining of glass in all kinds of colours and and all sorts of figures...*" shows he saw himself principally as an artist.⁵⁰² He also offered his services for the repair of '*old broken painted windows*', which was the skills Fountayne valued in relation to the Minster glass, but commissions for new work was what he wanted. Given Fountayne's patronage of Peckitt throughout his career, the lack significant commissions for new work, or even the installation of glass gifted to the Minster by Peckitt (discussed below), requires explanation. The sums expended on the glass in this period show it cannot be attributed to cost: the costs of glazing were routinely many multiples of the outlay to Peckitt for the glass itself.

In the early years, Peckitt was supplying the pieces of painted glass, but they were being both leaded up and installed by the Minster glaziers. This could account for the very odd proportions of some of the insertions, such as those in s36: it is hard to imagine how someone could create pieces of such incongruity if they had even part of the rest of the window on the bench. If, however, they

⁵⁰¹ This window, n27, is one which may have been worked on by the Crosbys, so some of the repairs to the grisaille may be theirs, not Peckitt's.

⁵⁰² YML *York Courant*, 14 July 1752.

were being painted in isolation off-site working only to an overall dimension of the space to be filled, or perhaps using a sketch and/or a rubbing of the leads to create an outline, it would be easier to understand how such discrepancies could arise. If Peckitt's draughtsmanship was not initially his strength, the working practices as evidenced by the accounts would certainly have made it even harder to create pieces which were sympathetic in style or scale to the surrounding original glass.⁵⁰³

If the technical standard and reliability of Peckitt's early painting were a cause of dissatisfaction to either himself or the dean, the quality of his later work would have more than made up for that: the colours and draughtsmanship of his late figures, particularly Abraham, are very fine and his work was obviously considered of a high enough quality to merit installation into the dean's family church at High Melton.⁵⁰⁴ The determination to employ Peckitt solely for repair and restoration work was, I believe, a conscious choice by Dean Fountayne to maintain and enhance the Minster as a treasure-house of *medieval* stained glass and not to disrupt that with major new insertions, however good. The result was Peckitt was unable to use the Minster as a 'shop-window' for his own new designs in painted work, which must have been deeply frustrating. A measure of Peckitt's frustration and attempts to break through this barrier may be evidenced by his January and April 1780 gifts to the Minster of '*A Figure as large as life, of King Solomon*' [Figure 68] and '*A Figure as large as life of Abraham*'.⁵⁰⁵ These figures are now two of the four monumental images with Moses and St. Peter [Figure 69]in the south wall of the south transept (s18, s19, s23, s24). There is no record in his Commission Book for the Moses figure, but in each of the other three cases the figures are recorded as "A Gift to York Minster' and valued by Peckitt at £40. Except for the replacement St Peter figure, none of these gifts were installed by the Minster in Peckitt's lifetime: the same figures were bequeathed to the Dean and Chapter by Peckitt's will some fifteen years

⁵⁰³ Several of the panels Peckitt repaired, such as s36, have been the subject of later rather heavy-handed restoration, so their current appearance may not be entirely Peckitt's fault!

⁵⁰⁴ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 339 entry 16.

⁵⁰⁵ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 403, entry 230.

later, on condition they be erected within one year of his death.⁵⁰⁶ The Moses figure had been speculatively created at some point between 1768 and 1780, and was (according to Peckitt's will) to have been bought by Dean Fountayne personally, but clearly something went awry. Brighton conjectured that Peckitt had wanted this figure to be placed in the third window (s23), replacing the window to John Petty, in order to secure the Petty glass for Walpole's Strawberry Hill collection.⁵⁰⁷ Walpole's influence as an arbiter of taste meant he was in a position to make or break Peckitt's reputation nationally, so the desire to win favour must have been very strong, but if Peckitt was attempting to secure this glass for Walpole he was ultimately unsuccessful.⁵⁰⁸ The Dean had not complied and this hope had not been realised.⁵⁰⁹ The Moses figure was eventually purchased in 1796 from Peckitt's widow and installed alongside the Solomon and Abraham figures, replacing the image of John Petty, just as the other figures replaced the remaining medieval glass in that row.⁵¹⁰ This supports the hypothesis that Fountayne valued the existing medieval glass and was unwilling to sacrifice it to install new glass, however highly accomplished. Peckitt's new glass work for Fountayne was drawing on the fruits of his attempts at the rediscovery or imitation of mediaeval techniques and use of strong colours (in contrast to the very muted tones of some of his contemporaries), but his work did not truly capture the style or palette of the medieval glass. Despite the praise afforded him by William Warrington, a key figure in the Gothic Revival, that he "*perhaps incorporated more ancient feeling into his work than any other contemporary artist*", no-one studying the glass today would mistake Peckitt's work for a medieval original.⁵¹¹

Both the earlier figures of Moses and Peter (s23 and s24) have distinctly Gothic canopies [Figure 69], but the later Abraham and Solomon figures have canopies [Figure 68] which did not draw on any ornament from the Minster in

⁵⁰⁶ Ibid, note to entry 230.

⁵⁰⁷ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 403.

⁵⁰⁸ Morris R. Brownell, *The Prime Minister of Taste: A Portrait of Horace Walpole* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2001).

⁵⁰⁹ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 403.

⁵¹⁰ Ibid, 403-404.

⁵¹¹ O'Connor and Haselock, "The Stained and Painted Glass", 388.

their design, but rather drew their influence from the late-fourteenth-century canopies in the New College glass installed by Peckitt in High Melton and in the tracery of s8. The Moses figure which Peckitt claimed was to have been purchased by Dean Fountayne must have made by him with the aspiration of it being installed in the Minster; its scale is too monumental to imagine it being installed in either High Melton Hall or the church. It may also be conjectured that Peckitt always intended it to be part of a series, a marvellously prominent display of his work in the most prestigious setting of his home city. The gift of a new St Peter to replace the earlier inferior piece suggests he also planned further New Testament figures to balance them, although there is no documentary evidence for this. But despite his patronage of and general favour towards Peckitt, it is clear this was not Dean Fountayne's vision for the Minster and its glass. He saw the Minster as a medieval, specifically Gothic, treasure; a repository of authentic (if not always native) medieval stained glass of which the installation of the New College Jesse glass was a part. As far as I have been able to determine, although this merits further research, in this the Minster is unique: no other dean was actively acquiring medieval glass for installation in their cathedral for anything other than patch repair. This speaks to the importance of the stained glass in the Minster's public portrayal and sense of identity, building upon the ideas outlined by Sweet with regard to York more widely.⁵¹²

Some of Peckitt's last work for the Minster, personally commissioned by Dean Fountayne, was the restoration of the rose window in the south transept (S16) [Figure 70]. James Torre wrote the rose window "*is called the 'marygold window glazed with coloured glass representing several little marigolds'*", but a century later it needed work.⁵¹³ On 25th June 1793 Peckitt recorded the supply of numerous pieces of red blue and 'Rich Yellow' coloured glasses and "*5 large Red Rounds at 2s 6d [and] 2 Red small painted roses 6 inches at 2s 6d*" to a total value of £3 8s for repairs '*to the circular window in the Minster*'.⁵¹⁴ Although the glass of S16 as it appears today is the product of extensive restoration both in

⁵¹² Sweet, "History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake's *Eboracum* (1736)".

⁵¹³ YMA L1/7 p.45 (the folio numbering is confused at this point in the manuscript: this is the modern pagination in this section of the photocopy).

⁵¹⁴ Brighton, "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", 427 entry 308.

1969-70 (when some Peckitt pieces were removed) and after the 1984 south transept fire, Peckitt's work is still discernible, most notably in the yellow flower he painted in the centre [Figure 71].⁵¹⁵ This has been described by Gibson and others as a sunflower, but it is in fact the English marigold, *calendula officinalis*.⁵¹⁶ After years of being denied a showcase, Peckitt took the opportunity to place his trademark symbol at the very centre of the window which was itself at the apex of the most public façade of the Minster. His trademark was, however, seemingly dictated by the existing imagery of the window. Perhaps his adoption of this symbol marked his long-held ambition to create a south-front scheme.

The relationship between the dean and his chapter

John Fountayne (1715-1802) was the Minster's longest serving dean, holding the post from 1747 (aged only 32, unusually young for a dean) until his death aged 87 in 1802.⁵¹⁷ Apart from his interest in and care for the Minster's glass, he was responsible for several 'improvements' and repairs to the Minster interior, including the dismantling of the rest of the fifteenth-century revestry screen behind the high altar (a process begun by Dean Finch).⁵¹⁸ The extent to which the repair and appearance of the Minster, especially the glass, was primarily if not solely the province of the Dean in this period can be glimpsed in the letters the Precentor, William Mason, and Horace Walpole exchanged between 1763 and 1797.⁵¹⁹ Whilst they did occasionally refer to Minster matters (usually Mason complaining bitterly about being in residence and the cold!), they never once spoke of the work on the glass, or Peckitt's role in it. A chance remark by Mason in relation to a long-standing plan to house the tomb of Prince

⁵¹⁵ Gibson, *The Stained and Painted Glass of York Minster*, 31; flower information from RHS Harlow Carr.

⁵¹⁶ Ibid.

⁵¹⁷ "Fountayne, John (FNTN732J)" in Venn, *A Cambridge Alumni Database* (University of Cambridge) <http://venn.lib.cam.ac.uk>.

⁵¹⁸ Owen, "From the Restoration until 1822", 257.

⁵¹⁹ Horace Walpole, *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford, and the Rev. William Mason; Now First Publ. From the Original Mss.*, ed. William Mason, et al. (London: Richard Bentley, 1851).

William of Hatfield (in the north quire aisle) sheds some light on the near-autonomous role of the Dean and his management of the fabric fund:

*"I have found out an empty gothic shrine in a conspicuous part of the Minster, which will exactly fit William de Hatfield, in which I plan to place him (The Dean willing) at my next residence. But I must do it at my own expense, I suspect;"*⁵²⁰

Even the second most senior residentiary canon had little direct authority over changes to the Minster fabric and the funding of them. Walpole did mention Peckitt on several occasions, asking Mason to convey parcels to Peckitt and on one occasion asking Mason to suggest to Peckitt that he look to the coloured glass used in *"every necklace shop [which] sells false rubies and emeralds, which jewellers must take out of the setting, to be sure they are not true!"* to solve the problem that *"he and all the modern glass-painters cannot recover the fine ancient reds and greens"*.⁵²¹ He was obviously well aware that Peckitt was working at York, and making coloured glass, yet on no occasion did he or Mason mention the work on the windows which one would have imagined would have been of interest to Walpole.

The interests of the Chapter during Dean Foutayne's tenure were focused on patronage of a different kind, that of clerical preferment and financial advantage.⁵²² There is no evidence, beyond acknowledgment of the annual accounts, that anyone beyond the dean took any interest in the glass or Foutayne's programme of works. As Mason's letter makes clear, the fabric was the dean's domain and individual, rather than collegiate, interests held sway. The decision to install Peckitt's figures in 1796 was taken in the last years of the aged dean's tenure when he was 81 years old. Maybe, by then, Foutayne was less dominant in Minster management, or perhaps, after his friend's death, Foutayne felt somewhat guilty that there was no fitting memorial to a man who had become the foremost glass-painter of his day in a cathedral so celebrated for its glass and relented.

⁵²⁰ Ibid. Letter from William Mason to Horace Walpole dated from York 12th May 1777.

⁵²¹ Ibid. Letter from Horace Walpole to William Mason 11th March 1776.

⁵²² Arthur H. Cash, *Laurence Sterne, the Later Years* (London ; New York: Methuen, 1986); YMA H7-H10/1 Chapter Act Books 1747-1802.

As Dorothy Owen noted the last decades of the eighteenth century were characterised by the Minster engaging more positively in city affairs and in 'improving' in the modernising sense the prospects of the Minster from various viewpoints.⁵²³ The south transept approach was the principal access from the city which now held the Minster in higher regard, so the ultimate acceptance of the Peckitt glass could be considered a decision to 'improve' this prospect. Perhaps, as discussed above, the time had come to celebrate York's most recent and nationally-famous glass-painting son. His death was reported in the *York Chronicle* and in *The Gentleman's Magazine* ("that eminent painter on glass, Mr William Peckitt") so more prominent recognition of his work and gifts may have been deemed prudent in city relations.⁵²⁴ Peckitt's monumental figures of Moses, Abraham and Solomon were installed and the Petty glass lost. There is no clue, sadly, as to the fate of the Petty figure: there is no evidence to suggest that Walpole ever did acquire it before his death in 1797. Perhaps it made its way into a glazier's stock of old glass and may one day come to light?

Conclusion

The nature, purpose and intensity of patronage of the Minster glass varied considerably between 1530 and 1796, but it was predominantly about individual motivation, and only rarely about collegiate identity. Dean Hygdon's connection with the Rotherham glass of the 1530s appears to have been bound up with his relationship to Cardinal Wolsey and a desire to assert archiepiscopal authority over civic power through stained glass. The dominance in the seventeenth century of archiepiscopal influence over Chapter and consequent diminution of power of absentee but long-lasting deans, like John Thornborough (1589-1617) who held many offices in plurality, or the hopeless gambler John Scott (1625-1644), did influence work, as seen in Lamplugh's memorial.⁵²⁵

⁵²³ Owen, "From the Restoration until 1822", 269-270.

⁵²⁴ YML *York Chronicle* 15th October 1795; *The Gentleman's Magazine*, October 1795 DEATHS *The Gentleman's Magazine: And Historical Chronicle, Jan.1736-Dec.1833*, 65(4), 878-886. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.york.ac.uk/docview/8145944?accountid=15181>.

⁵²⁵ A. L. Rowse, "Bishop Thornborough: A Clerical Careerist," in *For Veronica Wedgwood These: Studies in Seventeenth-Century History*, ed. Richard Lawrence Ollard, and Pamela Tudor-Craig (London: Collins, 1986), 89-108; Foster, "Archbishop Richard Neile Revisited".

The extent to which the Chapter House programmes of the 1660s and 1690s were dean-led or Dean and Chapter-led is uncertain, but the undoubted motivation was a reassertion of corporate governance. What is clear is that the appointment of a succession of four exceptionally able deans between 1697 and 1802, each of whom held only this ecclesiastical post, reasserted the control of the dean over the affairs of the Minster and the care of its fabric. In the careers of Finch and more particularly Fountayne we can see how that autonomy enabled an individual's vision for the Minster to be imposed upon the building through both personal patronage and through control of corporate funds. In the period of Dean Fountayne's tenure in particular we also see the emergence of a new kind of patronage, that of not only preserving old glass, but respecting its integrity and valuing it as an artistic entity, sometimes above the commissioning of new work. This understanding that, in York particularly, the medieval glass had a value beyond its functional or didactic qualities is explored in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR: - RECEPTION AND PERCEPTION

Introduction

The preceding chapters have considered the evidence for who made or cared for the glass and who paid for or initiated this work. The windows are now promoted and acknowledged as York Minster's defining feature for both quantity and quality of surviving medieval stained and painted glass, but I have demonstrated that they are not an untouched inheritance. In this chapter I will consider how the glass was viewed and understood and explore the possible origins of this idea of the pre-eminence of the glass through an analysis of the evidence for the relationship between the attitudes of the Dean and Chapter and the growing public interest in its windows. I explore the interrelated questions of who these viewers, one might almost say 'consumers' (building on Sweet's ideas of consumption in York in this period), were of the glass in the past and what influenced that experience.⁵²⁶ These audiences changed over time, but what prompted those changes and what impact (if any) did this have on the care or approach to patronage of the glass? The period I wish to focus on in this chapter is the one hundred and fifty years between the Civil War and the death of William Peckitt in 1795.

This was a period of intense antiquarian activity both nationally and in York. It was also a period of continuing ambiguity towards religious imagery.⁵²⁷ The continued addition to the stock of medieval glass and the care taken of the integrity of the appearance of the windows discussed in the preceding chapters speak of an enduring, occasionally intensifying interest in the presence of figurative imagery in the Minster. But the risks attendant upon the nature of such interests in a religious setting and the questions of propriety, spelled out as late as 1798 by Walpole in his *Sermon on Painting*, make the relationship between the windows and the concentric circles of 'consumer' - the Chapter, the antiquarians and scholars, polite society, and the wider public - worthy of study.⁵²⁸ Walpole cautioned against crossing the fine line between using an

⁵²⁶ Sweet, "History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake's *Eboracum* (1736)", 20.

⁵²⁷ Haynes, *Pictures and Popery*.

⁵²⁸ Horace Walpole, *The Works*, 1798, 5 vols., vol. 2 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1975), 279-287.

image of, for example, the Nativity, to inspire and evoke religious sentiment and using the same image as an object of idolatory.⁵²⁹ The importance of the York antiquarian James Torre (active c.1675-1691) is discussed both for his unique level of interest in the non-heraldic subject matter in the windows and for what the subtle changes in his terminology across the period of his recording may say about the shifting attitudes towards religious imagery in York and about visual literacy in general.⁵³⁰ The use of his (unpublished) work as both a source and inspiration for publications by Thomas Gent and Francis Drake in the mid-eighteenth century gives insight into how such manuscripts were used, while the publications themselves raise questions of supply and demand: did Drake and Gent respond to public demand, or generate it? The contemporary public accessibility of antiquarian scholarship is discussed by Sweet who said, “It cannot be said that antiquarianism was truly popularised or consumed by a mass readership”, but who acknowledged that the cheap publications by Thomas Gent on the Great East Window, which drew heavily on Torre’s work for the identification of scenes (but not for the bizarre poetic form!), come close to a form of popularisation and suggest that the glass exerted some particular fascination which created an unusual, if not unique, climate in York.⁵³¹ Underpinning all of these questions is the fluctuating attitude of the Dean and Chapter (but principally that of the dean, as Chapter Three has demonstrated) in this period as successive regimes imposed their ideas on the fabric.

The impact of the Civil War

The musician Thomas Mace published *Musick's Monument* in 1676 in which he wrote his eye-witness account of being in the Minster during the Siege of York in 1644. He described a Minster thronged with people of all social classes who had come to hear the preaching, prayers and psalm singing whilst

⁵²⁹ Ibid, 282.

⁵³⁰ Torre’s manuscript on the fabric of the Minster is preserved as YMA L1/7.

⁵³¹ Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, 309-310; Thomas Gent, *The Most Delectable, Scriptural and Pious History of the Famous and Magnificent Great Eastern Window (According to Beautiful Portraitures) in St. Peter's Cathedral, York* (York: impressed for the author [ie. Thomas Gent], 1762).

the fighting raged outside. His vivid descriptions of the gunfire "*so much that sometimes a canon bullet has come in at the windows and bounc'd about from pillar to pillar, in its returns or rebounds, until its force has been spent*" may have been written some thirty five years after the event, but it was a record of his own remembered first-hand experience of being in the Minster.⁵³² It is clear that the windows suffered some limited collateral damage, but equally that the glass and the Minster more generally was not a deliberate target. This was due to the personal intervention of the Parliamentarian commander, Sir Thomas Fairfax, a story which has become widely known in York. His orders, variously reported with degrees of exaggeration as being that anyone caught damaging the Minster or looting would be shot, through to ordering all the glass to be removed (it wasn't), appear to have been effective.⁵³³ There is no evidence that York suffered the indignities or redundancy that blighted some other cathedrals, quite the contrary. The city records show a desire to reform the Minster and reclaim it from the alienating Laudian practices which had intellectually separated the Minster from the local population. The building itself was now under city control and there was a new and somewhat surprising concern for its care.⁵³⁴

This did not, however, mean that the whole fabric was to be regarded as important, nor did it prevent the sale of glass: Torre noted the loss of one window from the north nave aisle: "*The first window being all of New White glass hath nothing observable in it for the old painted Glass was taken down & sold in the time of the late troubles (as I am Informed)*".⁵³⁵ The building was of use for large-scale worship, certainly offering the opportunity for larger scale gatherings than anywhere else in the city, and needed to be kept in good repair for that purpose, but with a distinctly practical edge. The proposed sale of the Chapter House, demonstrates the willingness to dispense with any part of the

⁵³² Thomas Mace, *Musick's Monument or a Remembrancer of the best practical music both divine and civil that has ever been known to have been in the world. Divided into Three parts* (London, 1676), 20.

⁵³³ The Fairfax story appeared in Daniel Defoe, *A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain* (London: printed for S. Birt, T. Osborne, D. Browne, J. Hodges, J. Osborn, A. Millar & J. Robinson, 1748), 174; see also, Thomas Gent's *The Antient and Modern History of the Famous City of York; and in a Particular Manner of Its Magnificent Cathedral, Commonly Call'd, York-Minister* (1730) and Drake's *Eboracum* (1736).

⁵³⁴ Angelo Raine, ed. "Proceedings of the Commonwealth Committee for York and the Ainsty", in Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series CXVIII (1951) *Miscellanea VI*, ed. C. E. Whiting, (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1953); Drake, *Eboracum*, 215.

⁵³⁵ YMA L1/7 f. 20.

building which was not useful and did not merit preservation on grounds of utility.⁵³⁶ Glass did have utility, it kept the weather out, but if money could be made from selling small amounts of 'useless' imagery and replacing it with good, honest clear glass, so much the better. However, this was not something to be attempted on any scale with windows the size of those in the Minster.

A matter of economics

Economic considerations may partially explain the emphasis on windows and images in glass in the orders issued by the Commonwealth Committee for York and the Ainsty 1645-1646.⁵³⁷ However, as Aston discusses, glass had not especially been a target for sixteenth-century Reformers, whereas now it was: images once considered unproblematic now caused unease.⁵³⁸ However, there was a distinct difference between the orders made for parish churches and the orders that affected the Minster: no mention was made anywhere of any work to be done on the windows in the Minster. During 1645 and 1646, forty-two orders were issued in respect of the Archbishop, the Dean and Chapter and York Minster, several directly concerned with the disposition and upkeep of the fabric.⁵³⁹ The funds necessary for the repairs were to be obtained through the removal and sale of moveable items, while the stone and woodwork 'liberated' by the removal of now-superfluous ornamental features were to be stored and used by the citizenry, perhaps to effect repairs to other buildings damaged in the siege of 1644. The first order, dated 30th October 1645, ordered that:

*"Mr. Dossie shall presently sell away the candlesticks of the Minster, being two of silver and the thre silver boates and the brasse about the shrine called Thomas a Beckitt, and the great brasse deske whiche stood in the quire and all other loose brasse that is bout the Minster for aid towards the repare of the fabricke and the bells".*⁵⁴⁰

⁵³⁶ Drake, *Eboracum*, 478.

⁵³⁷ Raine, "Proceedings of the Commonwealth Committee for York and the Ainsty".

⁵³⁸ Aston, *Broken Idols of the English Reformation*, 619.

⁵³⁹ Raine, "Proceedings of the Commonwealth Committee for York and the Ainsty".

⁵⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 6.

The mention of a still-recognisable shrine to Becket is surprising and indicative of how minimally the Minster had conformed to the religious changes of the previous one hundred years. The second, made 29th June 1646, "*Ordered that Mr. Richard Dossie shall furtherwith cause to be pulled down the greate organ lofte in the Minster* [this presumably refers to the organ on the north side of the quire, put up at the expense and behest of Charles I following his visit in 1633, and thus a particular target for the Parliamentarians] *and the canopie over the same, and the canopies in the severall clossits there are over the little awters in the quire and to take away the funt and ly upp all the material for the public use*".⁵⁴¹ The emphasis was on unlocking the perceived material wealth of the Minster and making it 'useful'.

The complete absence of any reference to the many images which could clearly be seen in the windows is in sharp contrast to the orders made for the rest of the city:

"John Gelderd, Alderman, and Mr. Herring are desired to view the windows in Walmgate ward and call unto them the Churchwardens and one or two of the best parishioners and where there are anie supersticious pictures in glasse therein they shall take order the same be taken downe and broken in pieces. The like order for Bootham ward. The like for Micklegate and the like for Muncke. Capt. Taylor to assist".⁵⁴²

They were also to view the pictures in the market cross in Thursday Market and in the Bedern Chapel. In May 1646, the "*severall supersticious pictures sett in glasse in the church windows of St. Martin 's in Cunistreit shalbe taken away or wholly defaced by the churchwardens*" in addition to the order that the gilded heads (apparently those of the Three Kings) in the same church be defaced and the font removed. The order was extended in August 1646 to include taking down all fonts and pull down all crucifixes "*and other scandalus pictures fourth of everie severall chirche window in this Cittie soe much as they seemes in the same as shalbe needfull*".⁵⁴³ Exactly what was classed as *supersticious* or

⁵⁴¹ Ibid, 8.

⁵⁴² Ibid, 14.

⁵⁴³ Ibid, 15.

scandalus was clearly open to some interpretation; both the St. Martin window in St. Martin's Coney Street and the Te Deum window survived untouched, the latter to be bought by the Minster in 1724 as discussed in Chapter Three, whilst the Trinity image [Figure 72] was badly damaged. The distinction made between *supersticious* and *scandalus* suggests that images were considered to pose two kinds of potential danger: they could still be the subject of inappropriate devotion and the focus of the perpetuation of a 'superstitious' belief that they held actual power; or they could be an affront to the accepted or approved theology of the time by portraying figures or scenes in a way considered to be 'scandalous' and therefore likely to cause offence.⁵⁴⁴ Thus, the presence of the image of a saint, even the face of God, alone was not sufficient to require removal: if there was no evidence that it had been the subject of veneration or devotion, or had been regarded as having supernatural agency (in the way that a statue might), then its removal was not necessary. The degree to which an image might be termed 'scandalous' depended upon the sensibilities and religious leanings of those doing the assessing, but also on accessibility the nature of the space. The large, public space of the Minster with its high, distant windows probably partially obscured by dirt and mending leads was a less 'dangerous' place than the parish churches where personal devotion and a closer proximity to some images may render them more problematic. In addition, it may be presumed the higher level of education of the clergy of the Minster and, by extension, those most likely to attend its services, would make them less susceptible to the corrupting influence of images than Walpole's "*poor vulgar who adore what seems to surpass the genius of human nature*".⁵⁴⁵ The key phrase in this order was "*soe much as they seemes in the same **as shalbe needful***".

The idea that images in glass could even be considered dangerous had become more extreme over time: even Zwingli, writing in the 1520s, had not considered stained glass imagery to be a cause of idolatrous worship but simply

⁵⁴⁴ This is discussed in relation to both windows and three-dimensional images in Aston, *Broken Idols of the English Reformation*.

⁵⁴⁵ Walpole, *The Works*, 281.

an ornament.⁵⁴⁶ Thus, an image of the Trinity might be considered *scandalus* if it could corrupt the minds of those viewing the image. By contrast, a depiction of a saint, it could be argued, may not be *superstitious* if it no longer had the power to evoke devotion in the minds of the parishioners and therefore it was not *needful* to remove or deface it, even if the image was contained within a representation of idolatrous practices (such as the St William window, n7). It would be naïve to assume that pragmatism played no part: the scale of the task and the height of some windows meant it could not be undertaken lightly or easily. Glass which was high up, such as the clerestory windows, would be difficult and expensive to replace, but arguably was of less concern as the imagery too would be less accessible and therefore less likely to be a focus for unsuitable devotion. In the absence of any especially zealous enforcement, the survival of glass around the city strongly suggests that some churches argued convincingly that the imagery in their glass held no significance for the parish beyond keeping the weather out and so removal and defacement of glass which could be deemed potentially *superstitious* was more limited than the tone of the order would suggest.

The impact of the removal of any glass deemed necessary was not lost on the committee who had ingenious ways of funding the necessary repairs: in December 1646, the churchwardens of St. Denys parish, who were noted to be repairing the windows, were instructed to “*sell away all the organ pipes and other materialls belonging to the organs at the best rate they can, and dispose of the money towards the repara of the church and windows*”. What this order for St. Denys has in common with the orders relating to the Minster was the concern that the buildings be kept in good repair, and quite likely in a better state than heretofore. There are several references to the cathedral being “in want of repair”, and very real concern expressed in December 1646 as to the necessity of the care of the cathedral and its property being properly overseen by the city “*the same in prevention of such abuses as some unruly persons do daily presume to offer to the same [cathedral and fabric] for want of due*

⁵⁴⁶ Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 257 and note 10.

custody".⁵⁴⁷ Ironically, the only person named by the Committee as indulging in the illicit removal of building materials from Minster property was Mrs Scott, the widow of the impecunious Dean Scott, whose stripping of the woodwork (particularly the wainscoting) of the deanery seriously compromised its stability as a building!⁵⁴⁸

The evidence for iconoclasm

The complete absence of any reference to the images in the Minster's windows is striking: it could hardly be imagined that the Committee had not noticed them. One clue to this apparent anomaly lies in the rest of the wording of the order to Mr Dossie quoted above: "... *by severall orders comitted to the Lord mayor and Aldermen of this City untill further order of Parliament in that behalfe...*" and again later "... *and this order to be duely observed untill the Parliament shall give other or further order in the premises*".⁵⁴⁹ It appears that the Committee were on sure ground as regards their authority over any aspect of the city churches, as well as the general maintenance of Minster buildings and the removal of moveable objects and fittings, but more circumspect when it came to actually altering the fabric of the Minster, particularly in ways which could compromise its resilience to bad weather. The effect of any large-scale removal of window glass on the fabric would have been very significant; it is no exaggeration to suggest that the wholesale removal of the stained glass without immediate boarding or replacement would have brought about the dilapidation if not ultimately the ruin of the building. However, this does not explain the apparent lack of use of other options, such as whitewash or inversion or disordering of images, none of which would have compromised the weatherproofing of the building. Trevor Cooper, in his edition of William Dowsing's *Journal*, makes numerous references to images being inverted to 'neutralise' them.⁵⁵⁰ Perhaps the scale of the task at the Minster was simply too

⁵⁴⁷ Raine, "Proceedings of the Commonwealth Committee for York and the Ainsty", 8.

⁵⁴⁸ Ibid, 6-7.

⁵⁴⁹ Ibid, 8-9.

⁵⁵⁰ Trevor Cooper, ed. *The Journal of William Dowsing: Iconoclasm in East Anglia During the English Civil War* (Woodbridge: The Ecclesiological Society/ The Boydell Press, 2001); see also Pamela Graves,

large, the Committee preferring to await further instructions, but there are two other avenues which merit further consideration. The first is that some limited iconoclasm or image 'neutralising' *did* take place, notably in windows most prominently in the civic/public sight, but that this was reversed almost immediately after the Restoration in 1660. An accurate assessment of this is unfortunately compromised by the work of later restorations which have removed the evidence. The second is that the comparative lack of action and the location of the putative action tell us something of the relative influence and importance that the Committee placed on images people might view in the Minster's windows as against those in their parish churches.

The figurative windows in the south transept and west end are above the ceremonial entrances and exits to the Minster. Their imagery would have been the most conspicuous to the public and the civil authorities and potentially the most cause for concern, but the evidence is very slight and inconclusive. Hildyard's *Antiquities of York City* noted: "*there is a window in the Minster over the South Door which the said John Petty Glazed, and wherein he is depicted in an Alderman's Gown: the same Window has since been Renewed by the Edmund Gyles Glazier anno 1662*" [Figure 24].⁵⁵¹ The figure of Petty kneeling at a prayer desk invoking prayers for his soul may have been altered, perhaps to remove the scroll or render it illegible, but the need for renewal may equally refer to the storm damage of 1660, also noted by Hildyard. The renewal of this kneeling image, positioned as it was beneath saints and bishops, would have acted as a visual reminder to the city of the place of the aldermen in the restored hierarchy of power.

It is possible that Peckitt's work of 1757 in w1 consisted of undoing iconoclasm or war damage, although Drake's (albeit brief) description of the window does not refer to any significant damage and he was able to identify the figures as kings and bishops.⁵⁵² It is significant that Peckitt's work was centred

"From an Archaeology of Iconoclasm to an Anthropology of the Body. Images, Punishment, and Personhood in England, 1500–1660," *Current Anthropology* 49, no. 1 (2008).

⁵⁵¹ Hildyard, *The Antiquities of York City*, 69. He also records a great storm in 1660 "*which did much hurt to the City and to the Minster*", probably necessitating repairs to the glass.

⁵⁵² Drake, *Eboracum*, 525.

on the *heads* of the saint and archbishop figures in the lowest row [Figure 73]. If it were the evidence for the cannon ball damage described by Mace, a larger area of disruption would be expected: the force sufficient to allow shot to ricochet from pillar to pillar, as Mace described, would have caused considerable surrounding damage as the lead came would have been dragged inwards. The replacement heads are not of the highest quality, several of them being out of scale with the body and with little attempt to imitate the style seen elsewhere in the window. This suggests that they were replacing either missing, or severely damaged, heads, damaged to the point that the outline of the space they should occupy had been distorted or altered in some way, possible evidence for some deliberate mutilation of these figures beyond the damage wrought by decay. The figures of apostles in the row above, and the scenes of the Annunciation, Nativity, Resurrection and Ascension above them, have not been damaged in the same way, but the faces of the figures in these panels are white glass with painted detail, not the chemically-unstable pink manganese glass of the other heads.⁵⁵³ The whole west window was worked over by Peckitt, as his inscriptions about the 1757 restorations are situated at the very top of the window. The inscriptions are sited below the one scene in the window that would seem to have been an obvious target for the iconoclasts: The Coronation of the Virgin [Figure 74]. This is at the very top of the window and difficult to see clearly from ground-level. Did obscurity and height save this image? Was it simply too difficult and expensive to get to the top of the window? If some of the damage to the bottom row heads was deliberate and represents some evidence for image-neutralising during the Civil War period, it was a limited effort focused on the most accessible images. However, they did represent both saints and archbishops, figures whose authority and power were no longer recognised: were they somehow 'defaced' as a gesture towards the purification of churches being carried out with mixed enthusiasm in the parish churches all around the city? Or was it more prosaically attributable to the poor durability of the pink

⁵⁵³ Within this row of figures, it is only the head of the beardless St John the Evangelist which is wholly original. All the other bearded disciples have had to be restored, suggesting the chemical composition played a significant part.

manganese coloured glass?⁵⁵⁴ Elsewhere in the Minster areas of window glazed with pink glass are badly degraded and some, such as the Great East Window (I) show significant historic replacement of such areas: a comparison of earlier descriptions of the window with the present colouration show substantial replacement of pinks with other colours, almost certainly due to its inherent chemical instability. Nevertheless, it is possible that the heads may have been whitewashed, scratched, or inverted, all of which could have hastened their demise. Likewise, at the west end of the south nave aisle, the head and hands of the crucifixion image in s36 required repair or 'restoration' by William Peckitt in 1757, possibly due to iconoclasm, possibly due to natural decay (although the rest of Christ's body, also pink, is original) [Figure 58].

Despite the presence of some 'superstitious' imagery in the rest of the Minster, such as the Bell-founder's window (n24) [Figure 75] with its image of a kneeling donor praying to St. William, there is remarkably little evidence for any of the other windows attracting iconoclastic attention. One small piece of conclusive evidence for iconoclasm of any period can be found in window s12, featuring St Michael and the dragon, one of the fifteenth-century windows in the east wall of the south transept. Here the papal tiara has been carefully erased from the device on the shield of the See of York [Figure 76], although sufficient traces remain to make out that it was once there. This very precise 'cleansing' of a specific device strongly suggests it was part of the sixteenth-century Reformation changes to Minster imagery (papal tiaras were also obliterated on the shields inside the central tower, whilst the rest of the imagery was similarly left untouched) and not Commonwealth fervour.

The appointment of Edmund Gyles, glazier, as the City Husbandman (effectively a Clerk of Works) throughout the 1650s and 1660s may well have contributed to the good care of the glass during the period of the City's responsibility, although he had not been in the direct employ of the Dean and Chapter prior to the Civil War.⁵⁵⁵ As discussed in Chapter Three, the care the city

⁵⁵⁴ The formula used to create the pink colouration is inherently unstable and decays at a faster rate than other colours. Conversation with Sarah Brown 14.9.2011.

⁵⁵⁵ Withington, "Views from the Bridge", 121-151.

took of the Minster in this period amounted to a new kind of patronage. The attitude of the city authorities to the careful maintenance of the Minster stands in stark contrast to the mass destruction of the churches of the religious orders a century before. The orders for further intervention into the Minster's fabric never came and the city authorities turned the Minster into a preaching centre for the whole city.⁵⁵⁶ In this new style of worship the focus for the congregation was inwards, towards the preacher who was based in the nave: the interior beyond the central crossing was of no use in the new Protestant Parliamentary church and so the imagery it contained was not a threat. The windows of the nave aisles were above eye level and possibly already quite hard to read due to the number of mending leads, but possibly also considered of no consequence. The seats, such as there were, would have faced in towards the centre of the nave, so the windows would have been either behind the members of the congregation or far away on the opposite side.⁵⁵⁷ The figures most clearly in sight, at the main entry points, had perhaps been dealt with in so far as was considered necessary, desirable or permissible. The Minster enjoyed a new integration into the religious life of the city, but there is no evidence of any aesthetic interest in the Minster; it was a preaching box. The repairs and minor maintenance listed in the York Housebook were caretaker measures only, good and necessary husbandry, but entirely functional.⁵⁵⁸

Restoration and Renewal

As the preceding chapters have shown, the second half of the seventeenth century was a period of renewal for the Dean and Chapter as they reasserted control in the immediate aftermath of the Restoration. This was most speedily and potently expressed in the repair of the Chapter House, the physical expression of their authority. The post-Restoration work on the Chapter House by the Crosby workshop, discussed in Chapter Two, included the replacement of

⁵⁵⁶ Cross, "From Reformation to Restoration", 214.

⁵⁵⁷ For discussion of Puritan church practice, see Eamon Duffy, *Reformation Divided: Catholics, Protestants and the Conversion of England*, 1st edn. (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 327-345.

⁵⁵⁸ York City Archives: York Housebook 1650-1663, f.147.

damaged or missing glass, particularly in window CHn3. This was not simply the insertion of plain coloured glass, but the introduction of alien figurative panels. In his work on the Minster glass, Peter Gibson referred to CHn3 having had “*ten misplaced panels*” removed in 1952, under the auspices of Dean Milner-White, “*to form the nucleus of the westernmost window in the South Nave aisle*” (s35) [Figure 77].⁵⁵⁹ These panels are largely mid-fourteenth century glass with the addition of a roundel of the arms of Thomas Dalby, Archdeacon of Richmond (1506-1526). They depict St Lawrence with a gridiron, a male saint (possibly Cuthbert), the Presentation in the Temple, St John in boiling oil, a panel variously identified by Toy as the Annunciation to the Shepherds and by O’Connor and Haselock as Joachim in the Wilderness, the meeting of Joachim and Anna at the Golden Gate, the Annunciation to Mary, St Stephen, and St Peter crucified.⁵⁶⁰ The completely different styles and variety of subject matter, coupled with the lack of relationship to the William story they interrupted, make it inconceivable that any of them were installed in that window as new glass in the fourteenth century. Torre’s description of the two Annunciation panels in the second and fourth lights and the saints in the bottom row indicates they were in situ by the last quarter of the seventeenth century.⁵⁶¹ The arrangement of the original thirteenth-century panels as described by Torre differs from the appearance of the window as recorded in a photograph of the early to mid-twentieth century (but before the extensive reordering by Dean Milner White in 1957) [Figure 78].⁵⁶²

The two panels of the Annunciation to Mary and the Annunciation to the Shepherds (panels 1b and 3b/4b) [Figures 79 & 80] are very high-quality work, very similar in style and colour palette and were probably originally in the same

⁵⁵⁹ Gibson, *The Stained and Painted Glass of York Minster*, 34; Milner-White’s removal of panels from CHn3 to create s35 is described in the Friends of York Minster Annual Report 1957, 38-39.

⁵⁶⁰ John Toy, *A Guide and Index to the Windows of York Minster* (York: The Dean and Chapter of York, 1985), 30; Gibson, *The Stained and Painted Glass of York Minster*, 13-14.

⁵⁶¹ YMA L1/7 f.70v-71.

⁵⁶² *Ibid.* Also see Brighton, “Henry Gyles, Virtuoso and Glasspainter of York 1645-1709” catalogue entry 51 p.52. The now ex situ Hercules panel attributed by Milner-White and Brighton to Henry Gyles was not in CHn3 in Torre’s description, so its insertion must post-date this campaign.

window.⁵⁶³ They contrast strongly with the somewhat intrusively repaired and stylistically very different saints in s35. O'Connor suggested that some of the panels, including the two scenes now in 1b and 3b/4b may have been part of the scheme in the now-lost chapel of St Mary and All Angels which formerly stood off the north nave aisle, a possible source of glass used for the repairs. The chapel was redundant after 1547 and the building and attendant tithes were sold to a Mr. Webster in 1562.⁵⁶⁴ Its fate thereafter is unknown, but it was a ruin by the time Torre recorded the Minster fabric and it is likely that valuable or useful elements had been systematically removed into the Minster glass store.⁵⁶⁵

The decision to use figurative panels indicates that the broad aesthetic of the window mattered even if the coherence or legibility of the subject matter did not. None of the inserted panels bear any narrative relation to scenes from the life of St William, so their insertion was not any kind of attempt to restore what had been lost in terms of narrative continuity. The considerable stylistic differences between the panels now in s35 1b and 3b/4b, which were formerly in Chn3 lights 2 and 4, and the thirteenth-century glass show that there was also no attempt being made to follow the style or even the colouring of the original. What these insertions do show is that the preservation of the overall visual rhythm of the windows mattered, the alternation of bands of coloured image-rich glass with bands of grisaille, and that inserted panels were individually legible as figures, and not simply a meaningless patching with coloured fragments. The insertion of the saint panels at the base of the window likewise followed the visual coloured band/white band rhythm of several of the other windows of the Chapter House scheme as recorded by Torre and had that coherence even if their presence again bore no relation to the original narrative.⁵⁶⁶ The visual impression of completeness was important, as was the

⁵⁶³ O'Connor and Haselock, "The Stained and Painted Glass", 378. These two panels are considered to be homogenous with panels in the Lady Chapel clerestory and the north aisle (n5), but even considered as a group they cannot have originally been part of CHn3.

⁵⁶⁴ Drake, *Eboracum*, 479.

⁵⁶⁵ YMA L1/7 f.25. More light on this may be shed by Eleanor Warren's Leeds PhD thesis, "Community and Identity in the Shadow of York Minster: the Medieval Chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels", supervised by Richard Morris, but this is unfortunately embargoed until 2019.

⁵⁶⁶ The Chapter House windows as they appear today all have grisaille glass as the bottom row, but it is clear from Torre's descriptions that this was not the case in the late seventeenth century. YMA L1/7 f.70v-71.

internal integrity of the individual panels, even if the detail of the overall narrative content did not bear much scrutiny. Moreover, it can be argued that the Chapter House was also being used as a place to preserve this high-quality glass for its artistic merit, a conscious decision to retain these panels as whole pieces. This was the beginning, perhaps, of the idea of the Minster as a treasure house of stained glass art, where appearance mattered more than content.

The rise of antiquarian interest

The origins of antiquarian study lay in the sixteenth century, but, as Sweet has noted, the growth of interest in topographical studies of a region to determine its history and record its curiosities, which had flourished in the Elizabethan period with the works of William Camden, began to gather pace in the seventeenth century as a new age of discoveries and investigation placed increasing emphasis on classification, order and recording.⁵⁶⁷ Early interest lay in manuscripts and documentary research, such as the collection and translation of Anglo-Saxon documents undertaken by Sir Robert Cotton, but this became a more systematic interest in buildings and monuments.⁵⁶⁸ At first, the monuments of the medieval, especially monastic, past were treated as subjects for study, not for their own sake, but within attempts to classify and order the history of place.⁵⁶⁹ As Gerrard states "Mostly, antiquarians had no wish to endorse the Catholic culture and religion of the later medieval period...".⁵⁷⁰ Rather, concern for the loss of ancestral information confirming or refuting the claims of lineage which underpinned social status led to attempts to record systematically the details of funerary monuments and heraldry.⁵⁷¹ The antiquarians themselves were often depicted with heraldic imagery; as Daniel

⁵⁶⁷ Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*.

⁵⁶⁸ Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1995).

⁵⁶⁹ Buchanan, "Science and Sensibility: Architectural Antiquarianism in the Early Nineteenth Century".

⁵⁷⁰ Christopher Gerrard, *Medieval Archaeology: understanding traditions and contemporary approaches* (London: Routledge, 2003), 7.

⁵⁷¹ Sir William Dugdale's work on heraldry and the compilation of his *Monasticon Anglicanum* was originally at the behest of Sir Christopher Hatton in 1641.

Woolf noted, "If they feature iconography at all, it tends to be armorial, befitting the general preoccupations of the period..."⁵⁷²

However, there were strong associations with the term 'antiquarian' and someone demonstrating a lack of taste or discernment from early on in the movement.⁵⁷³ They were lampooned as only being ghoulishly interested in the dead past, the opening of tombs and the finding of treasure: Bishop John Earle, in his popular book of character sketches, 'Microcosmographie' published in 1628 characterised the antiquarian thus " *one that hath that unnatural disease to be enamoured of old age, and wrinkles, and loves all things (as Dutchmen do cheese) the better for being mouldy and worm-eaten*".⁵⁷⁴ Earle also hinted at the gullibility of some desperate to acquire artefacts of antiquity for their collections: "*beggars coozen him with musty things which they have rak't from dunghills*".⁵⁷⁵ Methodical investigation, classification and recording were the correct modes of enquiry, leading to the publication of findings and scholarly debate. This approach of scholarly detachment was especially necessary when dealing with the recording, interpretation and assessment of religious sites, particularly the former monasteries. In the great antiquarian work of the 1650s, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, the details of every monastic foundation they could trace were recorded by Yorkshire antiquarian Roger Dodsworth, then ordered and published by his colleague and royal herald William Dugdale.⁵⁷⁶ Dogged by accusations that such recording was an aid to the ultimate return to Catholicism, Dugdale and Dodsworth worked hard to avoid accusations of 'covert Catholicism'.⁵⁷⁷ Dodsworth himself was very aware of the poor reputation of antiquarian study: in his 'Epistle to the Reader' at the opening of *Villare Anglicanum*, compiled at the behest of Sir Henry Spelman, he says Spelman was one who "*confuted that aspercion which is generally cast on Antiquaries, that*

⁵⁷² Woolf, "Images of the Antiquary in Seventeenth-Century England", 28-29.

⁵⁷³ Rosemary Sweet "Antiquarians and History" in *Making History: the changing face of the profession in Britain* <http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/resources/articles/antiquarianism>.

⁵⁷⁴ John Earle *Microcosmographie or a Peece of the World Discovered in Essays and Characters* (London, 1629) 5th ed Character no.9.

⁵⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁶ Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum, or, the History of the Ancient Abbies, and Other Monasteries, Hospitals, Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in England and Wales. With Divers French, Irish, and Scotch Monasteries Formerly Relating to England*.

⁵⁷⁷ Nicholas Orme, *The History of England's Cathedrals* (Exeter: Impress Books, 2017), 172.

they are either supercilious or superstitious, either proud or popishly affected, such his humble carriage to all persons and sincerity in the Protestant Religion".⁵⁷⁸ An interest in the past, especially the pre-Reformation past, had to be conducted with care.

Within these broader interests, the seventeenth century was also a period when cathedral buildings and their contents began to be serious objects of study beyond the proprietorial pride of their clergy. Writers like John Stow (d.1605) and William Somner (d.1669) were systematic and thorough in their approach to recording the layout and contents (particularly monuments) of buildings such as St Paul's and Canterbury cathedrals, devoting several pages to them within their respective wider works on London and Canterbury.⁵⁷⁹ Their approach moved beyond the more anecdotal collections of a man like Lieutenant Hammond, whose 1634-5 surveys formed a diary of his travels around England, or the impressionistic recordings of a traveller like Celia Fiennes.⁵⁸⁰ The evolution of antiquarian study and recording, particularly in relation to the emerging methods of the Royal Society, was discussed by Parry, Smiles and others on the occasion of the tercentenary of the Society of Antiquaries.⁵⁸¹ The association of such interest in cathedrals with churchmanship continued: as Orme notes, these works were mostly undertaken by those of Laudian or traditional sympathies "who cherished cathedrals instead of deploring them as Puritans did".⁵⁸² Dugdale's first edition of *The History of St Paul's* (1658), building on Somner's work, controversially included a record of the former shrines, images and

⁵⁷⁸ Sir Henry Spelman, *Villare Anglicum, or, a View of the Townes of England*, ed. Roger Dodsworth (London: Printed by R. Hodgkinsonne, dwelling in Thames-street neere Baynards Castle, 1656)

⁵⁷⁹ John Stow, *A Survey of London by John Stow* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908); William Somner, *The Antiquities of Canterbury. In Two Parts* (London: printed for R. Knaplock, 1703); Lieutenant Hammond, *A Relation of a Short Survey of 26 Counties, Observed in a Seven Weeks Journey Begun on August 11, 1634, by a Captain, a Lieutenant, and an Ancient, All Three of the Military Company in Norwich*, ed. Cyril Davenport and Leopold George Wickham Legg (London: F.E. Robinson, 1904); Celia Fiennes, *The Illustrated Journeys of Celia Fiennes, c.1682-C.1712* (London: Macdonald, 1984). For work on Stow see Ian Anders Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie, *John Stow (1525-1605) and the Making of the English Past* (London: British Library, 2004); Jonathan Gil Harris, *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

⁵⁸⁰ Hammond, *A Relation of a Short Survey of 26 Counties, Observed in a Seven Weeks Journey Begun on August 11, 1634, by a Captain, a Lieutenant, and an Ancient, All Three of the Military Company in Norwich*; Celia Fiennes, *The Illustrated Journeys of Celia Fiennes, c.1682-c.1712*, ed. Christopher Morris (London: Macdonald, 1984).

⁵⁸¹ Parry, "Earliest Antiquaries".

⁵⁸² Orme, *The History of England's Cathedrals*, 171.

textiles, while the second edition also included such items as the 1510 inventory of treasure and plate of York Minster.⁵⁸³

What is striking about all these early works is that they make no attempt to record the stained glass these cathedrals undoubtedly still contained. The fabric, the past possessions, the former lands, the clergy were all meticulously recorded, but not the glass in either word or image. Dugdale's plates depict the windows as either empty, as in the view eastwards along the nave, or as tracery filled with plain lattice and his text is silent.⁵⁸⁴ The potential for stained glass imagery (or imagery of any kind) to still be considered 'dangerous' is somewhat scathingly addressed in John Cleveland (1613-1658) in his poem in defence of the glass in Christ Church.⁵⁸⁵ Published in 1659, it derided the Puritan fear of corruption by contact with beauty and promoted the value of imagery to teach:

*"The Scriptures ray's contracted in a glasse
Like Emblems do with greater virtue passe,
Look in the book of Martyres and you'll see
More by the pictures than the History:"*

but the taint of Catholicism attached to imagery still in situ was there.

This omission by more casual visitors was not uncommon: the diarist John Evelyn visited York in 1654 and remarked that of the Minster "*most remarkable and worthy seeing is St. Peter's Cathedral, which of all the greate Churches in England has best ben preserv'd from the furie of the sacrilegious, by Composition with the Rebels, when they tooke the Citty, during the many*

⁵⁸³ Ibid p.173; Sir William Dugdale, *The History of St. Paul's Cathedral in London: From Its Foundation. Extracted out of Original Charters, Records, Leiger-Books, and Other Manuscripts. Beautified with Sundry Prospects of the Old Fabrick, Which Was Destroyed by the Fire of That City, 1666. As Also with the Figures of the Tombs and Monuments Therein, Which Were All Defac'd in the Late Rebellion. Whereunto Is Added, a Continuation Thereof, Setting Forth What Was Done in the Structure of the New Church, to the Year 1685. Likewise, an Historical Account of the Northern Cathedrals, and Chief Collegiate Churches in the Province of York.* By Sir William Dugdale Knt. Garter Principal King at Arms, The second edition corrected and enlarged by the author's own hand. To which is prefixed, his life, written by himself. ... ed. (London: printed by George James, for Jonah Bowyer, at the Rose in Ludgate-Street, 1716).

⁵⁸⁴ Ibid, 145 and 147.

⁵⁸⁵ John Cleveland and E. Williamson, *J. Cleaveland Revived: Poems, Orations, Epistles, and Other of His Genuine Incomparable Pieces Never before Publisht : With Some Other Exquisite Remains of the Most Eminent Wits ... That Were His Contemporaries*, (London: Printed for Nathaniel Brook, 1659), http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_val_fmt=&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:40261.

incursions of the Scotch & others".⁵⁸⁶ Although not an antiquarian, Evelyn was anxious not to be thought a mere dilettante, "he did not travel merely to count steeples".⁵⁸⁷ His remarks about the Minster reflect his churchmanship: he noted, for example, the "gorgeous covering for the altar and pulpit, carefully preserved in the vestry", but he too made no remarks about the glass, focussing instead on the pulpitum, the treasures and the view from the tower. The inveterate traveller, Celia Fiennes, had visited the Minster in the late 1680s and amongst her recorded impressions she wrote:

*"In the Minster there is the greatest curiosity for Windows I ever saw they are so large and so lofty, those in the Quire at the end and on each side that is 3 storeys high and painted very curious, with the History of the Bible; the Painting is very fine such as was in the Kings Chapple in Cambridge, but the loftyness of the windows is more than I ever saw anywhere else, and by all accounts is peculiar."*⁵⁸⁸

Evelyn's phrase 'ben best preserv'd' and Fiennes 'by all accounts' suggest that the Minster's fame for its glass being exceptional both in its remarkable quantity and the sheer size of the windows was already well-known in the second half of the seventeenth century.

Daniel Defoe, in his *Tour*, made a more systematic study of various sites of historic interest.⁵⁸⁹ For the Minster he made more reference to the windows, but in such a way as to suggest he was being shown the glass by a guide (probably a verger); he gave dimensions for the Great East Window and details of Thornton's contract, but said the glass itself "*represented, in fine painted glass, most of the History of the Bible*". He went on to describe the Five Sisters window as, "*a kind of Embroidery, or mosaic Needle-work*", and summarised the glass of the rest of the Minster as "*representing the Sacred History, and the Portraitures of eminent Persons*". He did not identify a single figure or scene in any of the windows. The rose window (S16) Defoe named as "*The Marigold Window, from its painted Glass, which resembles the Colour of that Flower*": this

⁵⁸⁶ William Bray, ed. *The Diary of John Evelyn*, vol. 2 (London: Dent, 1952), 302.

⁵⁸⁷ *Ibid*, xvii.

⁵⁸⁸ Fiennes, *The Illustrated Journeys of Celia Fiennes, c.1682-c.1712*, 91.

⁵⁸⁹ Defoe, *A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain*, 174.

concur with Torre's late seventeenth-century description of it being "*glazed with coloured glass representing several little marigolds*", but this raises a problem with the accepted history of this window.⁵⁹⁰ The glass today in the form of red and white roses, symbolising the unification of the Houses of York and Lancaster, is said to be sixteenth-century, but both Defoe and Torre refer quite explicitly to marigolds. This would be the common marsh-marigold, which are a distinctive yellowy-orange. Defoe referred quite explicitly to the colour being the reason for the name, and Torre clearly described little marigolds, not roses. Given Torre's precision with description and Defoe's explicit reference to the colour, it could be concluded that the window did not in fact contain the red and white roses at this date, c.1748. This is a subject for further study beyond the scope of this thesis.

Antiquarian studies of cathedrals

The exceptional nature of the prominence of the windows in the antiquarian study and presentation of the Minster can be established by comparison with works on other major cathedrals. Dugdale's study of St Paul's, published in 1716, is considered the first work solely devoted to one building, but others soon followed.⁵⁹¹ Like Dugdale, however, they paid little heed to glass, unless it contained heraldry.⁵⁹² In his 1723 work on Westminster Abbey, John Dart did describe some other windows, notably those depicting kings.⁵⁹³ He singled out the depiction of the legend of John the Baptist appearing as a pilgrim to Edward I, this being the origin story of the Coronation Ring of England, but focused on the text rather than the imagery. The remaining glass '*casts a religious Gleam*', but that is all.⁵⁹⁴ In his 1726 work on Canterbury Cathedral, Dart described the decoration and ornamentation in terms of wall paintings,

⁵⁹⁰ YMA L1/7 p.45.

⁵⁹¹ Orme, *The History of England's Cathedrals*, 173.

⁵⁹² Dugdale, *The History of St. Paul's Cathedral in London, from Its Foundation*, ix.

⁵⁹³ John Dart, *Westminsterium. Or the History and Antiquities of the Abbey Church of St. Peters Westminster. Containing, an Account of Its Ancient and Modern Building, ... In 2 Vol. By Mr. John Dart. To Which Is Added, Westminster Abbey, a Poem, by the Same Author* (London: printed & sold by James Cole, Joseph Smith, Tho. Bowles, Jer. Batley, Tho. Taylor, John Bowles, and by Andrew Johnstone), 58-61.

⁵⁹⁴ *Ibid*, 61.

tombs, even tapestries, but his comments on the glass were principally to lament its destruction and record the words uttered by the iconoclasts.⁵⁹⁵ Even when describing the glass of the Trinity Chapel, one of the most complete and compelling iconographic schemes, he noted only this:

*"This place i.e. Becket's Chapel, or rather Trinity, has still the remains of very curiously painted Windows, being full of Scripture Story, but so much mended and confus'd as not to afford much speculation"*⁵⁹⁶

Memorials and tombs are recorded in meticulous detail and many are depicted in fine engravings which record the minutiae of sculpture, carving and inscriptions. Conversely where windows are drawn at all they are as a backdrop to a tomb or architectural feature and the glass is (with two exceptions) depicted solely as hatched lines. The armatures are, however, drawn in and are correct in their styling and arrangement; it is the iconographic content which is omitted in all but two windows. The first is the depiction of a small coat of arms in the lower right light of the window behind the tomb of the Black Prince, where the rest of the glass is not shown [Figure 81].⁵⁹⁷ The tomb is in the Trinity Chapel, so the decision not to depict the content of the glass beyond this heraldic panel, however much it was '*much mended and confus'd*', is a deliberate choice. The second is a window shown in the background to the tomb of Odo Colligne, Bishop Elect of Beauvois and Cardinal Chastillion who died in 1571 [Figure 82]. This tomb is also in the Trinity Chapel and the shape and arrangement of the panels identifies this as Canterbury n2, one of the windows on the north side of the chapel. This is the earliest known depiction of this window and is detailed enough, when taken with its setting, to identify it, but it is not clear why this window has been singled out for illustration: it does not relate to the tomb or to Colligne and the windows to either side are not similarly depicted. It may be inferred that the glass itself was somehow significant, but the content is shown

⁵⁹⁵ John Dart, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Canterbury, and the Once-Adjoining Monastery* (London: Printed, and sold by J. Cole, engraver, at the Crown in Great Kirby-Street, Hatton-Garden, J. Smith, at Inigo Jones's Head, near Exeter-Exchange in the Strand, Jeremiah Battley, at the Dove in Pater-Noster-Row, Aaron Ward, at the King's-Arms in Little-Britain, T. Edlin, at the Prince's-Arms, over-against Exeter-Exchange in the Strand, Joseph Pote, at the Golden-Door, over-against Suffolk-Street, Charing-Cross).

⁵⁹⁶ *Ibid*, 33.

⁵⁹⁷ *Ibid*, 82.

in the manner of a painting, with no armature depicted, and the window is not referred to at all in the text.⁵⁹⁸ If Dart's engraver included the window to aid a sense of location within the image and rendered it in some detail to match the fineness of his rendering of the tomb and surround, his interest in the glass was not shared by Dart himself in the text. Like Defoe, it was seemingly sufficient to summarise the content as 'Scripture Story' or 'Sacred History'. It is in this company that antiquarian study of York, particularly the remarkable work of James Torre on the fabric and windows of the Minster, must be considered.

York and Yorkshire's antiquarians 1660-1700

The first recognisably antiquarian study of York was compiled by Sir Thomas Widdrington, a Parliamentarian politician and judge knighted in York in 1639, who had married the granddaughter of Sir Thomas Fairfax. Widdrington became the Recorder of York and it was during his time in this office that he compiled his "*Analecta Eboracensia: Some Remaynes of the Ancient City of York*" in 1660.⁵⁹⁹ Revd Caesar Caine, the editor of the 1897 edition of *Analecta* quoted in his introduction to the work what Thomas Fuller had written of Widdrington in his York section of "*Worthies of England*" in 1662: Fuller commended his "*Progress in his Exact Description of this City*" and went on to express his hopes that Widdrington's work would be published so that York would be "*A city most compleatly Illustrated in all the Antiquities and Remarkables thereof*".⁶⁰⁰ These hopes were not realised, as the 1897 edition was the first and only publication of Widdrington's work. Widdrington had intended to publish the work and offered to dedicate it to the "*Mayor, Aldermen, Sheriffs, Common Council and Citizens*" but this offer was met "*not only with coldness, but even derision*" and Widdrington withdrew his offer and prohibited publication.⁶⁰¹ Caine reproduced the text of the letter from the Mayor and Aldermen explaining their rejection,

⁵⁹⁸ Ibid, 83.

⁵⁹⁹ Thomas Widdrington, *Analecta Eboracensia: Or, Some Remaynes of the Ancient City of York*, ed. Revd Caesar Caine (London: C.J. Clark, 1897).

⁶⁰⁰ Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England endeavoured by Thomas Fuller D.D.* (London, 1662) as quoted in the Introduction to *Analecta*.

⁶⁰¹ Widdrington, *Analecta Eboracensia : Or, Some Remaynes of the Ancient City of York*, viiii-ix.

which paints a vivid picture of a city which had been brought to its knees by the economic impact of war, run down and with declining trade and expressing the sentiment that "*a good purse is more useful to us than a long story*".⁶⁰² It is clear from this exchange that grateful memories were very short, the antiquarian pursuit was not favoured by the civic authorities of York and that the recording and celebration of the monuments of the past was perceived to serve only as a rebuke to the reduced state of the citizenry. Caine himself found "*one grave fault*" with the work, "*a lack of order and method in the arrangement of the chapters and in the subject matter of the respective chapters*" but celebrated Widdrington's endeavours and achievement.⁶⁰³ Widdrington's references to the Minster were largely confined to listing the benefactors and builders and he makes no mention of the windows, which is surprising given his family connection to the Fairfaxes and their role in the preservation of the Minster and its glass. His history was, however, compiled principally from documentary sources, rather than personal observation of buildings, and most of the sources he consulted appear to have been ones held in London, rather than the locally-held records beyond those of the city itself. His work was known to and used by later writers, notably Francis Drake, but went into private collections for nearly seventy years after its creation in 1660 and does not appear to have been well-known outside this small circle of book collectors during that time.

York's eminent antiquarian, James Torre

The same accusation of 'lack of order or arrangement' could not have been levelled at James Torre (1649-1699).⁶⁰⁴ Much of what is known of the condition and content of the Minster fabric in the decades immediately after the Restoration is due to his diligence. His detailed description of the building, as well as his panel-by-panel description of the windows, some of which have since disappeared or been significantly repaired or reordered, gives a unique insight

⁶⁰² Ibid, xi.

⁶⁰³ Ibid, xv.

⁶⁰⁴ Jan Broadway, "Torre, James (1649-1699), Antiquary," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

into the Minster as it looked between c.1675 and c.1686, my estimated period of Torre's investigative work.⁶⁰⁵ These parameters are based on his life events and the likely impact of changes in archbishop and the Glorious Revolution. Unlike Widdrington, Torre undertook a detailed personal study of the standing fabric and methodically recorded his findings. Where Widdrington's style was frequently anecdotal, Torre created a system and order for recording which eschewed the conversational style in favour of numbered lists and annotated diagrams.

Torre matriculated from Magdalene College, Cambridge in 1666, and was admitted to Inner Temple the following year.⁶⁰⁶ One of his contemporaries at Inner Temple was the London antiquarian Henry Keepe, who published a short work on Westminster Abbey in 1683.⁶⁰⁷ Keepe's work may have influenced Torre as he also compiled a manuscript history of the city of York in the 1680s, the same time that Torre was working on his volumes. Torre married his first wife, Elizabeth, in 1672 and moved to York: Elizabeth was buried in the Minster in 1693, which meant Torre must have had some connection by residency, presumably by living in the Liberty of St. Peter (which extended to any property owned by the Dean and Chapter), and possibly in the Close itself, although there is no record of his having a lease.⁶⁰⁸ It was during the lifetime of his first wife that Torre embarked upon his great project of recording and collating the ecclesiastical history of York and Yorkshire, completed in fair copy form by 1691 (the date inscribed in the first volume).⁶⁰⁹ Torre was one of several antiquarians operating in Yorkshire: his friends included the Ralph Thoresby of Leeds, the great friend and patron of Henry Gyles, although Torre was never a member of

⁶⁰⁵ His manuscript volume on the fabric is at YMA L1/7.

⁶⁰⁶ John Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A Biographical List of All Known Students, Graduates and Holders of Office at the University of Cambridge, from the Earliest Times to 1900* (Cambridge: University Press, 1922).

⁶⁰⁷ Henry Keepe, *By Henry Keepe, Formerly of New-Inn-Hall in the University of Oxford, Gentleman-Commoner, and Now of the Inner-Temple London, Esq Having in the Year 1681 Published a Small Treatise by the Way of Essay to a More Compleat History of Westminster Abby* (London, 1683).

⁶⁰⁸ Robert H. Skaife, *The Register of Burials in York Minster Accompanied by Monumental Inscriptions and Illustrated with Biographical Notices* (York, 1870).

⁶⁰⁹ His manuscript volumes are held in the Minster Archives, class L1. A shortened version of his volume on the City of York, notably listing officials, was published by G. White in York in 1719. Torre is identified as the author, but the contents were apparently drawn from 'the papers of Christopher Hildyard', suggesting Hildyard had either worked with Torre, or had access to his papers at a later date.

the York Virtuosi in which Thoresby played such a part, as discussed in Chapter Three. Torre's work on genealogy in Yorkshire built on the work by Sir William Dugdale and the industrious Roger Dodsworth, compiled some fifty years earlier. Whilst there is no evidence that Torre was ever formally employed by Dugdale as a clerk, he may have been part of a circle connected with him at one remove: Dugdale's diary recorded the appointment of two clerks, Henry Johnston on 26th May 1666 ("*Henry Johnston came this day to me to be one of my Clerks*") and John Lapley in 1684.⁶¹⁰ Johnston was born in Methley, near Leeds, and between May 1669 and June 1671 he travelled around Yorkshire gathering antiquarian material for his brother, Nathaniel. Included in his manuscripts are descriptions and sketches of some of the windows of the Minster, including the St William window (n7) and the image of Sir John Petty [Figure 24].⁶¹¹ Johnston's notebooks also contain unique sketches of the windows in All Saints North Street, which similarly show detailed iconography and devotional imagery, not just the heraldry.⁶¹² Henry had been employed by Dugdale in London at his brother's request, but left his employ in 1669 ("*my man Henry Johnston went from me to Pomfret*") and converted to Roman Catholicism in 1674, becoming a Benedictine postulant at Dieulouard, Lorriane, and leaving his brother to disown him in an attempt to retain his position.⁶¹³ A remark in Johnston's diary entries for 1671 raises the intriguing possibility that Torre not only knew but worked with Johnston prior to moving to Yorkshire. Johnston described part of his journey near Goole and listed some of the people he met with and rode with, including 'old Torre'.⁶¹⁴ This raises the very real possibility that Torre was not only in close contact with Catholic sympathisers, but his own move to York and the embarking on a detailed recording of the Minster was inspired by, or at least influenced by, his contact with Johnston. Whether Torre was ever formally

⁶¹⁰ Sir William Dugdale, *Life, Diary and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale....* ed. William Hamper (London: Harding, Lepard & Co., 1827), 123, 146.

⁶¹¹ Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Top Yorks C14 f.94r.

⁶¹² Dugdale, *Life, Diary and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale....*, 131 and note to entry on p.123; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Top Yorks C14 f.94r.

⁶¹³ Geoffrey Scott (O.S.B), "A Benedictine Conspirator: Henry Joseph Johnston," *Recusant History* 20, no. 1 (1990); Dugdale, *Life, Diary and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale*.

⁶¹⁴ Notes by Johnston in Bodleian Library MS Top Yorks C 14 f.95r. Accessed via microfilm YMA MF 20.

employed by Dugdale is still unknown; he does not appear in Dugdale's diaries, nor did Torre himself make any reference to Dugdale as an employer in his notes.⁶¹⁵ At the very least it raises the possibility that Torre's move to York and his embarkation on such a monumental series of projects was in some way connected with Johnston and may indeed have been a question of his picking up (for his own interest or for employment) where his friend left off in the work that Dugdale required. Equally Torre may have known of Dodsworth's work on churches: Dodsworth's collections of church notes passed, on his death in 1654, to Lord Fairfax, who in turn lent them to Nathaniel Johnston with a view to Johnston writing a history of west Yorkshire, something he never completed.⁶¹⁶

Dugdale is widely regarded as one of the founders of the academic study of medieval history and archaeology. As discussed by Sweet and others, antiquarian interest hitherto had largely been focused on England's Roman heritage, with emerging concepts of nationhood placing great emphasis on the country's Classical past and identification of Britain with Troy and an even more illustrious Classical inheritance.⁶¹⁷ Dugdale's interest in the comparatively recent past marked a new departure in antiquarian studies and it is this road which Torre followed. Torre was one of an emerging breed of antiquarian who largely eschewed the anecdotal and imaginative story-telling antiquarianism of Widdrington and his contemporaries, such as John Aubrey. Aubrey's empathetic work with the archaeological sites of early peoples was remarkable for its time, and his emphasis on data gathering, measurement and interpretation, as Parry notes, "properly belonged to the Baconian ethos [of the royal Society]", but the more imagination-driven elements of his method were ultimately at odds with the more objective and dispassionate scientific approaches which began to be adopted across a wide range of investigative disciplines.⁶¹⁸

⁶¹⁵ A possible piece of Evidence of Torre practising as a lawyer in York is contained in the diary of an unknown French Huguenot refugee, living in York 1688-90 and connected with the Fairfax family, who recorded visits to a 'Mr Torre' in July 1690. Bodleian Library Ms Add A56 (SC30160), f.40.

⁶¹⁶ N. Denholm-Young and H. H. E. Craster, "Roger Dodsworth (1585-1654) and His Circle," *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*. XXXII (1935), 10; Roger Dodsworth, *Yorkshire Church Notes 1619-1631*, vol. xxxii, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series (Leeds: J. Whitehead, 1904).

⁶¹⁷ Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*.

⁶¹⁸ John Aubrey, antiquarian of Wiltshire is now widely credited with establishing the earliest principles of modern methods of field archaeology, but was widely discounted in his own day by

What set Torre's antiquarian pursuit apart from those of his contemporaries was his systematic observation and detailed recording of the iconography of all the stained glass. In this he is unique and his work fundamentally underpins this research. Interest within church recording had been focused on tombs, monuments and heraldry with the original emphasis on preserving the evidence of noble lineage against the very real possibility that the original records or inscriptions would be destroyed. The near-total destruction of the monastic records stored in St Mary's tower, which was blown up during the Siege of York in 1644, served as a very pertinent reminder of the vagaries of fate and, had it not been for Roger Dodsworth's meticulous transcribing of them in the years immediately prior to the Siege, the wealth of detail they contained would have been lost forever.⁶¹⁹ Drake tells us the fragmentary remains were sifted and recorded by the 'industrious Mr. Torre'.⁶²⁰

Such heraldic and genealogical concerns are apparent in Torre's recording of the Minster windows: Torre's recording of the windows included all the heraldic devices they contained both in name and in sketch. He identified all the shields, even the fragmentary ones, and ascribed their heraldic colours in the conventional language of blazon. But beyond that he recorded every part of every window that he could decipher and did so using a system for recording that was his own invention: he drew the windows with grids inside the tracery and assigned row and light numbers, which he then cross-referenced in his descriptions. This was far superior to any of the other partial attempts to record glass by contemporaries such as Henry Johnston or Samuel Gale. In this respect he is following in a distinguished line which included Spelman, Dugdale, Dodsworth and others. The recording of heraldic glass, even of inscriptions associated with scenes or donor figures was not unique to Torre: for example, Gunton's *History of Peterborough* (originally printed in 1686 from a manuscript

those such as John Ray who felt he was "a little too inclinable to credit strange relations" (Parry, *The Trophies of Time*, 300); see also Michael Hunter, *John Aubrey and the Realm of Learning* (London: Duckworth, 1975), 178-191; Sweet "Antiquarians and History" in *Making History* <http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/resources/articles/antiquarianism>; Parry, "Earliest Antiquaries", 39.

⁶¹⁹ Parry, *The Trophies of Time*, 222.

⁶²⁰ Denholm-Young and Craster, "Roger Dodsworth (1585-1654) and His Circle", 14.

compiled by 1641) recorded the inscriptions in the glazing of the cloister subsequently destroyed in the Civil War.⁶²¹ Such recording, motivated by fear of loss of important evidence for aristocratic lineage, was the origin of Sir Christopher Hatton's commission to and patronage of Dugdale.⁶²² But Torre's record of each window goes far beyond the heraldic and his whole approach to the recording of the Minster is unique for this period. In an article on Exeter cathedral, Sam Smiles asserted that such accurate recording of a cathedral was part of a development of antiquarian scholarship from the mid-eighteenth century onwards, but Torre's manuscript pre-dates this by almost a century and makes his manuscript unique in the recording of stained glass.⁶²³

Torre's methodology

Context

James Torre was compiling his study at a time when approaches to methodology and recording in many fields were undergoing significant change. As Shapin has noted, the emerging preference in the scientific field was for empirical evidence, personal observation over the inherited knowledge of others and this is an approach which Torre favoured.⁶²⁴ He stated in the opening to his work on the fabric that he was describing the building "*as it represents itself now to the Eye*", a telling phrase further discussed below, and not making qualitative judgements about the condition of the glass.⁶²⁵ This accorded with the aspirations of Bacon, Hobbes and others who, Shapin states, sought to record things "exactly as they presented themselves", not coloured by expectation or influenced by prior knowledge, which itself was subject to "the frailty of memory".⁶²⁶ These principles of detached experiment and observation were the

⁶²¹ Simon Gunton, *A History of the Cathedral Church of Peterborough, from Its Foundation, to the Present Time*, (Peterborough: printed and sold by J. Jacob, 1790).

⁶²² Dugdale, *Life, Diary and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale*.

⁶²³ Sam Smiles, "Data Documentation and Display in Eighteenth Century Investigations in Exeter Cathedral," *Art History* 25, no. 4 (2002).

⁶²⁴ Shapin, *The Scientific Revolution*, 69

⁶²⁵ YMA Torre L1/7 f.17.

⁶²⁶ Shapin, *The Scientific Revolution*, 90; Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 218.

premises on which the Royal Society was founded, a body of which Torre was never a member, but whose scientific ideas and principles his work followed.⁶²⁷

Torre set out his methodology at the start of his work and systematically worked his way around the building, section by section, noting each feature and detail as he went. He seldom strayed into anecdotes or anything which he himself had not seen and verified, except where his authority for the information could be stated or (in one instance) where the story was just too good to omit.⁶²⁸ His recording of the windows followed a strict order reading from the top down to the bottom of each window, recording the row number and then reading horizontally across the lights of the window. He adhered to this rationale for most of his recording. The pattern of reading a window from the top down instead of the bottom up, even when it would seem obvious that some of the narrative relationships between scenes or figures must have been apparent to an educated man like Torre, appears wilfully obtuse at first glance. However, in keeping with the analytical style he favoured, this allowed Torre to create an aura of complete objectivity and detachment: his methodology required him simply to record individual features, not interpret (or perhaps at times appear to be unhealthily familiar with the story or symbolism of) what he saw. The nature of the material he was describing may have rendered this desirable or even necessary to avoid accusations of Catholic sympathies, Dugdale's 'covert Catholicism', although the shifting nature of his terminology for key figures such as the Virgin does suggest that he at least leant towards the more Catholic end of the religious spectrum and had to modify his language when the climate became more hostile. His use of language is discussed below, but the timing of the creation and compilation of Torre's work does bear some relation to the interests and sympathies of the archbishops during whose terms he worked.

In describing the windows, Torre made no attempt to assign dates to any of them, nor comment routinely on the condition or legibility of the glass. His references to chronology are limited to occasional subjective phrases such '*lately*

⁶²⁷ Hunter, *The Royal Society and Its Fellows, 1660-1700: The Morphology of an Early Scientific Institution*.

⁶²⁸ The explanation (see below) of the iconography of the Monkey's Funeral panel in n25 as being a parody of the monks of St Mary's Abbey would appear to be the only example of this.

set up' or *'in the time of the late troubles'*, which suggests he was not supplementing his study of the glass with archival sources.⁶²⁹ If, for example, he had referred to (or had access to) the fabric roll for 1674 he would have seen glazier Edward Crosby being paid to take down glass *'likely to fall'*, or seen in the chamberlain's roll for 1677 that there was a payment *"to a mason who came to view ye window yt was fallen, and to advise about yt 2s 6d"*.⁶³⁰ In this regard Torre was not *'researching'* the windows in the manner of the documentary research he had undertaken for his other volumes, but rather objectively recording them as they appeared to him standing before them. These records of expenditure would, of course, have been very recent in Torre's time and may well have been regarded as confidential and therefore not available for study, but equally such information was not within the scope he had set himself for his task.

Torre's journey around the Minster

In his own words, Torre laid out his plan for recording the building thus:

*"In the next place I shall proceed to give some description of the Form of the building & manner of its workmanship as it represents itself now to the Eye."*⁶³¹

Having explored the exterior of the west end, he moved to the inside of the building, Torre set out his system for ordering his observations:

"The Architecture of the Inner work of the Minster may be considered In its: 1. Walls 2. Pillars, 3. Roofs, 4. Windows Also in the Funerall Monuments as 1. Tombs 2. Gravestones Describing the Curiosity within all. According to which divisions I shall begin at the West End of the Minster And first at the End of the two side Isles w[hi]ch are both of this sort of workmanship".⁶³²

⁶²⁹ YMA Torre L1/7 f.20.

⁶³⁰ Fabric roll: YMA E3/65/17; Chamberlain's roll: YMA E2/22 p.139.

⁶³¹ YMA Torre L1/7 f.17.

⁶³² YMA L1/7 f.18.

He dealt with the building in sections: not, ultimately, exactly laid out as he was planning to describe it, but dealing with each part of the building in turn working eastwards from the west end. Having described the Great West Window and the stonework surrounding it, he then proceeded to describe the windows of the north nave aisle to the crossing before moving across and working along the south nave aisle in the same way. He dealt with the windows of the lantern separately from the two transepts and the windows of the Chapter House and its vestibule separately again. His terminology for identifying windows was to describe them relative to the starting point for each section: for example, '2nd from the west' when identifying the nave aisle windows.

He did not ascribe any of the names familiar today to the windows, such as the 'St. William Window', except for the Five Sisters window in the north transept (n16) and the Bellfounders window (n24) which he called 'The Old Bell Window'.⁶³³ The rose window (S16) he said was called '*the Marygold window*', because it contained 'several little marigolds' as discussed above, but other windows were identified only by location. This may have been because such names were not yet attached to windows: some of the names used today cannot be positively identified in literature prior to the mid-twentieth-century descriptions and work by Dean Eric Milner-White.⁶³⁴ However, the use of the Five Sisters name does indicate that in that instance at least a common or popular name had been attached to a major window, with an explanatory legend. Francis Drake, drawing on Torre for much of his descriptive materials in *Eboracum* told the story of the maiden sisters' embroidery, but also said he had heard it referred to it as "*the Jewish window*" though he claimed not to know why it was so called.⁶³⁵ Browne Willis referred to the Five Sisters and connected it with the appearance of the glass resembling embroidery, as did Defoe in his *Tour*.⁶³⁶ Whilst this was some decades after Torre's work, it does indicate that

⁶³³ YMA L1/7 p.27.

⁶³⁴ Milner-White deployed such terms in his annual reports to The Friends of York Minster 1941-1963, but it is beyond the scope of this thesis to determine which, if any, he coined and which were already in existence.

⁶³⁵ Drake, *Eboracum*, 532.

⁶³⁶ Browne Willis, *A Survey of the Cathedrals of York, Durham, Carlisle, Chester, Man, Lichfield, Hereford, Worcester, Gloucester and Bristol* (London: R. Gosling, 1727); Defoe, *A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain*, 74.

such stories were current in the early eighteenth century and are likely to have been in circulation before that.

Torre's lack of such nomenclature for other windows may be indicative of the lack of such common or popular names, which would also reflect the level of popular familiarity with the glass, but would also be consistent with his empirical approach. Torre was sometimes at pains to record stories or explanations to account for the iconography, as with the panel now known as the Monkeys' Funeral (n25), which he claimed enshrined a joke about St Mary's Abbey discussed in more detail below, but unless a name had something more interesting or evidential to recommend it than simple common parlance then Torre did not include it.

Technology and access

Whilst the lack of artificial light is of no consequence when viewing windows, the size of the windows and the height at which many of the very detailed panels Torre described are situated does raise the question of whether he relied solely on ground-level observation, or whether he used any kind of apparatus to enhance his viewing skills. The moveable wooden scaffold called 'the fleet' was in existence, and could have been deployed to help access the higher levels, but it was cumbersome to move around and required at least four men to manoeuvre it safely.⁶³⁷ It is unlikely that Torre could have called on such manpower over such an extended period and even more unlikely that the Chapter would have permitted such an intrusion into their daily routine. There is no evidence that Torre held any official position at the Minster or in the diocese, so it would be unlikely that he would have necessarily been accorded any physical assistance with his work.⁶³⁸ Unless he was prepared to meet the costs associated with such assistance himself, for which there is no evidence in the accounts of the Clerk of Works to indicate that the fleet and the men necessary

⁶³⁷ This apparatus is repeatedly mentioned in the fabric rolls, and apparently was stored at the west end.

⁶³⁸ Despite being trained as a lawyer, there is no evidence that Torre ever practised law in York, or served the diocese or Chapter in any legal capacity. He appears to have lived as an independent gentleman scholar.

to move it were hired out in this way, Torre was recording at ground level.⁶³⁹ There is a slight decline in clarity of description for the upper levels, but his observational skills were remarkable. There is the possibility that he used a spyglass of some kind.⁶⁴⁰ The development of optics for scientific enquiry was fast-paced, but largely devoted to microscopic study. The early telescopes were large and cumbersome, designed principally for astronomy and navigation, not for relatively short-range magnification of close objects.⁶⁴¹ It would not be possible to focus on fine detail with such instruments: such close observation is best undertaken with binoculars, rather than a telescope, and there is no record of such instruments being manufactured at this date. A second argument is a more subjective one: for someone as methodical and detailed as Torre, who was clearly influenced by and keen to follow the new, more precise style of recording developed for the emerging study of science, it would surely have been a point of pride and social standing to note that he had used such a scientific instrument for his recording.⁶⁴² As he himself said, he recorded each feature "*as it represents itself now to the Eye*".⁶⁴³ It must be assumed, therefore, that the majority, if not all, of Torre's observations were made by the naked eye from ground level, which makes his descriptions remarkable for their consistency and his powers of observation impressive.

However, the windows in Torre's day did not have the external quarry glazing, so more light could shine through and the design lines would not have been blurred or compromised by the shadow and partially seen criss-cross of the quarry leading. There had also been few restorations or major interventions, so the windows as Torre saw them would have been more legible than many are now.

Torre's terminology

As an antiquarian and a layman, Torre was a new kind of 'consumer' of, or audience for, the glass. The original audiences had been the clergy and laity of

⁶³⁹ Such income from would have been recorded as part of the Fabric Accounts (YMA E3).

⁶⁴⁰ Henry C. King, *The History of the Telescope* (New York: Dover edition, 2003).

⁶⁴¹ Shapin, *The Scientific Revolution*, 72.

⁶⁴² Ibid, 122; *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England*.

⁶⁴³ YMA L1/7 f.18.

the pre-Reformation church, who (it may be presumed) could read the windows to varying degree and respond to them. Post-Reformation that audience had declined to be principally the Minster clergy until, during the Commonwealth, they too had departed and the glass had been preserved but largely ignored by a laity and Puritan ministry focused on the preaching of the Word. The subsequent restoration of Chapter authority had given a new impetus to the presentation of the glass as part of the overall building aesthetic, but not it would appear (as discussed above in relation to CHn3) to generating an interest in the narratives of individual windows. Torre's study stimulated a new era of interest in the windows, both as art objects and, potentially, as didactic tools, but after more than a century of Protestant angst about much of the subject matter, his choice of terminology gives insight into his perception of them, what thought he was seeing when he looked at these figures and scenes, and how he felt he could best record his observations.

In deciding to describe every figure and scene in every window, Torre was entering the very grey area which Dodsworth and others feared, that of risking to appear to be 'covertly Catholic'. In stepping outside the acceptable area of heraldic recording, Torre was immediately ascribing an importance to imagery which was medieval and Catholic in its origins and potentially problematic. Anglican attitudes to imagery of various kinds were complex and fluid and although two-dimensional work such as glass and painting was somewhat less contentious, the devil lay in the detail of how such work was perceived and used.⁶⁴⁴ The way in which Torre approached this was not consistent across the whole period of his recording, or even within a single window, and it is my contention that these variations were, in part, a reflection of the religious environment at the time of recording, giving a rare glimpse into the fluctuations of the social acceptability of Catholicism in York in the late seventeenth century. They were also undoubtedly affected by Torre's ability to recognise iconography and this gives an indication of the currency of such knowledge outside the Catholic milieu. There is not a sense that Torre's choice of

⁶⁴⁴ Haynes, *Pictures and Popery*; Parry, *Glory, Laud and Honour*; Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*.

term reflected growing knowledge on his part, although very occasionally it is possible to trace the source of his interpretations, usually when they are incorrect. There is a sense that his own religious preferences sometimes break through the objective quasi-scientific methodology he chose for his recording, but the inconsistency of this gives insight into what he did and did not know.

In this respect, Torre sometimes used overtly 'Catholic' terms: descriptions of Mary, for example, varied between 'woman in a blue robe with a child' to 'Our Lady and the Blessed babe'. Very few of the saints were individually identified, and in some instances, the objects being held were incorrectly described. This may be ignorance or an unwillingness to be seen to know what certain objects, very specifically identified with Catholic practices, were. The following extract [Figure 83] from his record of the crucifixion scene in window s36, made I would estimate in the late 1670s, usefully encapsulates many of these issues.⁶⁴⁵

"1. At top of all stands an holy woman in Azure & golden robes carrying in one hand the something like (a Charger)."

The item 'like a charger' is a disc bearing the emblem of the Agnus Dei. This is a mis-identification of the (clearly bearded) figure of John the Baptist [Figure 84]. As Torre was clearly able to discern the comparatively small element of the disc, it is odd he could not identify the figure as male.

"2. On her right side below stands another woman robed Vt & Gu [vert and gules] St Mary Magdalene.

3. And on her other side stands another woman robed A & Bl ."

This ought to be azure and possibly bleu celeste or sky blue, although the other dominant colour in the composition is now pale gold, possibly intended to be a rich white. As noted above, and by French and O'Connor, this seems to be an example of Torre creating his own abbreviations and mixing his terms for colours with heraldic terms.⁶⁴⁶ The A may be intended to be for Argent, but elsewhere he uses Arg for Argent, not just A, and he uses B for blue. This panel is a

⁶⁴⁵ YMA L1/7 f.18.

⁶⁴⁶ French and O'Connor, *York Minster: A Catalogue of Medieval Stained Glass Fascicle 1 the West Windows of the Nave Wi, Wii, Nxxx, Sxxxvi*, 86.

depiction of St Clare [Figure 85]. She is clearly shown holding a monstrance, which Torre omits from his description completely. The form of the monstrance, a crocketed pinnacle enclosing a clearly-delineated chalice with host suspended above, he may have mistaken it for part of the elaborate architectural surround, or simply have not known what it was. Equally likely is that open recognition of a monstrance (with the implication that his reader or readers would know what it was for) was too religiously charged an admission too far.

“4. In the middle light is a large Crucifix of our Lord with an azure garment over his Loyns hanging on a Cross. Impaled O & Vt (Or & Vert)

5. In the first light stands in a tabernacle an holy woman robed O & Gu Girded O her right hand elevated.”

This description was a failure to identify the Virgin Mary, who Torre readily identified elsewhere. Given the conventional position of Mary, to one side of the cross with John on the other, this failure is at first glance surprising, but Mary is shown in an unfamiliar pose (holding a book) and relatively unfamiliar colours - gold and red, rather than blue [Figure 86]. Torre's inability (as opposed to unwillingness) to identify this figure as the Virgin suggests his knowledge of her iconography was somewhat shallow and based very much on late medieval images rather than being the product of purposeful study. His practice of reading panels in isolation may also have hampered his identification, as the figure is not considered in its context with the other figures as part of a crucifixion scene, although this seems a little unlikely in such an obvious representation.

“6. In the 3^d light stand opposite to her another holy woman (in a Tabernacle) robed O & Vt.”

This is St. John, not a woman [Figure 87]. Torre seems to have mistaken robed men as women in several locations, especially when (like John) they are depicted as clean-shaven, although he mistook the bearded John the Baptist for a woman as well. Again, given the apparently very familiar iconography here of John and Mary at the foot of the cross, such an error is surprising. It is just conceivable that he was adopting the ultra-scientific approach of ‘first principles’, i.e. not assuming anything about the figures from their context, but simply recording

them as they appeared 'to mine eye', but this seems somewhat extreme given the clear identification of the crucified Christ.

"7. At the bottom of the middle light is a little Image of a man somewhat defaced."

This is thought to be a donor figure [Figure 59]. The fact that it was already illegible in Torre's time suggests that it had been damaged either during the Reformation or (less likely) during the Civil War.

It is interesting that here and elsewhere Torre uses the term 'image' for the contents of the windows: earlier use of the term 'ymage' had referred specifically to three-dimensional representational art, whilst depictions in windows were 'pictours'. As Aston observes, the term 'image' had particular potency during the Reformation as something to be wary of for fear of falling into superstition and idol worship and even in the Council's orders for the churches in 1646 discussed above, when windows fell under suspicion much more than they had before, the term used for depictions in windows was 'pictures' rather than 'images'.⁶⁴⁷ This suggests a religious language whose definitions were in a state of flux, where the term 'picture' was coming to mean more specifically a piece of painted art on board or canvas, as the Laudian faction in the seventeenth-century church explored the reintroduction of ornamentation and art into church interiors amidst much controversy.⁶⁴⁸

Torre and recognition of saints

Torre readily identified royal figures, such as those in the bottom row of the Great East Window and some bishops, although mostly those which were named in the glass. He also positively identified certain saints or specific religious figures by name and or epithet. This forms a pattern of recognition of the type of figure which seemed to present no difficulty, either practical or doctrinally in being named, namely the Virgin Mary (when represented in familiar poses such as enthroned or holding the Christ Child, or in specifically familiar colours such as

⁶⁴⁷ Raine, "Proceedings of the Commonwealth Committee for York and the Ainsty", 114; for a general discussion of the changing attitudes to imagery, see Aston, *Broken Idols of the English Reformation*.

⁶⁴⁸ Fincham, *Altars Restored*; Haynes, *Pictures and Popery*; Parry, *Glory, Laud and Honour*.

blue or gold), apostolic saints such as Peter and John, or saints whose attributes were sufficiently distinctive to make their identification easy, such as Katherine with her wheel [Figure 88].

However, it is also possible to see where his identification was influenced - and ultimately misled - by his contemporary understanding or sensitivities: an example is the Coronation of the Virgin in the Great West Window (w1).⁶⁴⁹ Torre described the top of the two middle lights as *“Our Lady Inthroned Robed B & O Crowned Gold with the Holy Babe in her right Armes in white Rayment”*: the figure of Mary is shown enthroned and crowned, but she is shown with her hands clasped in prayer, not holding Christ. It is just possible Torre mistook the white glass of her hands as the child *“in white Rayment”*, the Virgin and Child being a more familiar (or acceptable) image than the Coronation of the Virgin, but it is also possible he intentionally modified his description to something he may have considered less problematic. Torre's terminology strongly suggests that at the start of his recording he was at the very least sympathetic to the language of Catholic worship and felt able to express things in this way, albeit within certain boundaries of his own defining. There are, however, significant inconsistencies within his recording of this window: he failed to identify the Virgin in both the Annunciation and Nativity scenes lower down. The former was possibly because the physical separation of the panels into strongly architecturally defined lights, each panel bordered by an elaborate architectural frame within the design, led him to believe that each image stood alone and should be recorded as such. His own system prevented him from reading across to identify a scene he was certainly able to identify in window n28: here, he readily identified the iconography, despite omitting some details, such as the lily, and the unfamiliar palette of Mary's clothing [Figure 89]:

“[Marginal note: 2nd Row Our Ladyes Salutation]

In 2nd row & in first light stands the Angell saluting our Lady with words on an Escrole, issuing out of his mouth. She standing by robed Murry & A.”

⁶⁴⁹ This window, its restoration and reordering have been studied closely and very usefully presented in diagrammatic form in French and O'Connor, *York Minster: A Catalogue of Medieval Stained Glass Fascicule 1 the West Windows of the Nave Wi, Wii, Nxxx, Sxxxvi*.

In the same window (n28) He identified the three Kings, guided "*by a starr to our Ladys Inn two of which are crowned & the other on his knees with a golden cup in his hands making his offerings to her.*" [Figure 90], so the iconography of the Nativity was clearly familiar. This makes his failure to identify the Virgin and Child in the Nativity scene in w1 harder to explain - *On her left hand in the 3rd light stands an holy woman Robed O & Gu with something in her hand.* This is the Virgin and Christ Child, clearly visible from ground level; the '*something in her hand*' is the baby, depicted quite clearly wrapped in a green mantle. He may not have expected to see more images of Mary, already shown crowned at the head of the window, but the inconsistency in terminology suggests he was not writing from a position of ignorance. In other lights of w1 Torre correctly identified local saints St John of Beverley and Wilfrid of Ripon. He also identified William, Seward and Oswald in this row of archiepiscopal saints, but the label identification of 'Saint Thomas' is somewhat problematic: Thomas of Bayeux was not a saint and the other canonical candidates, Saint Thomas Beckett and Thomas Cantilupe were not, of course, archbishops of York.

"In 2nd Light stands Abp Thomas robed B o & Vt pall & face A mitred A& O Crosyer Gu with his left hand somewhat elevated as giving the Benediction and at his feet written S. Thomas.

Perhaps Torre assumed that all the early bishops and archbishops were saints, or simply made a mistake. The problems with identification of some of the archiepiscopal figures in the bottom row and the original ordering of them were discussed in detail by French and O'Connor in their analysis of the west end glazing iconography.⁶⁵⁰ What is clear is that without Torre's record the identification of many more of the figures and the possible options for the original ordering almost impossible to formulate.

On occasion, his knowledge and description extend beyond what is visible in the windows. Torre's identification in window s2 of the martyrdom story of St John Evangelist contained detail beyond the window imagery, that is that the executioner was *pouring scalding oyle on his head.* This required

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid, 15-16.

knowledge of one of the lesser-known (and widely discredited) miracle stories from the saint's life.⁶⁵¹ The position of this window at the far east end of the Minster means it was likely to have been recorded in the early 1680s, if the chronology of c.1675-c.1685 for the initial recording is accepted. This story of St. John miraculously surviving an attempt by the Emperor Domitian to execute him by boiling him in oil was recounted in *The Golden Legend*, but at this date this was not part of the Protestant canon of acceptable religious literature.⁶⁵² A copy of the 1493 supplement was, however, in the library of the Archbishop Tobie Matthew, which his widow Francis had given to the Dean and Chapter in 1628, and to which Torre may have had access.⁶⁵³ Torre also recounted in full a story relating to the other imagery in the window beyond details depicted [Figure 91]:

*"It is the story of a pilgrim who in his way to Jerusalem beggd Almes of St Edward for St John's sake. The king having nothing else to give gave him the Ring off his own finger which the pilgrim carrying to Jerusalem where meeting St John brought it back again to the King (by him Consecrated) with notice of the time of his death & glorification. Which Ring being consecrated by the Saint in Palestine hath been ever since religiously kept in the Abbey of Westminster And according to tradition is the Ring which the Abp of Cant putts upon the King's finger at his inauguration & Consecration hence called The Wedding Ring of England (BR 146)."*⁶⁵⁴

The connection to a story of harmony between church and state, particularly the role of the church in the consecration of kings, may have made this inclusion especially appealing, and suggests Torre was asserting his own loyal credentials to James II.

⁶⁵¹ YMA L1/7 f.49 The reference 'BR 146' is obscure and there is no surviving list of his abbreviations for manuscripts or references which casts any direct light on the source. The references to the coronation ceremony and Westminster Abbey are suggestive of a source from London and the number could be a manuscript number or a page number, but at present no source matching these has been identified.

⁶⁵² Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend* ed. Helmut Ripperger and Ryan Granger (New York: Arno Press, 1969).

⁶⁵³ Bernard Barr, "The Minster Library," in *A History of York Minster*, ed. Aylmer and Cant, 500.

⁶⁵⁴ YMA L1/7 f.49.

Interpreting 'problematic' images

The descriptions of 'problematic' imagery show how Torre dealt with and perceived (or interpreted) the iconography before him. Three examples are: The Monkey's Funeral panel in the bottom of n25; the Parker window with its depiction of the murder of Thomas Becket (n9); the penitential scene in n27.

The fourteenth-century Pilgrimage window (n25) contains a scene [Figure 92] in the lower border (panel 1a) interpreted as representing a parody of the Funeral of the Virgin.⁶⁵⁵ Torre's recorded the same figures, but placed a very different interpretation on the scene:

"The borders of these lights are filled with the Mock Representation of many Monkies marching in procession, one of them bearing the Cross before the host carried on the shoulders of 4 others.

Also stands a desk with a book on't out of which a fox is reading & a Cock behind it harkening.

Which is thought was sett up to delude the Regular Clergy then at difference with the Secular, Especially occasioned by a Visitation of the Dean and Chapter of York of the Abbey of St Maries which they took so ill that they could not forbear reflecting on them in their writings therefore to be eaven with them the Seculars of this Church might thus mistively [mischievously?] abuse them".

From Torre's description, it is obvious that he was, unusually, reporting a story heard elsewhere; it has all the hallmarks of a story told by someone standing with Torre in front of the window and there is no clue as to the source of the tale. The monks "reflecting on them in their writings" is presumably a reference to one of the St Mary's Abbey Chronicles 1334-1381, a date span which neatly maps to the likely period of the window's creation, although there is no entry in the main Anonimale Chronicle which can be linked to this supposed incident.⁶⁵⁶ The panel is now interpreted as a representation of the Fergus tale from the Funeral of the Virgin, a part of the highly developed late-medieval Marian

⁶⁵⁵ YMA L1/7 f.20v.

⁶⁵⁶ V. H. Galbraith *The Anonimale Chronicle 1333-1381: from a MS Written at St. Mary's Abbey, York* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970).

hagiography which had such strong currency in England. The funeral story was briefly popular as a Corpus Christi play performed initially by the Masons, but in 1431/2 they petitioned for the right to abandon it because it was not Biblical and its performance provoked hilarity and fighting rather than devotion.⁶⁵⁷

The panel as presented today contains all the recognisable elements of Torre's description: the cock, the fox, the desk with a book, and the cross being carried ahead of a procession of monkeys. What stands out is Torre's identification of the item being carried as the Host, not the Virgin's funeral bier. The panel depicts four variously coloured monkeys carrying the opposite ends of two horizontal poles on their shoulders with a hanging piece of olive green drapery between them and a partially unintelligible figure centrally beneath the drapery. This figure is interpreted now as Fergus, the glass showing the legs, torso and base of the neck and shoulders of a naked figure with arms raised up where the shoulder joint is shown. The interpretation of the panel as one of the borders, and the role of the borders within the window as a whole, are considered in Hardwicke's article 'Making Light of Devotion', whilst the detail of this panel in particular is the focus for his *Art History* article 'The Monkeys Funeral in the Pilgrimage Window, York Minster'.⁶⁵⁸ In both of these, Hardwick tests and rejects the simple 'joke' hypothesis, placing the seemingly humorous imagery within the taxonomy of medieval moral exemplars and spiritual guidance akin to the marginalia in contemporary manuscripts. It is essential, he suggests, that we read this panel not only in the context of the rest of the window, and not in humorous isolation, but remember that the window as a whole was set in the very public part of the Minster, a place whose medieval devotion to the Virgin make this "an extremely unlikely place to find a parody of this episode [the Virgin's funeral]".⁶⁵⁹ The anti-clerical symbolism of the fox preaching to the cock, which Hardwick contends should be read with the focus

⁶⁵⁷ York City Archives Memorandum Book AY1, extracted from the Ordo Paginarum entries.

⁶⁵⁸ Paul Hardwick, "The Monkeys Funeral in the Pilgrimage Window of York Minster" *Art History* 23, no. 2 (2000); "Making Light of Devotion: The Pilgrimage Window in York Minster" in *Medieval English Comedy*, ed. Sandra Hordis and Paul Hardwick (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 290-99.

⁶⁵⁹ Hardwick, 'Making Light of Devotion', 76.

on the cock as the sinner oblivious to his fate, could, however, have enjoyed a usefully ambiguous interpretation if the Abbey story has any basis in fact.⁶⁶⁰

Torre's identification of this as a Host procession may be explained by a fragment of glass immediately above the drapery, which has a circular feature painted on to it. It is possible Torre misinterpreted this as a Host displayed above a veil (as depicted in panel 9g of the Great East Window). It does suggest he did not know the iconography of the Virgin's Funeral, so made no connection without it. His explanation that this was a visual joke against St Mary's Abbey does not rely on the nature of the carried object being the Host, so it is noteworthy that he makes this identification as opposed to simply recording it as 'a procession'. The story of a concealed joke against St Mary's raises interesting questions about the historical information available, or which still had some currency, in York in the 1670s. Torre, tantalisingly, does not give any clues as to his source: phrases such as 'I am told' occur rarely, but suggest he was discussing his work with others and soliciting information, or (at the very least) being told unsolicited stories as he walked around the Minster floor, which he very occasionally then incorporated into his work.

The question of 'problematic' imagery was encountered again when Torre described the imagery of window n9.⁶⁶¹ This window, given by Canon Thomas Parker (died 1423), depicts the lives of three saints vertically in three lights, one in each light: St John of Beverley, St. William and St. Thomas of Canterbury. The survival of this prohibited Becket glass in such a significant part of the cathedral is surprising, but its survival is even more extraordinary given the very strong link made in this abbreviated hagiographical sequence between Thomas' faithful service to the king, his being made archbishop and then being martyred apparently at the king's behest. Torre read the glass across the lights so the saints' stories are broken up across his description, making it harder to read. It is significant that he readily identified St John of Beverley and King Athelstan, as this told of good relations between church and state, and able to identify the William panels with their scroll, but when it came to the Thomas

⁶⁶⁰ Hardwick, "The Monkeys Funeral in the Pilgrimage Window of York Minster", 292-93.

⁶⁶¹ YMA L1/7 f.34.

panels the king is recorded not as being on legal business, but "*sporting with a fair lady & gently touching her under the chin*" and Thomas is referred to variously as '*another archbishop*', '*an holy man*', '*an holy man like St John*' and lastly as '*a certain saint*'. Thomas' murder is described as "*the Execution of a certain saint with a dagger run into his head by the executioner*": the unwillingness to name Thomas is clear and the inclusion of key phrases "a certain" and "executioner" make it quite clear that Torre knew it was a depiction of the murder of Thomas Becket [Figure 93].

In considering why Torre chose not to identify Thomas it would be overly simplistic to assume that it was either that the imagery was Catholic - he had no such scruples about identifying St John of Beverley - or that it was that such images had been prohibited by Henry VIII, as this could easily have been dealt with by adding a censorious adjective such as 'unlawful' or even the much-vaunted 'scandalous'. The reason Torre was unwilling to identify Thomas would seem to have everything to do with the many uncomfortable resonances with the political events of the very recent past. Thomas Becket was the unfortunate victim of political turmoil between church and state, a martyr executed at the hands of zealots. Only fifty years before Torre was writing up his notes, Charles I, it was considered by many, had suffered the same fate and was already being acclaimed a martyr. In Torre's own day, the heir to the throne, the martyr's grandson, had been usurped for his Catholic sympathies and replaced, albeit bloodlessly, by a Protestant replacement. Overt identification of the depiction of the murder of an archbishop by a king would have been politically dangerous and laid Torre open to suspicion and accusations not only of Catholic sympathies but possibly Jacobite ones too.

The description of a scene in the Penancers' window (n27) [Figure 94], contains a description of a penitent receiving absolution from a monk "*pronouncing these words writ on an escrowle issuing out of the Dr priests mouth viz "Absolutionem & Remissionem penatorum"*", which was not consistent with Protestant teaching on confession.⁶⁶² Whilst the ideas of priests pronouncing

⁶⁶² The General Confession forms part of the service of Evening Prayer, followed by the Absolution 'to be pronounced by the Priest alone' to the kneeling congregation.

penance and absolution had reappeared in the Book of Common Prayer, such acts were firmly placed in the context of a general act within a public service, not private confession heard by a priestly monk. This suggests this description had been written in the late 1670 or early 1680s when there was a more tolerant atmosphere in York, as evidenced by the establishment of the Bar Convent Catholic School for girls and the number of Catholics living openly in the city in this period.⁶⁶³ The general tenor of his descriptions towards monks as 'holy men' was one of reverence and respect, in keeping with Scott's "freemasonry of scholarship" enjoyed by academics in the 1670s and coterminous with Archbishop Sterne's period in office (1664-1683), but also indicative of Torre's own churchmanship.⁶⁶⁴

Torre's recording of change

Torre occasionally recorded references to glass being replaced or recently inserted, although this stepped outside his strict code of 'as is' recording. The description of n29 in the north nave aisle contains one of the few references to glass being replaced because of Civil War damage: "*the first window being all of New White glass hath nothing observable in it for the old painted Glass was taken down & sold in the time of the late troubles (as I am Informed)*". Whether anyone would have been able to tell Torre what 'old painted glass' had been there formerly cannot now be deduced, but he simply recorded the repair. Likewise, in noting the 'new' Ingram shields in n28 [Figure 21], Torre made no attempt to ascertain what imagery (if anything) this glass had replaced. These three shields were carefully drawn, described and labelled by Torre. Although some of the heraldry in the glass is incorrect for their being armorials of Sir Thomas Ingram's familial connections by marriage, he makes no comment, he simply 'edits' the description to omit the incorrect quarters: "*Under the last are these 3 Coats lately set up in a Row viz Ingram / Ingram & Grevill / Ingram*". It is hard to determine exactly what timescale Torre had in mind when he used the phrase 'lately set up' – in his own experience perhaps? – but again he made no

⁶⁶³ Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy in the City of York, 1558-1791*, 96-97.

⁶⁶⁴ Scott, "A Benedictine Conspirator: Henry Joseph Johnston", 58.

attempt to ascertain what had been in those positions previously: his interest was to record the Minster as it was in his own time, not to write a history. In this, his approach differed completely from the historical and archival investigations he had undertaken for his other volumes, particularly those on the diocese and the parishes.⁶⁶⁵ His meticulous historical research into the holdings of the church was replaced by meticulous, but not completely dispassionate, observational study of the Minster as an object.

Torre's legacy

By the time of the transition to Archbishop Dolben (1683-1686), Torre's work was likely near completion in draft form and possibly laid to one side on Dolben's death as the toleration of Catholics nationally took a sharp downward turn with the events of the late 1680s. There is no suggestion that Dolben or the preceding archbishops had been specific patrons of Torre, but Dolben had been a benefactor of the Minster Library and closely involved in the life of the Minster, so is likely to have been aware of Torre's work.⁶⁶⁶ Archbishop Sharp's desire to use the manuscripts to ascertain the rights and dues of the church from his appointment in 1691 (as stated by Torre himself) suggest the work was complete and required only ordering and copying.⁶⁶⁷

The new dean, appointed following the death of Dean Wickham, was Thomas Gale (1697-1702), a noted antiquarian, Anglo-Saxonist and prominent in the Royal Society.⁶⁶⁸ Thomas was father to Samuel and Roger and father-in-law to Revd Dr William Stukeley, all noted antiquaries and part of a closely-connected and influential circle.⁶⁶⁹ Whilst at York Thomas compiled a history of the Minster, "Historicall view of the severall foundations and buildings of the cathedrall church of York" (never published), in which he credited General

⁶⁶⁵ YMA L1/1-6.

⁶⁶⁶ Gerald Aylmer, "Funeral monuments and Other Post-Medieval Sculpture", in *A History of York Minster*, ed. Aylmer and Cant, 445.

⁶⁶⁷ Hart, *The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York*, 328.

⁶⁶⁸ Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, 200; Hunter, *The Royal Society and Its Fellows, 1660-1700: The Morphology of an Early Scientific Institution*, 218-19.

⁶⁶⁹ Despite their keen antiquarian interest and connections, none of the Gale family was involved in the York Virtuosi group.

Fairfax with protecting the building during the Civil War, although he did not discuss or describe the glass.⁶⁷⁰ He did not say whether he used Torre's work, but the coincidence is remarkable. His son, Samuel, also wrote on the Minster, the small manuscript notebook dated 1700 "A Brief History of York Cathedral", dedicated to his late father.⁶⁷¹ Whilst it relied heavily on Torre's work (as it acknowledged) and added only a little contemporary material regarding the current state of the building, it marks the family's keen interest in the history of the Minster fabric. Torre's monumental work was likewise not published in his lifetime, but was known to, and used by, many in York, as discussed below. In 1699, the manuscripts were bought for twenty-five guineas from Torre's widow by Archbishop Sharp, whose executors later deposited them in the Minster library.⁶⁷² There they were consulted by antiquarians who mined them for information and published it to meet a growing public interest

The changing perception and reception of stained-glass windows

Torre had described what he saw in the windows and interpreted the iconography, drawing on his own religious understanding (or that part of it which he was prepared to commit to paper) and to historical narratives. In so doing he preserved the folk memory of religious dissention between the Minster and the abbey of St. Mary's, and of royal charity in his retelling of the legend of the pilgrim and the Coronation Ring, an intriguing variation on the more popular version of the story in *The Golden Legend*. The marked lack of interest shown in stained glass by earlier antiquarians of York or elsewhere and raises the question as to whether the value placed on historical features or artefacts by such study influenced the way they were later perceived or regarded? Did the exceptional nature of York's glass make it a natural focus of interest to someone like Torre, or did the interest shown by him engender a belief that this was important and worthy of wider care and attention? Whilst the inclusion of information about any stained glass in antiquarian studies cannot be claimed as unique, York is

⁶⁷⁰ Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Gough Yorks 22, f.18-42. The reference to Fairfax is f.37.

⁶⁷¹ YMA AddMSS 43.

⁶⁷² Hart, *The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York*, 325-331; Sharp, *The Life of John Sharp, Lord Archbishop of York*, 110.

certainly exceptional in both Torre's record and the prominence given to glass in later published works.

Comparison with similar works brings this into focus. As discussed above, a comparable work to Torre's would be that on Peterborough.⁶⁷³ Gunton had recorded the verses in the western cloister windows, but made no attempt to record or to describe the figurative detail of the glass itself. Even when describing the east window of the lost Lady Chapel, "*the fairest and goodliest in all the Church, scarce a fairer in any other Cathedral*" he described it simply as being "*adorned with painted glass, containing many stories, amongst the rest, of Julian the Apostate and these two verses*", the words of which he records in full.⁶⁷⁴ Although Gunton clearly valued the medieval ornamentation of the church and greatly lamented the losses and destruction of the Civil War, the only aspect of the stained glass which interested him enough to record it in detail was the use of inscriptions and verses. Similarly, John Dart's 1726 description of the Trinity Chapel glass in Canterbury Cathedral discussed above serves only to reinforce how unusual the focus on the detail of York's glass was. The contrast is clear: Torre's emphasis on describing the imagery and iconography of York's windows was exceptional and served as a rich resource for later authors who celebrated that inheritance; Dart seemed at pains both to separate himself from the risk of identifying the Becket miracle scenes and to reassure the reader that the cathedral's surviving glass was sufficiently confused as to be 'impotent'.

New audiences 1700-1765

Interested observers

In 1705 Joseph Taylor, a young Inner Temple lawyer, made '*A Journey to Edenborough in Scotland*', with two companions during which he recorded his observations and the expense of each place en route.⁶⁷⁵ Their trip from London to Scotland was a holiday, a pleasure trip for their own amusement, which took

⁶⁷³ Gunton, *A History of the Cathedral Church of Peterborough, from Its Foundation, to the Present Time*, xiv.

⁶⁷⁴ *Ibid*, 100.

⁶⁷⁵ Joseph Taylor, *A Journey to Edenborough in Scotland*, ed. William Cowan (Edinburgh: William Brown, 1903).

them through the east Midlands and the Peak District to York and thence to Newcastle and Berwick.⁶⁷⁶ Taylor was in the tradition of travellers like Celia Fiennes or Captain Hammond, already discussed, but he described his own account as a 'Survey' and was quite systematic in his approach. Taylor's initial observations were of the young women of York, but he moved on to describe Ouse Bridge, the arch of which "*the people inform'd us was 27 yards and 3 quarters wide*", making it clear that he was interested in what features the city had to offer. He continued "*The principall rarity here is the Cathedrall, which is the finest Gothick Structure in England, and therefore deserves a more particular account...*" for which he was which was drawing on "*a small historical manuscript of Mr. Samuell Gale, dedicated to his Father, late Dean of York*".⁶⁷⁷ Presumably Taylor knew the Gales from London, although this is not stated. The next six pages are a summary of Gale's history, itself heavily derived from Torre's work, but Taylor then moved on to his own observations which include the windows. For the Great West Window, he noted "*the Effigies of severall Bishops and a variety of History*" but no more.⁶⁷⁸ In the nave, he picked out The Monkeys' Funeral panel, calling it "*a procession of Apes in Priests habits*", then described the nave bosses in detail: for him, however, Mary was always 'the Virgin Mary', never 'Our Lady'. Apart from the Great East Window, most of the rest of the glass is briefly dismissed as containing coats of arms and "*the Effigies of severall Saints, and Bishops, and diverse historyes*", although he admired the height of the two quire transept windows. The Great East Window was worthy of more note, being described as:

" being divided into 108 partitions, each representing some sacred History (Except the lower part) In the Upper part, is the Creation of the world, representing Chaos, and the Almighty commanding all things into Being, Adam and Eve in Paradiſe, Their Fall and Ejection, Noah's Floud, The Tower of Babell, and the like, In the Middle part, is the whole Revelation of Saint John, In the lower part, are the Effigies of severall Christian Kings

⁶⁷⁶ Ibid, 5.

⁶⁷⁷ Ibid, 51; YMA AddMS 43.

⁶⁷⁸ Taylor, *A Journey to Edenborough in Scotland*, 56-57.

*and Bishops, particularly Lucius, Ethelbert, and Edwyn, Gregory, Augustine and Paulinus...*⁶⁷⁹

The Chapter House glass was “*adorn’d with diverse Coats of Arms and other devices*”, but mostly it was a detailed description of the many humorous carvings, apparently of nuns and “*old amorous*” friars.⁶⁸⁰ It is clear from the points picked out and the nature of the descriptive detail that Taylor had been given a guided tour, probably by a verger, and allowed to go up the tower – “*We could not leave the Church without going up to the top of the Lanthorn*” – before moving on to “*The next curiosity*”, the ruins of St Mary’s Abbey.⁶⁸¹

The Minster already had a reputation as a ‘rarity’ (Taylor p.51) and the glass as ‘by all accounts peculiar’ (Fiennes). It is also clear there was a tour with something of a script. Earlier visitors, from the 1630s (Hammond and Breteton) and the 1660s (Fuller) had paid scant regard to the windows, choosing to marvel instead at the wonder which was the octagonal Chapter House, but by the eighteenth century the windows were starting to take centre stage.⁶⁸² The details of the iconography generally could be ignored - many of the summary terms used by Taylor are almost identical to those used on Defoe’s tour over forty years later – but the one which did merit attention was the Great East Window, especially the less ‘difficult’ Old Testament section.⁶⁸³ By the early eighteenth century it is clear the cathedral was attracting more than traditional scholarly antiquarian interest, it was drawing in new visitors who could provide a ready market for publications.

York as a place of popular resort

Eighteenth-century York was a city transforming itself culturally and with ambitions to do so physically. Between 1700 and 1800 it underwent very

⁶⁷⁹ Ibid, 59.

⁶⁸⁰ Ibid, 62.

⁶⁸¹ Ibid, 64.

⁶⁸² Hammond, *A Relation of a Short Survey of 26 Counties, Observed in a Seven Weeks Journey Begun on August 11, 1634, by a Captain, a Lieutenant, and an Ancient, All Three of the Military Company in Norwich*; John Crawford Hodgson et al., *North Country Diaries: (Second Series)* (Durham: Andrews., 1915); Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England*, A new edition, with a few explanatory notes, by John Nichols, ... ed. (London: printed for F.C. & J. Rivington, 1811).

⁶⁸³ See also Fiennes, *The Illustrated Journeys of Celia Fiennes, c.1682-1712*.

significant cultural and economic change both driving and being driven by new social patterns and more limited, but nevertheless important, physical development pertinent to those cultural and social drivers.⁶⁸⁴ The city, which had spurned Widdrington's history on the grounds that it served only to remind the city fathers that their glory was long past and throw into sharp relief their present reduced state, began to reinvent itself both as a place of polite resort and pleasure for the gentry and as a place of intellectual pursuit.⁶⁸⁵ The desire across England to record and 'evidence' the lineages of the nobility and gentry through the study of heraldic devices on tombs and in stained glass, begun after the Reformation, had gained considerable momentum during the destruction of the English Civil War and its immediate aftermath.⁶⁸⁶ By 1700, a number of York's antiquarians (Widdrington, Johnson, Gale, Torre) had recorded aspects of the city's past which went far beyond this narrow focus and celebrated (or at the very least treated as a subject of study) the wider medieval heritage in buildings, monuments and documents. In so doing they had laid one of the foundation stones for York's new economic incarnation as "a centre of consumption and sociability".⁶⁸⁷ Ultimately this made the presentation, perception and reception of the past a matter of economic importance and by extension anything which affected that 'commodity' was a matter of interest to many parties.

The Minster as public space

The growing reputation of the history and architectural beauty of the Minster was followed by the publication of antiquarian studies and popular guidebooks which attempted to describe, depict and explain the features and 'curiosities' of the cathedral. The leisured classes, who required 'amusement' and the opportunity to meet in socially acceptable venues outside of the home, were the principal consumers of these new works and constituted a new group

⁶⁸⁴ The development of various aspects of York's cultural life in the eighteenth-century are explored in Mark Hallett and Jane Rendall, *Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society* (York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York, 2003). See also Matthew Jenkins, "The View from the Street: Housing and Shopping in York During the Long Eighteenth Century" (University of York, PhD thesis, 2013).

⁶⁸⁵ Widdrington, *Analecta Eboracensia*.

⁶⁸⁶ Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, 231.

⁶⁸⁷ Sweet, "History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake's *Eboracum* (1736)", 20.

with a specific interest in the Minster.⁶⁸⁸ Prior to the creation of the New Walk along the banks of the River Ouse in 1730, the Minster's nave was a popular place for perambulation and promenading as it provided an indoor space where the gentry could see and be seen whilst ostensibly admiring the antiquities of the tombs and architecture.⁶⁸⁹ So popular was this activity that in the same year as the New Walk was being constructed, the floor of the nave and transepts were re-paved by William Kent with black and white stone to the Classical Greek Key design proposed by Lord Burlington.⁶⁹⁰ Francis Drake, the York author of '*Eboracum*' published in 1736 included a plate across a double-page spread [Figure 95]. This was a marked departure from the interest in and perception of the Minster in the preceding century, where reassertion of ecclesiastical authority and scholarly study had been to the fore.

Paid for subscription started by the clergy, the re-paving was only ever intended to be in the areas frequented by the laity; the east end beyond and around the quire was excluded from the design. The practical reasoning behind this was to leave an area where internments within the cathedral could continue to be made without disturbing the new floor. The location of this area of designated 'sacrificial' flooring is however significant: the far east end had hitherto been an area reserved for the burial of Minster clergy and some archbishops. The new scheme meant that anyone, clerical or lay, who was granted the right to burial in the cathedral, could theoretically now *only* be buried in this area, directly in front of the Great East Window or in the quire aisles, suggesting that Burlington and the Chapter did not expect significant numbers public to frequent that part of the building. This suggests that in the 1730s it was not envisaged that the promenading public would want or need to make a close study of the window which would be the subject of the first popular guidebook on the Minster, Thomas Gent's, *The Most Delectable, Scriptural and Pious History of the Famous and Magnificent Great Eastern*

⁶⁸⁸ Peter Borsay, "Politeness and Elegance: The Cultural Re-Fashioning of Eighteenth-Century York", in *Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society*, ed. Hallett and Rendall, 1-12.

⁶⁸⁹ Mark Hallett, "Pictorial improvement: York in Eighteenth-Century Graphic Art", in *Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society*, ed. Hallett and Rendall, 34-41.

⁶⁹⁰ Drake, *Eboracum*, 524-525.

Window (According to Beautiful Portraitures) in St. Peter's Cathedral, York published in 1762.⁶⁹¹

The laying of the new floor largely destroyed the evidence of burials (many with inscriptions or the indent of lost brasses) which had been so faithfully recorded by Torre and which constituted the very sort of genealogical elements which earlier antiquarians had valued so highly. The cost of the pavement was considerable: original estimates set the cost at £1,600 but the final total was estimated to be £2,500.⁶⁹² Such a costly venture reflected the importance placed by the subscribers on having a place to promenade, and the cathedral, having already established itself as the natural meeting place, was content to alter its fabric to meet the need of that newly-emerged group.⁶⁹³ In common with most cathedrals at this time, the nave served little regular liturgical purpose: there were very few processions, and only occasional baptisms at the font which had been re-introduced at the west end in 1660. The new pavement fulfilled no structural or liturgical needs, its purposes were aesthetics and convenience for those using that part of the cathedral most regularly. The Dean and Chapter regarded the nave primarily as a secular space and the features and relics of the medieval past within it as part of the historical display of antiquities which the vergers supplemented with paid access to the 'treasures' in the vestry, such as the Horn of Ulph and the wooden effigial head of Archbishop Thomas Rotherham, or the tour offered to visitors like Joseph Taylor. Those meeting and perambulating wished to know more about the tombs and 'curiosities' they saw and sought books which could inform them.

The market for publications

Whereas antiquarians more widely had been publishing their work for over a century, and continued to do so, such publication had been primarily for

⁶⁹¹ Gent, *The Most Delectable, Scriptural and Pious History of the Famous and Magnificent Great Eastern Window (According to Beautiful Portraitures) in St. Peter's Cathedral, York*.

⁶⁹² Drake, *Eboracum*, 523.

⁶⁹³ Owen, "From the Restoration until 1822", 253. The role and impact of the Burlington Pavement is a subject deserving greater study alongside work being developed on the Assembly Rooms by Dav Smith (York).

circulation amongst a select group of like-minded scholars. As Parry has observed, large-scale antiquarian study required scholarly co-operation over many years and publication was often only finally achieved at great expense and frequently after the principal contributors had died.⁶⁹⁴ York included an intellectual stratum for which these traditional antiquarian publications would be the acquisition of choice; the subscription list in Drake's *Eboracum* attests to the interest such a monumental study could attract, which included The Archbishop of Canterbury and eighteen members of Chapter, but not (as discussed in Chapter Three) the Archbishop of York.⁶⁹⁵

To take a cathedral as the subject of an antiquarian study was neither new, nor unique to York: Dugdale had studied St Paul's, and Gunton had undertaken his study of Peterborough cathedral during his years as vice-dean, but like Torre, Gunton had died before publication of his history and it is uncertain whether he had intended his work to be commercially published. Gunton's studies were published in a handsome folio volume in 1686, some ten years after Gunton's death by Symon Patrick. Patrick's motivation was firmly in the antiquarian tradition of providing access to material "*not unworthy [of] Publick View*", but this was tempered, even constrained, by commercial reality:

*"I might have been furnished with other Records out of the same Library [Sir John Cotton's]; which I sought after, but could not find until it was too late: that is, till the Supplement to this History was grown so big, that it could bear no further enlargement, without great loss to the Undertaker."*⁶⁹⁶

Large in format and with a limited number of detailed engravings of prospects of the church, it was a work intended to be studied in a gentleman's library.

Sweet has discussed the eighteenth-century emergence of urban histories, often focused on a cathedral or a large church, which were aimed at those with an interest in the history of a town or city in relation to the

⁶⁹⁴ Graham Parry "Earliest Antiquaries", in *Making History: Antiquaries in Britain, 1707-2007*, 37-39.

⁶⁹⁵ Sweet, "History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake's *Eboracum* (1736)", 14.

⁶⁹⁶ Gunton, *A History of the Cathedral Church of Peterborough, from Its Foundation, to the Present Time*, preface, 4.

emergence of tourism and travel.⁶⁹⁷ Few of these works paid much if any attention to the glass of the cathedral and with a few small exceptions such references were devoted to heraldic glass. Samuel Gale's 1715 work on Winchester made a passing reference to the "*ancient painted glass*" of the cathedral, but without detail.⁶⁹⁸ Henry Hyde's work, which incorporated Gale's, gave slightly more: he was impressed by the dimensions of Winchester's windows and said the east window contained the "*portraits of several saints and bishops*".⁶⁹⁹ The extremely productive Richard Rawlinson, who published works on Rochester, Salisbury, Bath Abbey and Hereford, all in 1717, gave more attention to glass, but with the primary purpose of recording the arms and details of those who had given windows.⁷⁰⁰ In Bath Abbey, he mentioned a figure of the Virgin Mary and some Katherine wheels, but his real interest lay in donors and arms.⁷⁰¹ This was a trend which continued into the mid-eighteenth century: large-sale publications on Exeter and Norwich both pay scant regard to glass in the cathedrals other than heraldic, although poor survival naturally played a part.⁷⁰²

Although several of the eighteenth-century publications on York described the contents of the Minster's windows in reasonable (often considerable) detail and made attempts (of variable success) both to identify and account for the subject matter in at least some of them, this was not universally the case. Publications such as Browne Willis' more general 1727 work (which

⁶⁹⁷ Rosemary Sweet, *The Writing of Urban Histories in Eighteenth Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

⁶⁹⁸ Samuel Gale, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinity in Winton*. By Samuel Gale, Gent (London), 22.

⁶⁹⁹ Henry Hyde and Samuel Gale, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Winchester. Containing, All the Inscriptions Upon the Tombs and Monuments* (London: printed for E. Curll at the Dial and Bible against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-Street).

⁷⁰⁰ Richard Rawlinson, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Rochester* (London: printed for E. Curll, at the Dial and Bible near St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-Street); *The History and Antiquities of the City and Cathedral-Church of Hereford* (London: printed for R. Gosling, at the Mitre and Crown against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-Street); *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral-Church of Salisbury, and the Abbey-Church of Bath* (London: printed for E. Curll, in Fleetstreet, 1719), 197, 199.

⁷⁰¹ Rawlinson, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral-Church of Salisbury, and the Abbey-Church of Bath*, 52-53.

⁷⁰² *The Antient History and Description of the City of Exeter* (Exeter: printed and sold by R. Trewman, behind the Guildhall; by whom all Manner of Printing-Work is neatly and expeditiously performed on the most Reasonable Terms); Francis Blomefield, *The History of the City and County of Norwich*, (Norwich: Printed at Norwich in the year of our Lord).

was almost a *Monasticon* for selected cathedrals and their dioceses) dealt principally with their history, with their “*foundations, builders, antient monuments and inscriptions*”, as in the title.⁷⁰³ Willis’ references to the windows are few and almost identical to the terminology used by Joseph Taylor: the windows contains a sacred pieces of history, “*effigies of bishops and other historical narratives*”, but he did pick out the Great East Window as “*exquisite*” and containing “*a history of the Bible*”.⁷⁰⁴ Willis referred to two other works already in circulation as being the reason his description was short: a 1719 *Antiquities of York City* and *The Historiographer* of 1720 (the latter so far untraced). The 1719 book was Christopher Hildyard’s edition of Torre’s work, in which the only references to the Minster windows were to the Petty glass over the south door and to give the dimensions of the windows in the appendix; the windows in the parish churches of the city were described in more detail, but only in terms of their heraldry.⁷⁰⁵

Heraldry was ‘safe’ and of national interest; figures were either of less interest, or harder to describe in ways which would not arouse suspicion when books went to print. Heraldry had a language of its own which transcended national borders, a specialist terminology of extreme complexity developed by the College of Arms and used for answering familiar questions not only of the order of inheritance and obligation, but also antiquity and authenticity. In its exactness and gradations, it had much in common with the classification systems which the world of natural science was starting to develop. Equally importantly, it was devoid of religious affiliation. There was no comparable ‘system’ for describing figurative imagery and the terms chosen could be loaded with significance. Beyond heraldry, bishops, sacred histories, the Bible were all uncontentious topics, but outside York there was no attempt like Torre’s to capture the detail of the whole corpus in any cathedral. Something of the emerging reputation of York’s windows can be seen in the anonymous 1755 work on York and Canterbury published in York by J. Hildyard: here, the Great

⁷⁰³ Willis, *A Survey of the Cathedrals of York, Durham, Carlisle, Chester, Man, Lichfield, Hereford, Worcester, Gloucester and Bristol*.

⁷⁰⁴ *Ibid*, 16-17.

⁷⁰⁵ Hildyard, *The Antiquities of York City*, 69, 156.

East Window is “*the finest window in the world*” and “*To enter upon a description of the Imagery, in Painted Glass, which is still preserved in the windows..... would be endless*”.⁷⁰⁶ Even here, however, the survival of heraldic glass is celebrated above other specific content: “*since Glass is so frail a substance, that it is almost a Miracle so many Coats are up in windows at this Day*”.⁷⁰⁷ But York’s exceptional interest in its glass and the prominence of the other content of the Minster’s windows in the definition of the cathedral and increasingly the city can be seen in the productions of two authors: Francis Drake and Thomas Gent.

Francis Drake

Francis Drake’s 1736 volume, *Eboracum*, has become the defining work of reference for York in the eighteenth century.⁷⁰⁸ Drake himself did comparatively little original research, preferring instead to draw on the work of others and to protest that his own efforts were as nothing in comparison with the likes of the ‘inestimable Mr Torre’, on whose work (and that of Hildyard) he drew heavily. The dominant feature of his publication was the inclusion of the large and detailed drawings [Figure 96], including the major windows depicted in considerable detail. These were probably commissioned by him specifically for the work, and possibly in response to the publications by Thomas Gent which, in the competitive world of eighteenth-century printing, had pre-empted Drake’s intended publication date of 1730 (see below).⁷⁰⁹ The inclusion of such high-quality copper plates was an approach which the Society of Antiquaries was advocating with their active commissioning of record drawings by artists such as George Vertue.⁷¹⁰ *Eboracum* was handsomely published by subscription: it was a

⁷⁰⁶ Anon, *An Accurate Description and History of the Metropolitan and Cathedral Churches of Canterbury and York, from Their First Foundation to the Present Year. Illustrated with One Hundred and Seventeen Copper-Plates, Consisting of Different Views, Plans, Monuments, Antiquities, Arms, &c* (London: printed for W. Sandby, Bookseller, in Fleet-Street; and sold by J. Hildyard, Bookseller, in York), 76 and 66.

⁷⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 66.

⁷⁰⁸ Drake, *Eboracum*.

⁷⁰⁹ Drake’s response to Gent’s pre-emptive publication is discussed by Sweet, “History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake’s *Eboracum* (1736)”.

⁷¹⁰ Sam Smiles, “The Art of Recording”, in *Making History: Antiquaries in Britain, 1707-2007*, 123.

library work, designed to be viewed at leisure, a mark of genteel erudition.⁷¹¹ The calf-bound books, also offered as one bound volume of the three component parts, are almost fifteen inches tall and the combined volume (printed at crown folio size and priced at five guineas) is approximately four inches thick.

This new interest in the medieval past can be characterised as 'curiosity' in the early eighteenth-century sense of stimulating an interest in something, but in York it seems to have had a particular appeal. Matthew Jenkins discusses York's intelligentsia who consciously favoured the medieval aesthetic in vernacular architecture, choosing to live and socialise in 'unimproved' streets such as Stonegate and who equated the preference for such buildings with serious study, regional identity and a disdain for the prevailing fashion in other parts of York society for the Palladian.⁷¹² This small but influential group formed part of the subscription list for Drake's *Eboracum*, but the production of a wider and less scholarly range of publications indicates a broader interest in the antiquities of the city. Drake's work clearly fed an appetite for the perception of York as a place of refined leisure where interesting relics of a glorious past could be readily enjoyed, but the place which attracted most interest was the Minster.

Alongside the Burlington pavement, discussed above, he described various 'curiosities' which the gentry promenading would find 'of interest' and continued so to do well into the nineteenth century: in 1858, Dean Duncombe received a complaint via a scathing report that the nave was "*without life or meaning...a lounge for idle citizens...a raree-show for cheap excursionists, for whom seedy vergers lie in wait.*"⁷¹³ The first abridged version of Drake's work, which appeared in 1755, reproduced only the Minster section: the section relating to secular York was not reproduced until 1785 and was published in three sections in a smaller, cheaper format.⁷¹⁴

⁷¹¹ Drake, *Eboracum*, Subscribers list; Sweet, "History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake's *Eboracum* (1736)", 20

⁷¹² Jenkins, "The View from the Street: Housing and Shopping in York During the Long Eighteenth Century", 125-181.

⁷¹³ *The Yorkshireman*, 23 May 1858.

⁷¹⁴ Sweet, "History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake's *Eboracum* (1736)", 13.

To what extent this burgeoning interest influenced decisions about the fabric itself is hard to determine. Were visitors drawn to the Minster by the exceptional survival of the glass in a largely legible condition, or did the presence of large numbers of 'curious' visitors encourage not only its retention and preservation, but the deliberate acquisition of medieval glass from St Martin Coney Street, discussed in Chapter Three, for installation in the south transept, the most publicly-accessible area of the Minster? As Milton had described in *Il Penseroso*, the interior of an ancient church was meant to have "*storied Windows richly dight, Casting a dim religious light*".⁷¹⁵ Rich blues and reds should suffuse the interior with suitably religious tones which subliminally affected the visitor's emotion and responses. But the Minster authorities went beyond the mere replacement of clear glass with coloured and instead installed the figurative Te Deum glass. In installing this glass was the Minster consciously adding to the quantity of medieval glass for which it had become famous, deliberately making itself even more 'old' and 'complete' than it had been before? Where the Dean of Exeter had collected his medieval glass fragments to repair and make 'complete' his east window, were the deans of York collecting whole windows to repair and make 'complete' their whole Minster? Interest in the glass was sufficient for Drake to pay for large and detailed plates of them for his work, but not everyone who came to York could afford such publications, even the edition without prints priced at two and half guineas and the chance to buy the plates separately: entrepreneurs, like Thomas Gent, saw an opportunity.⁷¹⁶

Thomas Gent

The revitalisation of the city as a place of genteel diversion also provided a new market for less exhaustive and less expensive publications which could provide the interested and educated visitor with scholarly information in an

⁷¹⁵ John Milton, *Paradise Lost. A Poem, the Author John Milton. To Which Are Added, Paradise Regain'd, Lycidas, L'allegro, Il Penseroso. Vol. I* (Paris: printed by Didot the eldest; and sold by J. N. Pissot, Barrois, junior, 1780), 233.

⁷¹⁶ Sweet, "History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake's *Eboracum* (1736)", 13.

engaging and easily portable way.⁷¹⁷ The portability of such works was reflected not only in their physical format, but also in the style of writing which took the form of a tour with directions to the user. Such works could not be financed by the traditional antiquarian routes of patronage or subscription, so their existence is testament to the existence of a market for such works and the topics they covered are an accurate reflection of public interest at the time of publication. As Sweet has observed, the many publications emerging at that time were "much more in tune with an increasingly popular market, offering picturesque antiquities, less erudition and more contemporary comment" and Gent's York books in particular were "explicitly aimed at the visitor market and much more modestly sized and priced".⁷¹⁸

Such public interest generated demand for popular publications which were within the reach of more modest incomes; a demand that York printer Thomas Gent determined to meet. A speculative printer of considerable and somewhat eccentric character, Gent promoted himself as an antiquarian and historian. He was also at various times a printer of pamphlets and a newspaper proprietor. Ferdinand's work on the provincial newspaper trade in the eighteenth-century amply demonstrates the increasing importance of the press in shaping and cultural life outside London.⁷¹⁹ Papers such as *The Daily Courant*, begun in London in 1702, spawned a host of local imitators such as *The York Courant* (later *The York Mercury* or *Mercurie*). This latter started in 1719 as a weekly rather than daily publication, which reported 'news' but also communications about history, science and the arts, often with some comment.⁷²⁰ From 1724-1739 it was owned and written by Thomas Gent.⁷²¹ Gent reproduced items which had already appeared elsewhere and contributed items in turn to other publications, such as the monthly *The Gentleman's Magazine*, the principal organ of cultured debate in eighteenth-century England.

⁷¹⁷ See Borsay, "Politeness and Elegance: The Cultural Re-Fashioning of Eighteenth-Century York".

⁷¹⁸ Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, 310.

⁷¹⁹ C. Y. Ferdinand, *Benjamin Collins and the Provincial Newspaper Trade in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: New York: Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press, 1997).

⁷²⁰ There is a collection of early editions of *The York Courant* in the collections at the Minster Library, part of the Hailstone Collection.

⁷²¹ Thomas Gent, *The Life of Mr. Thomas Gent, Printer of York; Written by Himself* (London: Thomas Thorpe, 1832).

Newspapers were also a way of promoting the sale of publications and pamphlets and these were a feature of York's paper in particular: J. Jefferson Looney's work on Yorkshire newspaper advertisements (used by Ferdinand) showed that in 1760 alone, *The York Courant* carried 541 advertisements "for books and other printed material", at one and the same time reflecting and shaping the interests of its subscribers.⁷²² By contrast, *The Leeds Mercury* carried only 88 such advertisements in the same period, underlining York's position as a centre of culture and enquiry.⁷²³ The circulation area, and thereby the influence, of such papers was far beyond their originating city: York papers were sent across the counties of York, Lincoln and Durham as well as to other large towns, creating circles of intellectual connection between people who may never meet face to face.⁷²⁴

Gent had no patron and struggled for subscribers, so it is reasonable to conclude that in printing his books on the Minster and its glass, he felt sure of their success. In addition to printing a wide range of books on topics as diverse as religious history, a companion to the Bible and complete history of England, Gent had published "*The Ancient and Modern History of the Famous City of York: and in a particular manner of its magnificent cathedral commonly called York Minster*" in 1730 which contains descriptions of many of the main windows.⁷²⁵ His publication just ahead of Drake's intended date forced Drake to differentiate his (much more expensive) work by commissioning large plates, but Gent paid comparatively little attention to the history of the city, devoting most of his work to a description of the cathedral. He copied many of the sources used in Drake's text, notably Hildyard's 1715 work, and in later editions produced a somewhat crude version of some of Drake's plates, but clearly the appetite was there amongst the wider public, beyond the social stratum of the subscribing, library-owning elite, for details about the cathedral and particularly the glass of the East

⁷²² Ferdinand, *Benjamin Collins and the Provincial Newspaper Trade in the Eighteenth Century*, 206.

⁷²³ Ibid.

⁷²⁴ Ibid, 125.

⁷²⁵ Thomas Gent, *The Antient and Modern History of the Famous City of York; and in a Particular Manner of Its Magnificent Cathedral, Commonly Call'd, York-Minster* ([York]: Sold by Thomas Hammond, Inn, bookseller in High-Ouzegate; at the Printing-Office in Coffee-Yard, York: and by A. Bettesworth, in Pater-Noster-Row, London.; Thomas Gent, *The Life of Mr. Thomas Gent, Printer of York; Written by Himself*.

window.⁷²⁶ The tone was very much to the popular taste with almost no reference to any documentary sources. The sales of Gent's work make it clear that there was a commercial market for this type of history and that interest had grown far beyond the somewhat narrow spectrum of antiquarian subscribers.

Building on his success, in 1762 Gent printed *The most delectable, scriptural and pious history of the famous and magnificent great eastern window (according to beautiful portraitures) in St. Peter's cathedral, York ... A book, which might be styl'd, the history of histories.*⁷²⁷ Gent was clearly at pains to emphasise his Protestant credentials through his use of the terms 'scriptural' and 'pious', laying the emphasis on the biblical source of the window's imagery as opposed to any Roman Catholic or idolatrous understanding of, or interest in, the iconography. He further reinforced this through the reference to the artistic appreciation of the 'beautiful portraiture' within it: acceptable appreciation of the imagery may be for its depictions of Scripture and for its beauty, as a work of art, an antiquarian curiosity. The appreciation of the window as an example of medieval art did not, therefore, appear to have extended to a recognition of the artistic genius of the creator, John Thornton [Figure 97]. The phrase 'A book, which might be styl'd, the history of histories' echoed the fact that the window depicts both the beginning and end of time and perhaps was intended to recall the inscription in the Chapter House "Ut rosa flos florum, sic est domus ista domorum" (As the rose is the flower of flowers, so this is the house of houses).

Gent described the content of the window as being in three parts, which he then listed as follows:

"Of the Celestial Hierarchy in refulgent Glory, with Patriarchs, Prophets, Evangelists, Apostles, Saints and Martyrs, likewise of their Holy Living and Dying.

The glorious manner of the Creation; the Antediluvian State of Nature, Noah's Ark, Erection of Babel, King Milchisedek's Reception of Abram; Isaac Blessing Jacob; Moses providentially found by Princess Merisa; his

⁷²⁶ Hildyard, *The Antiquities of York City*.

⁷²⁷ Gent, *The Ancient History of Saint Peter's Magnificent Cathedral in the Famous City of York; The Most Delectable, Scriptural and Pious History of the Famous and Magnificent Great Eastern Window*.

Meeting with Aaron, and appearing before the Throne of her royal Father; Joseph and his Brethren receiving the patriarchal Benediction; the sudden Immersion of the Egyptian Monarch with his Host in the Red Sea; the Death of Samson, Fall of Goliath and Absalom's Suspension. The Revelation of St JOHN agreeable to the Predictions of DANIEL: Not only concerning the Mighty Empires of Assyrians, Medes, Persians &c but the spiritual Kingdom of our Redeemer CHRIST JESUS, even to His tremendous appearance at the most solemn Tribunal of Judgement. LIKEWISE IS ADDED A Chronological Account of some Eminent Personages therein depicted, anciently remarkable for their Learning, Virtue and Piety."

The choices made in the descriptive list of the Old Testament scenes are interesting: whilst all the scenes Gent listed are certainly present, they are not necessarily the ones most readily identifiable to the viewer from the ground. The panel depicting Jacob blessing his sons (described by Gent as Joseph and his Brethren receiving the patriarchal Benediction) is very similar to the panel immediately before it and has little in the way of distinctive motifs to help the viewer locate it in the window [Figure 98]. Nor are the scenes he chose to mention specifically those most popularly depicted in contemporary art. The window contains a panel depicting Moses and the Brazen Serpent, a subject popular both in painting and stained glass (for example Anthony Van Dyck's 1618-1620 oil painting *The Brazen Serpent* - now in the Prado Museum - and James Pearson's 1781 east window of Salisbury Cathedral), but this panel is not selected by Gent for inclusion in his list.⁷²⁸

The cross-reference to the biblical book of Daniel and the details of the Four Kingdoms shows a level of theological sophistication which Gent presumably thought his audience would share, or aspire to. The book of Daniel is an Apocalypse visionary narrative sometimes taken to be explicitly prophetic of the Coming of Christ and the end of the world; the fates of the Four Empires (albeit only three were named here: Assyrians, Medes, Persians) were thought to

⁷²⁸ Prado Inventory ref: P001637.

be reflected in the beasts and destruction as described in the Book of Revelation. The popularity of Protestant Covenant-based theology of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries placed great emphasis on the events and stories of the Old Testament being both a prefiguring, an ante-type, to those of the New Testament and a necessarily imperfect precursor to the coming of Christ.⁷²⁹ Thus the Book of Daniel was considered a prophetic vision of the events of Revelation which in turn contained the perfect prophesy of the Second Coming and the end of time. This situates Gent's description and 'reading' of the window firmly within impeccable Protestant theology and would have ensured his readership did not need to be concerned that interest in such imagery may carry the taint of Catholicism. Gent's book was composed in rhyming couplets with extensive notes and biblical citations accompanying each pairing, a seemingly bizarre choice of form for such a work and one which rendered it almost useless as a practical guide to the iconography of the window.⁷³⁰

Gent reworked his cathedral history in 1767 and issued it under the new title *Ancient History of Saint Peter's magnificent cathedral in the famous city of York*, demonstrating once again the predominant position of the Minster in the historical appeal of the city.⁷³¹ In it he described the St Martin, Coney Street window acquired and installed in 1724, but he misinterpreted the subject matter as the Athanasian Creed, not the Te Deum, as discussed in Chapter Three. The attribution of this more readily understood subject matter may represent a misreading of the glass, but it may also have been a deliberate attempt to include a popular topic with which his readers would be familiar. The emphasis

⁷²⁹ Numerous essays, sermons and longer works were published on this topic from the late 1680s onwards, of which but one example would be: Edward Wells, *A Paraphrase with Annotations on the New Testament: In Two Volumes. The First Containing the Four Gospels, and the Acts of the Holy Apostles. To Which Is Added a Treatise Concerning the Harmony of the Gospels. The Second, All the Epistles, and the Revelation: And a Paraphrase on the Book of Daniel.* ... B. Edward Wells, D.D. Rector of Cotesbach in Leicestershire [London]: Printed for James and John Knapton, at the Crown in St Paul's Church-Yard. London, 1730).

⁷³⁰ The verse style used by Gent has strong similarities with the anonymous laudatory verse at the opening of volume 2 of *The Gentleman's Magazine* (1732)*. As Gent was a contributor to the magazine, particularly in that year, it is tempting to attribute authorship to Gent, but also to note that the acceptability of such verse forms in scholarly or cultured discourse clearly had a precedent.

*[viewed online at <http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015016468301;view=1up;seq=6> 19.08.2015]. The poetic form was also employed by John Dart for Westminster Abbey, but not about the glass. See John Dart, *Westminster-Abbey: a Poem* ... (Printed for J. Batley, at the Dove in Pater-Noster-Row, 1721).

⁷³¹ Gent, *The Ancient History of Saint Peter's Magnificent Cathedral in the Famous City of York*.

on the stained glass and the growing reputation of the Minster as to all intents and purposes a visitor attraction may have contributed to the conscious acquisition by the dean and chapter of medieval glass from other churches, but crucially it meant they chose not to pursue a 'cleansing' policy of the coloured glass like the one deployed so thoroughly during James Wyatt's restoration at Salisbury (1789-92).⁷³² The work at Salisbury caused an outcry and letters were written to *The Gentleman's Magazine* protesting against Wyatt's programme, but the principal point of objection was the destruction of the medieval fabric, not the glass. The glass Wyatt removed was mostly decorative or grisaille, not figurative, which may account for the comparative lack of interest in its destruction: a survey of letters to the magazine between 1789 and 1791, showed no mention of an objection to the removal of most of the cathedral's remaining medieval glass.⁷³³ So although the Salisbury work may have been something of a watershed with regard to medieval fabric being regarded as 'barbarous' and disposable, the preservation of medieval glass *per se* was still not universally high on the antiquarian agenda.

Conclusion

The audiences for reception and perception of the Minster's glass expanded across this period as a series of widening but overlapping circles. The windows for the post-Restoration Chapter, most notably in the Chapter House, were part of a reassertion of ecclesiastical authority achieved visually by the restoration of a particular 'complete' aesthetic which restored the past, rather than concern with individual panel detail. The antiquarian interest of James Torre in the detail of the glass was unique and any personal motivation for such depth, beyond a desire for thoroughness, is difficult to determine, although the evidence of Celia Fiennes suggests the windows already had something of a reputation as something exceptional. Torre's work laid the foundations for a

⁷³² Tatton-Brown and Crook, *Salisbury Cathedral: The Making of a Medieval Masterpiece*, 118-123.

⁷³³ An example of one of these letters is one published on 10 Dec:

Viewed online at <http://search.proquest.com/docview/8445031?accountid=15181>.

series of publications to feed an emerging public appetite which expanded from more conventional publications for gentlemen's libraries into early guidebooks and popular works which focussed solely on the cathedral and its glass. Drake's use of Torre's work was central to the establishment of his scholarly credentials, but Gent's popular and derivative work arguably had the greatest impact in how the Minster was perceived both by the public paying the vergers for tours and potentially by the church itself. Cause and effect are hard to pin down in this instance: did Gent's book promote public interest in the glass and create a climate in which it became more valued, or did Gent respond to an emerging market, his book simply providing the evidence for the extent of that interest? When fire gutted the quire in 1829 and there was public debate as to whether the Minster should be restored or left as 'romantic ruin', the argument turned on the fact that the Great East Window had 'miraculously' survived and should be preserved, a local and national sentiment undoubtedly supported by the continued popularity of Gent's book, still in circulation at the time, while the report of the 1829 fire in *The Spectator* described the Minster as "*the pride of the nation*".⁷³⁴

Evidence of discussions and debates within Chapter about the glass or the rising public interest in the eighteenth century are sadly lacking. There was no requirement for the Dean and Chapter to communicate with any external body, unless a situation arose which was so extreme that it breached canon law or otherwise constituted grounds for an archiepiscopal Visitation.⁷³⁵ Individual Chapter members may have expressed their views about cathedral matters in private correspondence, such as the letters between the Precentor William Mason, Horace Walpole and Richard Hurd (where Mason complained about the tourists!), but these were exactly that, individual private views.⁷³⁶ Choices were made about the fabric and the glass which were not driven by liturgical need,

⁷³⁴ <http://archive.spectator.co.uk/article/7th-february-1829/8/the-burning-of-york-minster>

⁷³⁵ Whilst the administration of cathedrals in this period has not been the subject of a great volume of recent scholarly research, the administration of dioceses and their cathedrals, including York is discussed in Norman Sykes, "Episcopal Administration in England in the Eighteenth Century", *The English Historical Review* XLVII, no. CLXXXVII (1932).

⁷³⁶ Leonard Whibley, ed. *The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason, and Letters of Richard Hurd to Thomas Gray* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), 116.

but which directly benefited the visiting public. This says something about attitudes to the nature of the different spaces within the building and how they were perceived, which by extension says something about how the glass within those areas was viewed both by the public and by Chapter. The popularity of the publications and exceptionally early production of a unique popular, cheap book solely devoted to a single window are evidence of an extraordinary appetite in York which was not matched elsewhere.

CHAPTER 5:- CONCLUSION

This thesis has made an important contribution to our understanding of the care, production, patronage and reception of the stained and painted glass of York Minster in the period 1450-1802. In so doing it has challenged the myth that significant parts of this period witnessed no glass or glazing work worthy of study and has opened a number of new avenues for further exploration. Three key themes have been explored in this work.

First, through a detailed investigation into how the glass was cared for, I have made a new and distinctive reassessment of the post-Reformation craft structure and skills-base of glaziers and glass-painters in York. This has focused primarily on the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries and has added to the body of scholarship which challenges the model of a post-Reformation near-collapse of glass-painting in England dwindling to a few workshops in London. It has also articulated for the first time the real impact that the reframing of glass-painting as an 'art', and the commensurate break with the wider skill of glazier, by Henry Gyles and more emphatically by Peckitt had on the guild structure and the subsequent history of the two skill sets.

Second, I have made a significant contribution to our understanding of the relationships between the Dean, the Chapter and the craftsmen and how patronage worked and evolved in response to changing demands and shifting power balances between the Dean and Chapter and the Archbishops. I have demonstrated that there is little evidence for any truly collegiate patronage of glass; instead the role of individuals and their ability to assert their authority has been a defining factor in the story of glass maintenance and acquisition. This is underpinned by a broader understanding of the relationships between the Dean and the Chapter, the Dean and the Archbishops, the Minster and the city, and beyond that to the intellectual and cultural influences operating within York itself and society more widely.

Third, by showing how the undertaking of close and detailed analysis of the archival and other documentary records alongside the surviving glass of a single cathedral can produce new insights and understanding, I have suggested a new methodology for approaching the comprehensive contextual study of the

glass history of other cathedrals. The use in tandem of both archival sources and the antiquarian manuscripts of James Torre has enabled me particularly to uncover the detailed history of the glass across the seventeenth century, a period of much greater jeopardy for the windows than the Reformation, and demonstrate how the appreciation of the windows as a 'treasure' emerged during this turbulent period.

Craft and workshop structures

Studies of stained glass in York and elsewhere have given priority to the identification of authorship of medieval glass and the working practices of individual workshops, such as the Petty family.⁷³⁷ Comparatively little attention has been paid to the practical continuation of the craft of glass-painting by English craftsmen in the post-medieval period in York or elsewhere prior to the 'rediscovery' of techniques in the eighteenth-century.⁷³⁸ This thesis has proved that far from collapsing, the painting of glass to a high standard continued to be a commercially viable skill practised by structured workshops in York throughout the latter part of the sixteenth and all of the seventeenth century. The long-held assumption that there were only a few people capable of doing such work, and only one of those in the seventeenth-century was in York, Henry Gyles, has been challenged and disproved, but its longevity has inhibited the study of this period and resulted in significant mis-attribution of works. In some cases, glass has been attributed to Henry Gyles or to his predecessor, the Dutchman Bernard Dininckhof, which was created beyond the scope of their lifetimes or beyond the reasonable outputs of an individual craftsman.

The existence and working practices of structured workshops with fluid working relationships between them as work arose, such as that possibly between Marmaduke Crosby and Bernard Dininckhof in the work on Temple Newsam and the Minster, has begun to be explored here as space permitted. There is a lot more work to do in this much-neglected area of study, both for

⁷³⁷O'Connor, "John Petty, Glazier and Mayor of York", 253-262.

⁷³⁸Two articles in *Journal of Stained Glass* (2005 and 2009) by Geoffrey Lane already cited on the London glass-painters 1600-1710 are a notable exception to this.

York and more widely. The discovery of a much more developed and robust continuity of practice from the medieval period has also shone new light onto the careers of York's two most famous glass-painters, Henry Gyles and William Peckitt. The question of who trained Henry Gyles to paint glass, a question first posed by Brighton in his 1984 biography of Gyles, in which he absolutely discounted the possibility of it being his father, can now be answered with some degree of confidence.⁷³⁹ There is every likelihood that it was indeed Henry's father, Edmund Gyles, who worked alongside the Crosby family in the restoration of the Chapter House, or even Charles Crosby himself who was painting glass for the Minster into the 1690s.

The impact on our understanding of the career of William Peckitt and his claim to have rediscovered long-lost glass-painting techniques alone and to have been entirely self-taught is equally important. The departure of the Crosbys from the York glass-painting scene after 1703 could have meant that in the space of one generation the skills and knowledge were sufficiently lost for a 'rediscovery' to be necessary, but the change in status and perception of the craft which Peckitt attempted to achieve are also significant. Peckitt saw himself as 'a man of science' and a practitioner of intellectual, liberal arts not the practical craft of lead-glazing, so his desire to separate himself from the manual labour aspect of glazing and redefine his work as that of an artist, in the wake of the work of Sir Joshua Reynolds, necessitated his cutting off any suggestion that he had a base of practitioners from whom such skills could be learnt. This thesis has found evidence of the beginnings of the separation of the skill of glass-painting in the late seventeenth century by Henry Gyles, which was to bring about a profound change in practice. This ultimately sounded the death knell for the guild of glaziers, who by the mid-eighteenth century were no longer able to control the quality or output of the most prestigious and valuable aspect of the glass-workers' workshops. The cult of the lone artist designing and creating painted glass for insertion by others still has currency today, such was the fundamental

⁷³⁹ Brighton, "Henry Gyles, Virtuoso and Glasspainter of York 1645-1709", 6-7.

nature of the shift in practice which this thesis has drawn out in the specific example of York.

Patronage and the drivers for care

The underlying questions motivating the research for this thesis were a desire to understand how the Minster retained so much medieval glass, enabling it to be promoted as a uniquely rich 'treasure-house of stained glass', and what the origins of this concept were. This thesis has explored the story of the glass from the completion of the medieval glazing schemes to the end of the eighteenth century and in so doing has uncovered the complex web of considerations influencing decisions about repair, acquisition and relocation. Hitherto the emphasis has been on establishing original patronage and authorship, with comparatively less attention paid to the glass once installed. Caviness and others have undertaken work more recently in this area, but focusing on individual windows, subject matter or assemblages, not on the glazing of a whole building across an extended period.⁷⁴⁰

The importance of patronage and favour across the whole period is an area of study which has been brought out of the shadows, particularly the importance of the favour of individual deans in the care of the Minster's glass. New models for patronage have been described, including that of favouring the preservation of old glass over the commissioning of new, of collective and individual approaches to the windows, and the influence of craft structures on the craft/patron relationship. The question of patronage, especially in the long eighteenth century, and how it was fundamental to the development and sustainability of the careers of Henry Gyles and William Peckitt, has been explored in a new way, but its roots can be seen in the Crosby's relationship with Sir Arthur Ingram. Gyles' tentative desire to sustain himself by glass-painting alone can now be seen in the light of the state of the craft nationally, but his ability to secure such patronage as was available demonstrates the continuing importance of York as the second city of glass-painting in the seventeenth-

⁷⁴⁰ Caviness and Weaver, *The Ancestors of Christ Windows at Canterbury Cathedral*.

century. The considerable significance of the role of Dean Fountayne in Peckitt's relationship with the Minster and especially Peckitt's thwarted ambitions to install a major scheme had not hitherto been explored, but this now provides a model for reappraising the very particular role of deans in cathedral maintenance, especially glass, across the period and demonstrates how closely influence and craft practice are linked.

This thesis has shown that such extended study brings out evidence of relationships and influences which are otherwise hidden, but which are of major significance in shaping our understanding of the position York managed to achieve. It has shown the considerable influence that the individual tastes and mores of deans, archbishops and (occasionally) lesser clergy took precedence over the collective authority of Chapter in ways which the governance structure would not otherwise suggest. This thesis highlights the importance of the changing religious 'temperature' within the Minster to the employment of glass-painters, but also to the terminology of the recording of the windows by James Torre. In so doing it provides for a much more nuanced understanding of the pressures and influences at work within the Minster on its glass than the simple headlines of 'Reformation', or 'Civil War' which previously have been the definitions most commonly deployed. especially apparent in the exploration of the relationship between Dean John Fountayne and William Peckitt in the second half of the eighteenth-century.

How the windows were perceived and understood

I have shown that the audiences for reception and perception of the Minster's glass expanded across this period as a series of widening but overlapping circles. These began with the changing needs and ideas of the Dean and Chapter, which then expanded into the lay interest of antiquarians and gentlemen scholars and then beyond them to a wider public newly enthused with interest in the glass. Whilst it is not possible to prove that public interest directly influenced decisions about the care, acquisition and placement of glass in the eighteenth century, in the way it had regarding the laying of the

Burlington pavement, it can be said that decisions were made which were not driven by liturgical need and which appear to have been primarily of benefit to the visiting public. This says something about attitudes to the definition and understanding of significance of space within the building both by the public and by Chapter.

It has also shown the influence antiquarian scholarship and 'polite interest' may have had in the determined acquisition of medieval glass and its placement, most notably the Te Deum window from St Martin's Coney Street, which fed the public appetite for the spectacle of viewing the glass. This resulted in an almost symbiotic relationship, where the visitors' interest in stained glass was indulged and cultivated as a by-product of the personal interests of the deans. Likewise, the extraordinary resource of Torre's manuscript enabled publications to be produced which fed the public appetite and this appetite thus stimulated generated sufficient commercial demand for the publication of popular works on the Minster and its glass outside the subscription model traditional to antiquarian publications. In doing so this thesis has taken the use and understanding of the antiquarian sources for York Minster in a new direction, beyond mining them for references to individual windows to aid conservation into consideration of them as drivers for our understanding of the Minster's role within the changing perception of York in the eighteenth century.⁷⁴¹ Work on antiquarian scholarship by Sweet, Mendyk and others has considered the role and work of individual antiquaries and the importance of their networks, including what motivated individual scholars to undertake their often monumental works of recording and transcription and the popularisation of their work for wider consumption.⁷⁴² This thesis takes that discussion forward into new areas by considering the long-term and secondary impact of their work on the monuments they studied, in this case cathedrals. More specifically, it moves the discussion into an examination of their role in the preservation and appreciation of stained glass, an area which has received comparatively little

⁷⁴¹ Sweet, "History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake's *Eboracum* (1736)".

⁷⁴² Sweet, *The Writing of Urban Histories in Eighteenth-Century England*; Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*; Mendyk, *Speculum Britanniae: Regional Study, Antiquarianism and Science in Britain to 1700*.

scholarly attention previously, but which contributes significantly to our understanding of the resurgence of the popularity of figurative glass in the nineteenth-century.

The methodology employed

This thesis has demonstrated that the close and detailed study of the archival records as the underpinning research method has yielded new insights and uncovered the contributions of glaziers and glass-painters hitherto unknown to the glass history of York Minster. The diachronic approach favoured by Brooks and Evans has influenced the shaping of this work, but it is the examination of every relevant piece of documentary evidence which has brought out the patterns in the subtle ebb and flow of work and brought to light the many and various elements which went into the care of the glass across this period of three-hundred and fifty years. The previously unknown or unacknowledged work of the Crosby family and the existence of their York workshop for the whole of the seventeenth century is a significant discovery and one which has opened several new avenues meriting further exploration, not least the necessity of revisiting much of the glass hitherto attributed to Henry Gyles and Bernard Dininckhof.

In the undertaking of the archival research I have been able to bring to bear my professional expertise as an archivist of some thirty years' experience to understand the organisational context within which the records were created and maintained. The fabric rolls are very specifically the records of expenditure of an individual fund, not a complete record of the expenditure on the fabric, as they are frequently assumed to be. As such, other records and documentary sources are necessary to fill out the details of the story and to fill the gaps, where possible, in this administrative series. Changes in record-keeping practices reflecting changing attitudes to administration also had an impact on the information available, but also tell us something of the climate in which work was happening. Working from this base has enabled me to draw out the significance or meaning of apparent gaps in the accounting record, exploring

how the Minster functioned financially as an organisation and how this influenced not only what work was done, but how and why it was organised and accounted for. This in turn has exposed how the working practices of the craftsmen and their workshops engaged with clients and with the role of retained employees. This approach has allowed a new interpretation of the state of the craft of glazing in York in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, successfully challenging the supposition held by Brighton and others that the craft was in terminal decline after the Reformation. Membership of the guild of glaziers and having the status of freeman (and thus the right to trade within the city) has been shown to be a requirement only for the head of a workshop. This allows an alternative reading of the comparatively sparse list of names in the 1598 register, which can now be understood to represent the head of a larger workshop or firm, with journeymen succeeding or breaking away once their masters had retired or died. In this new interpretation the craft emerges as much more buoyant than previously understood, with the members of individual workshops diversifying or specialising as the market dictated.

The methodical, systematic nature and quality of Torre's recording provided an unparalleled snapshot of the Minster fabric in the late seventeenth century, but his unique focus on the imagery of the stained glass is what sets his work apart from all other antiquarians of his period. No other antiquarian placed such importance on capturing faithfully and with such 'scientific' rigour the details of all the stained glass of their chosen subject, not just the heraldic and genealogical material, and Torre's place in the pantheon of antiquarians deserves to be a high one and his work deserves a published edition.

Further areas of research

The statement made at the outset of this project, that the reason this period had not been studied was because I had been told there was nothing to talk about, has proved to be groundless. I have shown it to be a period rich in interest and new material. The original proposed end-date for the study was the eve of the 1829 fire, but the project had to be adapted to take account of the

sheer volume of material I found, requiring some flexibility in scope and approach. Even with a revised end-date, there was a realisation that this would leave some areas explored only as a broader overview than the material merited. In choosing a long chronological span, I wanted to be able to examine how trends and ideas played out across periods of considerable change in fortunes for cathedrals up to the point at which their future began to look more assured. By covering such a wide time-span, I have been able to expose several areas where much more research is warranted. Unfortunately, the constraints of this thesis have prevented it at this stage. The first area is more work on the structure and working relationships of the craft workshops in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The work of the Crosby family and their relationships with both Dininckhof and the Gyles family, both within and beyond the Minster, requires further study for what might emerge about how contracts and subcontracts were utilised and managed between craftsmen and how specialist skills were maintained and deployed. It has become clear that the attribution of some of the painted glass of this period has been based on very limited evidence and new research into the working practices and relationships between craftsmen would shed new light on this neglected area and bring the work of many more craftsmen to the fore.

The second area of future research potential is the exploration of the role of antiquarians in influencing the care of the fabric of the Minster and other cathedrals more generally. This research undertaken here has highlighted an interesting lacuna, almost a 'blind spot', in the antiquarian recording of glass in several cathedrals, such as Canterbury and Peterborough and it would be interesting to explore what effect the treatment of and regard for other aspects of fabric and furnishings had on their care and survival. The study of antiquarianism and the antiquaries is an expanding area and this additional strand of research could yield interesting comparisons not only between cities and regions, but between periods. This could be undertaken with regard to the study of cathedrals, but there may be useful cross-over with the existing areas of study of other public buildings or monuments. Sweet has explored this question of the preservative role of the antiquaries, and the origins of the idea of

preservation for reasons of cultural merit over utility, but the dual nature of cathedrals as both monument and living buildings would be a valuable addition to that debate.⁷⁴³

The third and undoubtedly the most ambitious work waiting to be done is to continue a study of this kind beyond 1802. In the aftermath of the 1829 fire in the eastern arm of the Minster, serious consideration was given to leaving the burnt-out quire as a 'romantic ruin'; it was the fame and apparently 'miraculous' survival of the stained glass of the quire in general, and especially the Great East Window, which provided a different outcome, a very direct example of the power of public opinion. The burgeoning of the Gothic Revival movement in the mid-nineteenth century, the removal of the glass during the First World War, changing attitudes to repair and conservation, the deliberate 're-medievalisation' of the Minster by Dean Milner-White, all provide a rich seam for study. The glass history of the Minster from 1802 onwards is a complex and potentially enormously rewarding piece of research which could provide a framework within which the studies of individual windows or craftsmen could be situated and thus better understood with new connections uncovered.

This thesis has demonstrated the value of taking a multi-disciplinary, diachronic approach to researching the glass history of a cathedral for the post-medieval period. It has shown scholars that taking such an approach brings new insights which go far beyond the question of attribution and instead see the study of the glass as the central node in a web of cultural, economic and intellectual relationships which speak to the study of other disciplines and periods. It offers the opportunity for stained glass studies to broaden its usual focus beyond the work of individual craftsmen into a more textured exploration of the world in which they worked and in which the fruits of their labours are understood, valued and enjoyed.

⁷⁴³ Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, 277-307.

Abbreviations

CVMA	Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi
TNA	The National Archives
V&A	Victoria and Albert Museum
YCA	York City Archives
YMA	York Minster Archives
YML	York Minster Library

Conventions used within the text:

Quotations from original sources have been italicised, and original spelling, abbreviations and punctuation have been retained, except where it would render the meaning opaque to the modern reader.

Monetary units have been transcribed as £ for 'l' or 'li'; 's' and 'd' have been retained for shillings and pence. Roman numerals have been converted to Arabic.

Where applicable and necessary, pre-1752 dates have been rendered using the standard old year/new year convention (e.g. January 750/1).

CVMA window numbers have been rendered in Arabic numerals, e.g. n2 rather than nll.

SOURCES and BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Bodleian Library

- Notebook of Henry Johnston MS Top Yorks C14
- 'Historicall view of the severall foundations
and buildings of the cathedrall church of York'* MS Gough Yorks 22
(SC 18289)
- Diary of French refugee living in York 1688-90 Ms Add A56 (SC 30160)
- Annals of St Mary's Abbey MS Bodl 39 (SC 1892.904)

Prado Museum

- Oil painting *The Brazen Serpent*, (1618-1620),
by Anthony van Dyck P001637

The National Archives

- Will of William Matterson IR/261433
- Will of Dean Bryan Hygdon PROB 11/26, f.114r-v

University of York: Borthwick Institute of Archives

- St Michael-le-Belfry baptism register PR Y/MB3
- "York Guild of Glaziers and Plumbers Ordinance
Book 1598-1742"*
(original held by Rakow Library, Corning Museum
of Glass, New York) MFE 246

Victoria & Albert Museum

- Glass portrait of Bishop Edward Willes C140-1929

Wells Cathedral Archive

Fabric rolls series DC/F/2

York City Archives:

"Memorandum Book " AY1/1

York City House Books 1476-1835 Giles B1-B50; Giles BB1-2

York Minster Archives: archival sources

St Michael-le-Belfry Parish Register St M le B

Chamberlains' Account Rolls 1460-1462 E1/41/1-2

Chamberlains' Account Rolls 1463-1679 E1/40/1- E1/138

Chamberlains' Draft Account Roll 1667 E2/22

Chapter House vouchers, 1692-1695 B3/1/1-3

Chapter House account – single sheet E3M/4

Chapter Act Book 1427-1504 H2/3

1504-1543 H3/1

1543-1558 H3/3 (partial)

1565-1634 H4

1634-1641, 1660-1671 H5

Chapter Act Books, contd.

1701-1728 H6

1728-1747 H7

1747-1756 H9/1

1756-1771 H9/2/1

1784-1807 H9/3

Draft Chapter Act Book, 1661-1663 H8/8

Chapter Minutes & Drafts 1680-1747 H8/1-6

Fabric Rolls, 1370-1802 E3/1-218v

Inventory of Plate, 1549 M2/2/3

Inventory of Treasures, 1510 M2/2d

Presentment, 1519 L2/3c

Treasurers' accounts, 1661-1827 E4a

Treasurers' accounts, 1763-1826	E4d
Treasurers' "Day Book ", 1677-1748	E4b
Visitation Presentment, 1519	L2/3c

York Minster Archives: manuscript sources

Gale, Samuel, "Brief History of York Cathedral"	AddMS 43
Torre, James, "The Fabric of York Minster."	L1/7

Printed primary sources

An Accurate Description and History of the Metropolitan and Cathedral Churches of Canterbury and York, from Their First Foundation to the Present Year. Illustrated with One Hundred and Seventeen Copper-Plates, Consisting of Different Views, Plans, Monuments, Antiquities, Arms, &C. London: printed for W. Sandby, Bookseller, in Fleet-Street; and sold by J. Hildyard, Bookseller, in York.

'An Enthusiastic Admirer of Salisbury Cathedral', "Salisbury Dec 10 Letter" *The Gentleman's Magazine: And Historical Chronicle*, 1789.
<http://babel.hathitrust.org/>.

Articles, Laws and Rules, of the Glass-Makers' Friendly Society, Held at the House of Mr. William Wilson, Sign of the Sun, in the Broad-Chare, Newcastle Upon Tyne. Begun November 15, 1755, Newcastle: printed by M. Angus, 1800.

Atkinson, Revd J. C., ed. *Cartularium abbathiae de Rievallae ordinis Cisterciensis Fundatae anno MCXXXII.* Surtees Society 83. Durham: Andrews, 1889.

Bray, William, ed. *The Diary of John Evelyn.* London: 1952.

Collins, Francis, ed. *Register of the Freemen of the City of York; from the City*

Records ... 1272-1759, Surtees Society, 96 & 102. Durham: Andrews, 1897 & 1900.

"Deaths: Mr Peckitt." in *The Gentleman's Magazine: And Historical Chronicle*, October 1795, 878-86.

Fowler, J. T., ed. *Rites of Durham: Being a Description or Brief Declaration of All the Ancient Monuments, Rites, and Customs Belonging or Being within the Monastical Church of Durham before the Suppression*. Surtees Society 103. Durham: Andrews, 1903.

Frewen, Accepted, Archbishop of York, *Articles of Visitation and Enquiry Concerning Matters Ecclesiasticall: Exhibited to the Ministers, Church-Wardens, and Side-Men of Every Parish, within the Diocesse and Province of Yorke: In the Metropolitanall Visitation of the Most Reverend Father in God Accepted, by Divine Providence Lord Arch-Bishop of York: Begun in the Year of Our Lord God, 1662: And in the Second Year of His Graces Translation*. York: Printed by Alice Broade, 1662.

Galbraith, V. H., ed. *The Anonimalle Chronicle 1333-1381 from a MS Written at St. Mary's Abbey, York*. 2nd ed. Manchester: The University of Manchester Press, 1970.

Geddes, W., ed. *A Booke of Sundry Draughtes (Leaded Glass), Principally Serving for Glasiers and Not Impertinent for Plasterers, and Gardiners: Besides Sundry Other Professions Whereunto Is Annexed the Manner How to Anniel in Glas: And Also the True Forme of the Fornace and the Secretes Thereof*. London: 1615, Fascimile edition: London, 1898.

Hamper, William, ed. *Life, Diary and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale...* London: Harding, Lepard & Co.1827.

Lancaster, William T., ed. *Letters Addressed to Ralph Thoresby F.R.S. Printed from the Originals in the Possession of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society*, Leeds: printed by J. Whitehead and Son, for the Thoresby Society, 1912.

Laud, William, *The Proceedings and Tryal in the Case of the Most Reverend Father in God, William, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and the Right Reverend Fathers in God, William, Lord Bishop of St. Asaph, Francis, Lord Bishop of Ely, John, Lord Bishop of Chichester, Thomas, Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, Thomas, Lord Bishop of Peterborough, and Jonathan, Lord Bishop of Bristol, in the Court of Kings-Bench at Westminster in Trinity-Term in the Fourth Year of the Reign of King James The second, Annoque Dom. 1688*. London Printed for Thomas Basset ... and Thomas Fox ..., 1689.

Malden, Reginald John, ed. *Register of York Freemen, 1680 to 1986*. York: William Sessions, 1989.

— — —. *Hearth Tax Returns for the City of York, 1671*. York: York City Archives, 1972.

Mason, William, ed. *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford, and the Revd William Mason; Now First Publ. From the Original Mss*. London: 1851.

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost. A Poem, the Author John Milton. To Which Are Added, Paradise Regain'd, Lycidas, L'allegro, Il Penseroso. Vol. I*. Paris: printed by Didot the eldest; and sold by J. N. Pissot, Barrois, junior.

Mortimer, Jean E., "Ripon Minster Fabric Accounts 1661-1676", in Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series CXVIII (1951), *Miscellanea VI*, ed. by C. E. Whiting, 86-150. Leeds: 1953.

Price, William, *Glass-Painting Reviv'd*. London, 1720? Accessed at Early English Books, 1641-1700 / 2124.2:142.

Raine, Angelo, "Proceedings of the Commonwealth Committee for York and the Ainsty." in Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series CXVIII (1951), *Miscellanea VI*, ed. by C. E. Whiting, 1-30. Leeds: 1953.

Raine, James, ed. *Cartularium Abbathiae de Rievallie*, Surtees Society 83. Durham: 1889.

———. *Testamenta Eboracensia. A Selection of Wills from the Registry at York. Vol. IV*. Surtees Society 53. Durham: Andrews, 1869.

———. *The Fabric Rolls of York Minster: With an Appendix of Illustrative Documents*. Surtees Society 35. Durham: Andrews, 1859.

Sancroft, William, Archbishop of York, *Occasional Sermons Preached by the Most Reverend Father in God, William Sancroft ... ; with Some Remarks of His Life and Conversation, in a Letter to a Friend*. London: Printed by T. B. for Thomas Bassett, 1694.

Sharp, Thomas, *The Life of John Sharp, Lord Archbishop of York: To Which Are Added, Select, Original, and Copies of Original Papers, in Three Appendixes*, edited by Thomas Newcome. London: C. & J. Rivington, 1825.

Skaife, Robert H., ed. *The Register of the Guild of Corpus Christi in the City of York*. Surtees Society 57. Durham: Andrews, 1872.

———. *The Register of Burials in York Minster Accompanied by Monumental Inscriptions and Illustrated with Biographical Notices*. York, 1870.

— — —. *The Register of the Guild of Corpus Christi in the City of York*. Surtees Society 57. Durham: Andrews, 1872.

Smart, Peter, *A Catalogve of Superstitious Innovations in the Change of Services and Ceremonies, of Presumptuous Irregularities, and Transgressions, against the articles of Religion, Act of Parliament for Uniformity, Canons, Advertisements, Injunctions, and Homilies and lastly, of Sundry Perjurious Violations of the Locall Statutes of Durham Cathedrall Church, Which the Dean and Presendaries, and All Other Members of the Said Church, Took Their Corporall Oaths, to Observe, and Obey, at Their Admittance and Installation, According to That in the 13. chap. De Admissione Canoniorum ... / Opposed by Peter Smart*. London: Printed for Joseph Hunscoth 1642.

Southeran, H., *York Guide*, York: 1803.

Stow, John, *A Survey of London by John Stow*. 1603 edited by Charles Lethbridge Kingsford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.

Stukeley, William, *The Family Memoirs of the Rev. William Stukeley M.D. And the Antiquarian and Other Correspondence of William Stukeley, Roger and Samuel Gale, Etc. Vol. li*. edited by W. C. Lukis. Surtees Society 73, 76, 80. Durham: Andrews, 1883.

"The Manner How to Anneile, or Paint in Glass, the True Receptes of the Cullors,..." in, *The Gentleman's Magazine: And Historical Chronicle*, 28, (1758): 9-11.

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/8285415?accountid=15181>.

The Spectator, 7th February 1829

<http://Archive.Spectator.Co.Uk/Article/7th-February-1829/8/the-Burning-of-York-Minster>.

The Yorkshireman 23rd May 1858.

Turnbull, William, ed. *Account of the Monastic Treasures Confiscated at the Dissolution of the Various Houses in England by Sir John Williams, Late Master and Treasurer of the Jewels to His Majesty King Henry VIII.* Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1836.

Walpole, Horace, *The Works*. 1798 ed. 5 vols. Vol. 2. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1975.

Webb, C.C. ed. *Churchwardens' Accounts of St. Michael, Spurriergate, York, 1518-1548*, in *Borthwick Texts and Calendars* 20. York: University of York, 1997.

Wells, Edward, *A Paraphrase with Annotations on the New Testament: in Two Volumes. The First Containing the Four Gospels, and the Acts of the Holy Apostles. To Which is Added a Treatise Concerning the Harmony of the Gospels. The Second, All the Epistles, and the Revelation: And a Paraphrase of the Book of Daniel B Edward Wells, D.D. Rector of Cotesbach in Leicestershire*, London: Printed for James and John Knapton, at the Crown in St. Paul's church-yard, 1730.

White, Benjamin, *A Catalogue of a valuable collection of books; consisting of several libraries, and particularly those of the Rev. Thomas Negus, D.D. Rector of St Mary's Rotherhithe, and Mr. William Price, a very ingenious Painter of Glass. Both lately deceased, this collection comprehends near ten thousand Volumes in various Languages, and in almost every Class of Learning, and many of them in the most elegant Bindings.....* London, 1766.

Williamson, E., ed. *J. Cleaveland Revived Poems, Orations, Epistles, and Other of His Genuine Incomparable Pieces Never before Publisht: With Some Other*

Exquisite Remains of the Most Eminent Wits ... That Were His Contemporaries. London: Printed for Nathaniel Brook, 1659.

York Chronicle, 15th October 1795.

York Courant, 14th July 1752.

Secondary Sources

Adams, Percy G., *Travelers and Travel Liars 1660-1800*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1962.

Addleshaw, G.W.O., *The High Church Tradition: a Study in the Liturgical Thought of the Seventeenth Century*. London: Faber, 1941.

Akehurst, Ann-Marie, "'The Very Best of Its Kind out of the Metropolis': the Foundation of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society, the Yorkshire Museum And its Gardens in the Early Nineteenth Century." Institute for the Public Understanding of the Past, University of York, <https://web.archive.org/web/20110605080132>.

Allen, Jasmine, "Stained Glass, Laudians and Puritans: The Case of Peterhouse College Chapel, Cambridge." *Vidimus*, no. 33 (October 2009). <http://vidimus.org/issues/issue-33/panel-of-the-month/>.

Archer, Michael, Sonia Halliday, Ann Lockhart, and Laura Lushington, *Stained Glass*. Pitkin Pride of Britain Books Glass. Pitkin Pictorials, 1994.

Ashurst, Dennis, *The History of South Yorkshire Glass*. Sheffield: J.R. Collis Publications, 1992.

Aston, Margaret, *Broken Idols of the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

———. *Faith and Fire: Popular and Unpopular Religion, 1350-1600*. London; Rio Grande, Ohio: Hambledon Press, 1993.

———. *The King's Bedpost: Reformation and Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

———. *England's Iconoclasts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

———. *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion*. London: Hambledon Press, 1984.

Aston, Nigel, *Art and Religion in Eighteenth-century Europe*. London: Reaktion Books, 2009.

Atherton, Ian, "Cathedrals, Laudianism, and the British Churches." in *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 4 (2010): 895-918

Aveling, J. C. H., *Catholic Recusancy in the City of York, 1558-1791*. Publications of the Catholic Record Society. Monograph Series. Catholic Record Society, 1970.

Ayers, Tim, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Wells Cathedral*. Oxford: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2004.

Aylmer, Gerald and Reginald Cant, eds. *A History of York Minster*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

Aylmer, Gerald, "Funeral monuments and Other Post-Medieval Sculpture." in *A History of York Minster*, edited by Gerald Aylmer and Reginald Cant, 430-486. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

Ayres, James, *Art, Artisans & Apprentices: Apprentice Painters and Sculptors in the Early Modern British Tradition*. Oxford; Philadelphia: Oxbow Books, 2014.

- Bailiff, Ian, "Bolsterstone Glass House, Stocksbridge, Sheffield, South Yorkshire: Luminescence Dating Report." *Research Department Report Series No. 98-2010*. Sheffield: English Heritage, 2010.
- Baker, Sir John, "Tudor pedigree Rolls and Their Uses." in *Heralds and Heraldry in Shakespeare's England*, edited by Nigel Ramsay. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2014.
- Barnwell, Paul S. and Arnold Pacey, *Who Built Beverley Minster?* Reading: Spire Books: In association with The Friends of Beverley Minster, 2008.
- Barnwell, Paul S., *The House Within: Interpreting Medieval Houses in Kent*, London: H.M.S.O., 1994.
- Barr, Bernard, "The Minster Library." in *A History of York Minster*, edited by Gerald Aylmer and Reginald Cant, 487-539. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Baylis, Sarah F., "'The Most Untractable of All Saxon Uncouthness': Eighteenth-century Painted Glass in Ely Cathedral and the Removal of the Choir." *The Antiquaries Journal* 68, no.1 (1988): 99-114.
- Bemden, Yvette vanden, *The Sixteenth-Century Glass from Herkenrode Abbey, Belgium, in Lichfield Cathedral and Elsewhere*, edited by Jill Kerr, Carmélia Opsomer-Halleux and London Society of Antiquaries. London: Adlard, 1986.
- Bennett, J. A., "The Mechanics' Philosophy and the Mechanical Philosophy." *History of Science* 24, no. 1 (1986): 1-28.
- Bentham, James, *The History and Antiquities of the Conventual and Cathedral Church of Ely: From the Foundation of the Monastery, A.D. 673. To the*

Year 1771. Illustrated with Copper-Plates. By James Bentham, M. A. Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, London, Rector of Feltwell St. Nicholas, Norfolk, and Late Minor Canon of Ely. Cambridge: printed at the University Press, by J. Bentham. Sold by Mr. Bathurst in Fleet-Street, London; Messrs. Merrill and Mr. Woodyer, at Cambridge; and by Mr. Fletcher & Mr. Prince at Oxford, 1771.

Bettesworth, A., and C. Hitch, *The Builders Dictionary: Or, Gentleman and Architect's Companion. Explaining Not Only the Terms of Art in All the Several Parts of Architecture, but Also Containing the Theory and Practice of the Various Branches Thereof, Requisite to Be Known by Masons, Carpenters, Joiners, Bricklayers, Plaisterers, Painters, Glaziers, Smiths, Turners, Carvers, Statuaries, Plumbers, &C. Also Necessary Problems in Arithmetic, Geometry, Mechanics, Perspective, Hydraulics, and Other Mathematical Sciences. Together with the Quantities, Proportions, and Prices of All Kinds of Materials Used in Building; with Directions for Chusing, Preparing, and Using Them: The Several Proportions of the Five Orders of Architecture, and All Their Members, According to Vitruvius, Palladio, Scamozzi, Vignola, M. Le Clerc, &C. With Rules for the Valuation of Houses, and the Expencc Calculated of Erecting Any Fabrick, Great or Small. The Whole Illustrated with More Than Two Hundred Figures, Many of Them Curiously Engraven on Copper-Plates: Being a Work of Great Use, Not Only to Artificers, but Likewise to Gentlemen, and Others, Concerned in Building, &C. Faithfully Digested from the Most Approved Writers on These Subjects. In Two Volumes. London: printed for A. Bettesworth and C. Hitch, at the Red-Lion in Pater-Noster-Row, 1734.*

Binksi, Paul and Elizabeth Anne New, eds. *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium*. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2012.

Blair, John, and Nigel Ramsay. *English Medieval Industries: Craftsmen, Techniques, Products*. Hambledon Press, 1991.

Blomefield, Francis, *The History of the City and County of Norwich, Containing Its Original Rise and Increase, It's Antient and Present Government, with the Various Accidents That Have Happen'd to It; the Foundations of the Cathedral, Castle, Parochial Churches, Monasteries, Hermitages, Hospitals, and Other Publick Buildings. A Description of the Streets, Walls, River, Remarkable Houses, and Other Things Never before Taken Notice of by Any Author. The Lives of the Bishops, Priors, Deans, & Other Eminent Men, Either Born or Inhabiting There. Lists of the Provosts, Bailiffs, Mayors, Sheriffs, Burgesses in Parliament, & Other Officers of the Corporation; with an Account of the Benefactions to Publick Uses. The Inscriptions, Arms, & Monuments, in the Churches and Publick Buildings; with the History of All the Villages within the County of Norwich, and Their Antient and Present State. Collected from the Registers, Charters, and Evidences of the See, and from Those of the Corporation Now Extant in the Gild-Hall; as Also from Various Mss. Registers, Collections, & Other Memorials, in Diverse Hands, by Francis Blomefield, Rector of Fersfield in Norfolk*. Norwich, 1745.

Bloor, David, *Knowledge and Social Imagery*. 2 ed Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Bonnet, T.G., *Cathedrals, Abbeys and Churches of England and Wales*. London: Cassells, 1891.

Borsay, Peter, "Politeness and Elegance: The Cultural Re-Fashioning of Eighteenth-Century York." In *Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society*, edited by Mark Hallett and Jane Rendall. York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York, 2003.

- Brighton, J. Trevor, and Roy Newton, "Unravelling an 18th Century Mystery: Peckitt's Red Glasses." *Stained Glass Quarterly: The Stained-Glass Association of America* 81, no. 3 (1986): 214-20.
- Brighton, J. Trevor and Brian Sprakes, "Medieval and Georgian Stained Glass in Oxford and Yorkshire: The Work of Thomas of Oxford (1385-1427) and William Peckitt of York (1731-1795) in New College Chapel, York Minster and St. James High Melton." *Society of Antiquaries* LXX, part 2 (1990): 380-415.
- Brighton, J. Trevor. "Henry Gyles, Virtuoso and Glass-painter of York 1645-1709." *York Historian* 4 (1984): 1-62.
- . "The Enamel Glass-Painters of York: 1585-1795." University of York, PhD thesis, 1978.
- . "William Peckitt's Commission Book, 1751-1795", in *The Fifty-Fourth Volume of the Walpole Society, 1988*. London: The Walpole Society, 1991.
- Broadway, Jan. "Torre, James (1649-1699), Antiquary." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Brooks, Christopher and David Evans, *The Great East Window of Exeter Cathedral*. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1988.
- Brown, Sarah, *Apocalypse: The Great East Window of York Minster*. London: Third Millennium Publishing, 2014.
- . *A History of the Stained Glass of St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle*. Historical Monographs Relating to St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, edited by The Revd Canon John A. White. Windsor: The Dean and Canons of Windsor, 2005.

———. 'The Medieval Glazing of the Minster Library' within the project *1414: John Neuton and the Re-foundation of the Minster Library*,
<http://hoportal.york.ac.uk/hoportal/yml1414essay.jsp?id=21>.

———. *"Our Magnificent Fabrick": York Minster: An Architectural History, C 1220-1500*. London: English Heritage, 2003.

———. *Stained Glass at York Minster*. London: Scala in association with the Dean and Chapter of York, 1999.

———. *Glass-Painters*. London: British Museum Press, 1991.

Brown, Sarah, Mark Fletcher, Paul Holberton, and Sebastian Strobl, *Stained Glass in Canterbury Cathedral. / - Conservation and Restoration*. Canterbury: Cathedral Gifts, 1991.

Brownell, Morris R., *The Prime Minister of Taste: A Portrait of Horace Walpole*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2001.

Buchanan, Alexandrina, "Science and Sensibility: Architectural Antiquarianism in the Early 19th Century." in *Producing the Past: Aspects of Antiquarian Culture and Practice 1700-1850*, edited by Martin Myrone and Lucy Peltz, 169-186. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.

Buttery, Darrell, *York Minster Revealed: Pictures of York Minster from the 17th Century to the Present*. York: Sessions Book Trust, 2007.

Camden, William, *Remaines, Concerning Britaine: But Especially England, and the Inhabitants Thereof. Their Languages. Names. Surnames. Allusions. Anagrammes. Armories. Monies. Empresses. Apparell. Artillarie. Wise Speeches. Prouerbs. Poesies. Epitaphes. Reviewed, Corrected, and*

- Encreased*. Printed at London: By Iohn Legatt for Simon Waterson, 1614.
- Cash, Arthur H. *Laurence Sterne: The Early & Middle Years*. London: Methuen, 1975.
- . *Laurence Sterne, the Later Years*. London; New York: Methuen, 1986.
- Caviness, Madeline Harrison, *The Windows of Christ Church Cathedral, Canterbury*. London: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Caviness, Madeline Harrison, and Jeffrey Weaver, *The Ancestors of Christ Windows at Canterbury Cathedral*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2013.
- Chadwick, Owen, "From 1822-1916." in *A History of York Minster*, edited by Gerald Aylmer and Reginald Cant, 272-312. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Clark, Linda, Colin Richmond and Maureen Jurkowski, *Image, Text and Church, 1380-1600: Essays for Margaret Aston*. Toronto, Ont.: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2009.
- Cobb, Gerald, *English Cathedrals: the Forgotten Centuries; restoration and change from 1530 to the present day*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980.
- Cocke, Thomas, *Salisbury Cathedral: Perspectives on the Architectural History*, edited by Peter Kidson, Royal Commission on Historical Monuments of England. London: H.M.S.O., 1993.
- . "The Architectural History of Ely Cathedral from 1540-1840." In *Medieval Art and Architecture at Ely Cathedral*, edited by Nicola Coldstream and

Peter Draper, 71-78. Leeds: British Archaeological Association Leeds, 1976.

Colchester, L. S., ed. *Wells Cathedral: a history*. London: Open Book Publishers, 1982.

Collinson, Patrick, *The Sixteenth Century 1485-1603*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Colvin, Howard, *The History of King's Works*. Part 1, London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1963.

Cooper, Trevor, ed. *The Journal of William Dowsing: Iconoclasm in East Anglia During the English Civil War*. Woodbridge: The Ecclesiological Society/ The Boydell Press, 2001.

Coppack, Glyn, *Medieval Bishop's Palace, Lincoln*. English Heritage, 2000.

Coster, Will, Andrew Spicer and Simon Ditchfield, *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Crankshaw, David, "The Elizabethan Faculty office and the Aristocratic Patronage of Chaplains." in *Patronage and Recruitment in the Tudor and Early Stuart Church*, edited by Claire Cross, 20-75. Borthwick Studies in History 2. York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, 1996.

Crewe, Sarah, *Stained Glass in England c.1180-1540*. London: Royal Commission on the Historic Monuments of England, 1987.

Cross, Claire, *Close Encounters: English Cathedrals and Society since 1540*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham, Dept. of Adult Education; Sherwood Press, 1991.

———. *Priests into Ministers: The Establishment of Protestant Practice in the City of York 1530-1630*. London: Scolar Press, 1980.

———. "From Reformation to Restoration." in *A History of York Minster*, edited by Aylmer Gerald and Reginald Cant, 193-232. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

———. *Religion in York 1559-1662*. York: Dean and Chapter, 1977.

———. *Church and People, 1450-1660: The Triumph of the Laity in the English Church*. London: Fontana, 1976.

———. *The Economic Problems of the See of York: Decline and Recovery in the Sixteenth Century*. London: British Agricultural History Society, 1970.

Crouch, David J. F., *Piety, Fraternity, and Power: Religious Gilds in Late Medieval Yorkshire, 1389-1547*. Woodbridge, Suffolk; Rochester, NY: York Medieval Press, 2000.

Dart, John, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Canterbury, and the Once-Adjoining Monastery: Containing, an Account of Its First Establishment, Building, Reedifications, Repairs, Endowments, Benefactions, Chapels, Altars, Shrines, Reliques, Chauntries, Obiits, Ornaments, Books, Jewels, Plate, Vestments; before the Dissolution of the Monastery: And the Manner of Its Dissolution. A Survey of the Present Church and Cloysters, Monuments and Incriptions; with Other Things Remarkable: Which, with the Several Prospects of the Church, Are Engraven by the Best Hands. The Lives of the Archbishops, Priors, &C. Of Christ-Church: With an Account of Learned Men There Flourishing in Their Several Times. An Appendix of Ancient Charters and Writings Relating to the Church and Monastery. A Catalogue of the Church-Wealth in Prior*

Estrey's Time. An Ancient Saxon Obituary, and a Large One Continu'd Thence Downward. By the Reverend Mr. J. Dart. London: Printed, and sold by J. Cole, et al, 1724.

———. *Westmonasterium. Or the History and Antiquities of the Abbey Church of St. Peters Westminster. Containing, an Account of Its Ancient and Modern Building, ... In 2 Vol. By Mr. John Dart. To Which Is Added, Westminster Abbey, a Poem, by the Same Author.* London: printed & sold by James Cole, Joseph Smith, Tho. Bowles, Jer. Batley, Tho. Taylor, John Bowles, and by Andrew Johnstone, n.d.

Davids, Carolus Augustus and Bert de Munck, eds. *Innovation and Creativity in Late Medieval and Early Modern European Cities.* Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.

Davidson, Clifford and Anne Nichols, eds. *Iconoclasm Vs. Art and Drama,* Early Drama Art and Music Monograph Series, vol. 11. Kalamazoo: Mediaeval Institute Publication, 1989.

Davies, Julian, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625-1641.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Day, Rosemary and Felicity Heal, *Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church of England, 1500-1642.* Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1976.

Defoe, Daniel, *A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain. Divided into Circuities or Journeys. Giving a Particular and Entertaining Account of Whatever Is Curious and Worth Observation; Viz. I. A Description of the Principal Cities and Towns, Their Situation, Government, and Commerce. Ii. The Customs, Manners, Exercises, Diversions, and Employment of the People. Iii. The Produce and Improvement of the Lands, the Trade, and*

Manufactures. Iv. The Sea Ports and Fortifications, the Course of Rivers, and the Inland Navigation. V. The Public Edifices, Seats and Palaces of the Nobility and Gentry. Vi. The Isles of Wight, Portland, Jersey, Guernsey, and the Other English and Scotish Isles of Most Note. Interspersed with Useful Observations. Particularly Fitted for the Perusal of Such as Desire to Travel over the Island. By a Gentleman. The Fourth Edition. With Very Great Additions, Improvements, and Corrections; Which Bring It Down to the Year 1748. In Four Volumes. With a Copious Index to Each Volume.
London: printed for S. Birt, T. Osborne, D. Browne, J. Hodges, J. Osborn, A. Millar, and J. Robinson, 1748.

Denholm-Young, N., and H.H.E. Craster, "Roger Dodsworth (1585-1654) and His Circle." *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*. XXXII Part 1 (1935/6).

Dew Roberts, Elizabeth, *Mitre and Musket: John Williams, Lord Keeper, Archbishop of York, 1582-1650*. London; New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Dickens, A. G., *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York 1509-1588*. 2 ed. London: The Hambledon Press, 1982.

———. "The Marriage and Character of Archbishop Holgate" *English Historical Review* 52, no.207 (1937): 428-442.

———. *Robert Holgate: Archbishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North*, St Anthony's Hall Publications No.8. York: St. Anthony's Press, 1955.

———. *The Marian Reaction in the Diocese of York. Part I, the Clergy*, St Anthony's Hall Publications No.11. York: St. Anthony's Press, 1957.

———. *The Marian Reaction in the Diocese of York. Part II, the Laity*, St

Anthony's Hall Publications No.12. York: St. Anthony's Press, 1957.

Dobson, R. Barrie, "Admissions to the Freedom of the City of York in the Later Middle Ages." *Economic History Review 2nd Series* 26 (1973): 1-22.

Dodsworth, Roger, *Yorkshire Church Notes 1619-1631*. Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series XXXVII, Leeds: J. Whitehead, 1904.

Drake, Francis, *Eboracum: Or the History and Antiquities of the City of York, from Its Original to the Present Times. Together with the History of the Cathedral Church, and the Lives of the Archbishops of That See, from the First Introduction of Christianity into the Northern Parts of This Island, to the Present State and Condition of That Magnificent Fabrick. Collected from Authentick Manuscripts, Publick Records, Ancient Chronicles, and Modern Historians. And Illustrated with Copper Plates. In Two Books. By Francis Drake, of the City of York, Gent. F. R. S. And Member of the Society of Antiquaries in London*. London: printed by William Bowyer for the author.

Duffy, Eamon, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009.

———. *Reformation Divided: Catholics, Protestants and the Conversion of England*. 1st edn. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.

———. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580*. 1st edn. New York: Yale University Press, 1992.

Dugdale, Sir William, *Monasticon Anglicanum, or, the History of the Ancient Abbies, and Other Monasteries, Hospitals, Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in England and Wales. With Divers French, Irish, and Scotch Monasteries Formerly Relating to England*. London: for Sam. Keble, Hen.

Rhodes, 1693.

— — —. *The History of St. Paul's Cathedral in London: From Its Foundation. Extracted out of Original Charters, Records, Leiger-Books, and Other Manuscripts. Beautified with Sundry Prospects of the Old Fabrick, Which Was Destroyed by the Fire of That City, 1666. As Also with the Figures of the Tombs and Monuments Therein, Which Were All Defac'd in the Late Rebellion. Whereunto Is Added, a Continuation Thereof, Setting Forth What Was Done in the Structure of the New Church, to the Year 1685. Likewise, an Historical Account of the Northern Cathedrals, and Chief Collegiate Churches in the Province of York. By Sir William Dugdale Knt. Garter Principal King at Arms.* London: printed by George James, for Jonah Bowyer, at the Rose in Ludgate-Street, 1716.

Earle, John, *Microcosmographie or a Peece of the World Discovered in Essays and Characters*. 5 ed. London: 1629.

Edwards, Kathleen, *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages: A Constitutional Study with Special Reference to the Fourteenth Century*. 2 ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967.

Erskine, Audrey, *The Accounts of the Fabric of Exeter Cathedral, 1279-135: Part 1: 1279-1326*. Exeter: Devon & Cornwall Record Society, 1981.

Erskine, Audrey, Hope Vyvyan, and John Lloyd, *Exeter Cathedral: A Short History and Description*. Exeter: Exeter Cathedral, 1988.

Everitt, Alan, "Change in the Provinces: The Seventeenth Century." in *Department of English Local History Occasional Papers*, edited by Alan Everitt. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1972.

Feeser, Andrea, Maureen Daly Goggin and Beth Fowkes Tobin, *The Materiality of Color: The Production, Circulation, and Application of Dyes and Pigments, 1400-1800* Burlington: Ashgate, 2012.

Ferdinand, C. Y., *Benjamin Collins and the Provincial Newspaper Trade in the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: New York: Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Fiennes, Celia, *The Illustrated Journeys of Celia Fiennes, c.1682-c.1712*. London: Macdonald, 1984.

Fincham, Kenneth, "*According to Ancient Custom*": *The Return of Altars in the Restoration Church of England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

———. "*So Potent, Crafty and Violent an Adversary*": *Samuel Harsnett, Master of Pembroke and Archbishop of York*. Cambridge: Pembroke College, 2006.

———. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993.

Fincham, Kenneth, and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake, eds. *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006

Foster, Andrew, "Archbishop Richard Neile Revisited" in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, C.1560-1660*, edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.

- French, Thomas, *York Minster, the St. William Window*. Oxford; New York: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1999.
- . *York Minster: The Great East Window*. Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi Great Britain. Edited by Prof. C. M Kaufmann. Vol. Summary Catalogue 2, Oxford: The British Academy, 1995.
- French, Thomas, and David E. O'Connor, *York Minster: A Catalogue of Medieval Stained Glass Fascicle 1 the West Windows of the Nave Wi, Wii, Nxxx, Sxxxvi*. Oxford; New York: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Frere, W. H., *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, 1558-1625*. London: Macmillan, 1904.
- Frere, W. H., and W. W. Kennedy, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*. 3 vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1910.
- Fryde, E. B. and Diana Eleanor Greenway, *Handbook of British Chronology*. 3 ed, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Fuller, Thomas, *The History of the Worthies of England*. London, 1662.
- Gadd, Ian Anders, and Alexandra Gillespie, *John Stow (1525-1605) and the Making of the English Past*. London: British Library, 2004.
- Gale, Samuel, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinity in Winton*. By Samuel Gale, Gent. London: undated c.1710?
- Gee, Eric. "Architectural History until 1290." In *A History of York Minster*, edited by Gerald Aylmer and Reginald Cant, 111-148. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

Gent, Thomas. *The Ancient History of Saint Peter's Magnificent Cathedral in the Famous City of York: Extracted from Records of the Church, in Three Books. The second edition, with emendations.* York: Thomas Gent, 1762.

— — —. *The Antient and Modern History of the Famous City of York; and in a Particular Manner of Its Magnificent Cathedral, Commonly Call'd, York-Minister. As Also an Account of St. Mary's Abbey, and Other Antient Religious Houses and Churches; the Places Whereon They Stood, What Orders Belong'd to Them, and the Remains of Those Ancient Buildings That Are yet to Be Seen: With a Description of Those Churches Now in Use, of Their Curiously Painted Windows, the Inscriptions Carefully Collected, and Many of Them Translated: The Lives of the Archbishops of This See: The Government of the Northern Parts under the Romans, Especially by the Emperors Severus and Constantius, Who Both Dy'd in This City: Of the Kings of England and Other Illustrious Persons, Who Have Honour'd York with Their Presence: An Account of the Mayors and Bayliffs. Lord-Mayors and Sheriffs. (with Several Remarkable Transactions, Not Published before) from Different Manuscripts, Down to the Third Year of the Reign of His Present Majesty King George the Second. To Which Is Added, a Description of the Most Noted Towns in Yorkshire, with the Antient Buildings That Have Been Therein, Alphabetically Digested for the Delight of the Reader; Not Only by the Assistance of Antient Writers, but from the Observations of Several Ingenious Persons in the Present Age. The Whole Diligently Collected by T.G. York: Sold by Thomas Hammond, Inn, bookseller in High-Ouzegate; at the Printing-Office in Coffee-Yard, York: and by A. Bettesworth, in Pater-Noster-Row, London.*

— — —. *The Life of Mr. Thomas Gent, Printer of York; Written by Himself.* London: Thomas Thorpe, 1832.

— — —. *The Most Delectable, Scriptural and Pious History of the Famous and Magnificent Great Eastern Window (According to Beautiful Portraitures) in St. Peter's Cathedral, York*. York: impressed for the author [ie. Thomas Gent], 1762.

Gerrard, Christopher, *Medieval Archaeology: Understanding Traditions and Contemporary Approaches*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Gibson, Peter, *The Stained and Painted Glass of York Minster*. 9 ed. Norwich: Jarrold Publishing for the Dean and Chapter of York, 1992.

Giles, Katherine and Christopher Dyer, *Town and Country in the Middle Ages: Contrasts, Contacts and Interconnections, 1100-1500*. Leeds: Maney Publishing, 2004.

Gillispie, Charles Coulston, *The Edge of Objectivity; an Essay in the History of Scientific Ideas*. 2 ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Godfrey, Eleanor S., *The Development of English Glassmaking 1560-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Goldberg, P. Jeremy Piers, *Medieval England: A Social History, 1250-1550*. London: Arnold, 2004.

Gorman, Frank, *The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political and Social History 1688-1832*. London: Arnold, 1997.

Grassby, Richard, *The Business Community of Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Graves, Pamela C., "From an Archaeology of Iconoclasm to an Anthropology of the Body. Images, Punishment, and Personhood in England, 1500–1660." *Current Anthropology* 49, no. 1 (2008): 35-60.

———. *The Window Glass of the Order of St. Gilbert of Sempringham: A York-Based Study*. York Archaeological Trust for Excavation: Council for British Archaeology, 2000.

Greaves, Richard L., *Saints and Rebels: Seven Non-Conformists in Stuart England*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985.

Groll, Marie, "The Installation and Restoration History of the Sixteenth Century Herkenrode Glass at Lichfield Cathedral (1795 -1945)." York: MA dissertation, History of Art, 2011.

Gunton, Simon, *A History of the Cathedral Church of Peterborough, from Its Foundation, to the Present Time. The third edition, with an elegant engraving of the north view of the cathedral*. Peterborough: printed and sold by J. Jacob, 1790.

Gwyn, Peter, *The King's Cardinal: The Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey*. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1990.

Haigh, Christopher, ed. *The English Reformation Revised*. 4 ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Halfpenny, Joseph, *Gothic Ornament*. York: 1795

Hallett, Mark, "Pictorial improvement: York in Eighteenth-Century Graphic Art." In *Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society*, edited by Mark

Hallett and Jane Rendall, 24-49. York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York, 2003.

Hallett, Mark, and Jane Rendall, eds. *Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society*. York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York, 2003.

Hammond, Lieutenant, *A Relation of a Short Survey of 26 Counties, Observed in a Seven Weeks Journey Begun on August 11, 1634, by a Captain, a Lieutenant, and an Ancient, All Three of the Military Company in Norwich*. London: F. E. Robinson, 1904.

Hardwick, Paul, "Making Light of Devotion: The Pilgrimage Window in York Minster." in *Medieval English Comedy*, edited by Sandra Hordis and Paul Hardwick, 61-82. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.

———. "The Monkeys Funeral in the Pilgrimage Window of York Minster." *Art History* 23, no. 2 (2000): 290-99.

Harris, Jonathan Gil, *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

Harrison, Katie, "'There Is No Trace of It in the Minster Glass now': An Investigation into the East Window of St. Martin's Coney Street and Its Eighteenth-Century Acquisition by York Minster". *York Historian*. 32 (2015): 2-29.

Harrison, Revd. Frederick, *The Painted Glass of York: An Account of the Medieval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches*. London: SPCK, 1927.

———. "The War and the Medieval Glass of York." *Journal of the British Society of Master Glass Painters* IX, no. 1 (1943): 22-.23.

- Hart, A. Tindal, *Ebor: A History of the Archbishops of York from Paulinus to Maclagan, 627-1908*. York: William Sessions, Ebor Press, 1986.
- . *The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York*. London: S.P.C.K., 1949.
- Haskell, Francis, *History and its Images: Art and the Interpretation of the Past*. New Haven; London: Yale, 1993.
- Hasted, Edward, "Canterbury Cathedral: the Deans (from the Reformation to 1672)." in *The History And topographical Survey of the County of Kent: Volume 12*. Canterbury: W. Bristow, 1801.
- Haynes, Clare, *Pictures and Popery: Art and Religion in England, 1660-1760*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Hebgin-Barnes, Penny, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Cheshire*. Oxford: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Hildyard, Christopher, *The Antiquities of York City, and the Civil Government Thereof: With a List of All the Mayors and Bayliffs, Lord Mayors and Sheriffs, from the Time of King Edward the First, to This Present Year, 1719. Collected from the Papers of Christopher Hildyard, Esq; with Notes and Observations, and the Addition of Ancient Inscriptions, and Coates of Arms, from Gravestones and Church-Windows. By James Torr, Gent. And since Continued to This Present Year, 1719. With an Appendix of the Dimensions of York Minster, the Names of the Founders, Repairers, and Benefactors. A Catalogue of All the Religious Houses, Chappels, and Churches, That Have Been, and at Present Are, in the Said City. As Also the Gifts and Legacies to the Charity-Schools, with the Names of the First Promoters and Founders Thereof*. York: printed by G. White for F. Hildyard, 1719.

- Hodgson, John Crawford, Jacob Bee, William Brereton, Mark Browell, John of Brunton Sir, John Dawson, Richard Pococke, *North Country Diaries: (Second Series)*, Surtees Society, 124. Durham: Andrews, 1915.
- Holton, Alexander Barry, "The Archaeology and Conservation of the East Front of York Minster." University of York, PhD thesis, 2010.
- Hordis, Sandra M. and Paul Hardwick, *Medieval English Comedy*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.
- Howarth, David, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance 1485-1649*. Los Angeles: University of Berkley Press, 1997.
- Hunter, Michael, *The Royal Society and Its Fellows, 1660-1700: The Morphology of an Early Scientific Institution*. Chalfont St. Giles, Bucks: British Society for the History of Science, 1982.
- . *Science and Society in Restoration England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- . *John Aubrey and the Realm of Learning*. London: Duckworth, 1975.
- Hyde, Henry, and Samuel Gale, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Winchester. Containing, All the Inscriptions Upon the Tombs and Monuments: With an Account of the Bishops, Priors, Deans, and Prebendaries; Also, the History of Hyde-Abbey. Begun by the Right Honourable Henry Late Earl of Clarendon, and Continued to This Time, by Samuel Gale, Gent. Adorn'd with Sculptures*. London: printed for E. Curll at the Dial and Bible against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-Street.
- Jago, James Sherrington. "The Dissemination and Reassessment of Private Religious Space in Early Modern England 1600-1660: An Examination of

the Cultural Contexts Surrounding Royal, Episcopal and Collegiate Chapels from the Accession of James I to the Restoration." University of York, PhD thesis, 2012.

Jenkins, Matthew, "The View from the Street: Housing and Shopping in York During the Long Eighteenth Century." University of York, PhD thesis, 2013.

Keen, Laurence and Thomas Cocke, eds. *Medieval Art and Architecture at Salisbury Cathedral*. British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, vol. XVII. Exeter: British Archaeological Association, 1996.

Keepe, Henry, *By Henry Keepe, Formerly of New-Inn-Hall in the University of Oxford, Gentleman-Commoner, and Now of the Inner-Temple London, Esq Having in the Year 1681 Published a Small Treatise by the Way of Essay to a More Compleat History of Westminster Abby*. London, 1683.

Kenworthy, Joseph, *Handbook No 6 to: 'The Early History of Stocksbridge and District': Subject - the Bolsterstone Glasshouse and Its Place in English Glass-Making*. Sheffield: by the author, 1914.

Kenyon, G. H., *The Glass Industry of the Weald*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1967.

Kermode, Jennifer, *Medieval Merchants: York, Beverley, and Hull in the Later Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

———. *Enterprise and Individuals in Fifteenth-Century England*. Stroud: Alan Sutton Pub., 1991.

———. "Merchants, Overseas Trade, and Urban Decline: York, Beverley, and Hull C.1380-1500." *Northern History* 23 (1987): 51-73.

Kesselring, K. J., *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics and Protest in Elizabethan England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Kilburn, Terence, and Anthony Milton, "The Public Context of Strafford's Trial and Execution." in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl Strafford 1621-1641*, edited by J. F. Merritt. Strafford Papers Project (Sheffield, England). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

King, David, "Glass-Painting in Late-Medieval Norwich: Continuity and Patronage in the John Wighton Workshop." in *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Paul Binski and Elizabeth New, 347-365. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2012.

———. *The Medieval Stained Glass of St Peter Mancroft, Norwich*. Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi Great Britain Vol. 5. Oxford: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2006.

King, Dennis, ed. *Medieval Art & Architecture at Ely Cathedral*. British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions. Leeds: B.A.A., 1976.

King, Henry C., *The History of the Telescope*. New York: Dover Publications, 1979.

King, John N., *Voices of the English Reformation: A Sourcebook*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Knowles, John A., "The Price Family of Glass-Painters." *Antiquaries Journal* 33 (1953): 184-92.

———. *Essays in the History of the York School of Glass-Painting*. London; New York: SPCK; The Macmillan Co., 1936.

———. "Glass Painters of York - Robert Petty." *Notes and Queries* S IX, no. 12 (1921): 103-104.

———. "Glass-Painters of York - Sir John Petty." *Notes and Queries* S IX, no. 12 (1921): 61-64.

———. "Glass Painters of York VIII: The Thompson Family." *Notes and Queries* S IX, no. 12 (1921): 163-165.

———. "Glass-Painters of York VII the Petty Family." *Notes and Queries* S IX, no. 12 (1921): 21-22.

Koopmans, Rachel, "Early Sixteenth-Century Stained Glass at St Michael-Le-Belfrey and the Commemoration of Thomas Becket in Late Medieval York." *Speculum* 89, no. 4 (2014): 1040-1100. Published electronically October 2014. doi:DOI: 10.1017/S0038713414001675.

———. *Wonderful to Relate: Miracle Stories and Miracle Collecting in High Medieval England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Lake, Peter, and Michael C. Questier, eds. *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000.

Lake, Peter, "Moving the Goalposts? Modified Subscription and the Construction of Conformity in the Early Stuart Church." in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*, edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier. *Studies in Modern British Religious History*, 179-205. Woodbridge: The Boydell press, 2000.

Lamburn, D. J., "The Influence of the Laity in Appointments of Clergy in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century." in *Patronage and Recruitment in the Tudor and Early Stuart Church*, edited by Claire Cross, 95-119.

Borthwick Studies in History 2. York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, 1996.

Lancaster, Joan C., "John Thornton of Coventry, Glazier." *Birmingham Archaeological Society Transactions and Proceedings* 74 (1956): 56-58.

Lancaster, William Thomas, ed. *Letters Addressed to Ralph Thoresby F.R.S. Printed from the Originals in the Possession of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society*. Leeds: printed by J. Whitehead and Son for the Thoresby Society, 1912.

Lane, Geoffrey, "A World Turned Upside Down: London Glass-Painters 1600-1660." *Journal of Stained Glass* 29 (2005): 45-75.

———. "Adding 'Beauty to Light': London Glass-Painters 1660-1710." *Journal of Stained Glass* 34 (2009): 50-61.

Laud, William, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father In God, William Laud D.D., Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*. Vol. VI part I, Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1857.

Le Couteur, J.D., *English Medieval Painted Glass*. 2 ed. London: SPCK, 1926.

Lea, R. S., "Sir Peter Thompson, (1698-1770), of Mill St., Bermondsey and Market St., Poole, Dorset." Institute of Historical Research, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org>.

Lehmberg, Stanford E., *English Cathedrals: A History*. London; New York: Hambledon Continuum, 2006.

———. *Cathedrals under Siege: Cathedrals in English Society 1600-1700*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996.

———. *The Reformation of Cathedrals: Cathedral in English Society 1485-1603*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Levine, Joseph M., *Dr. Woodward's Shield: History, Science, and Satire in Augustan England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Lillich, Meredith P., *Studies in Medieval Stained Glass and Monasticism*. Pindar Press, 2001.

Lushington, Laura and Sonia Halliday, *The Bible in Stained Glass*, edited by Tim Dowley. London: Bible Society, 1990.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700*. London: Allen Lane, 2004.

———. *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*. 2nd edn. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001.

———. "The Birth of Anglicanism." *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 7, no. 35 (2004): 418-28.

———. *Thomas Cramner*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1996.

———. *Building a Godly Realm: The Establishment of English Protestantism, 1558-1603*. London: Historical Association, 1992.

———. "Prophets without Honour: Arminius and the Arminians." *History Today* 39, no. 10 (1989): 27-34.

Mace, Thomas, *Musick's Monument or a Remembrancer of the Best Practical Music Both Divine and Civil That Has Ever Been Known to Have Been in the World. Divided into Three Parts*. London, 1676.

Maitte, Corine, "The Cities of Glass: Privileges and Innovations in Early Modern Europe." in *Innovation and Creativity in Late Medieval and Early Modern European Cities*, edited by Carolus Augustinus Davids and Bert De Munck. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014, 35-54.

Marchant, Ronald A., *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560-1642*. London: Longmans, 1960.

Marks, Richard, "A Will Casts Light: Robert Hunt and the West Window of St Margaret's Church, Westminster." in *Patrons and Professionals in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2010 Harlaxton symposium*, edited by Paul Binski and Elizabeth New, 366-385. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2012.

———. *Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2004.

———. "Research and Methodology. Medieval Stained Glass: Recent and Future Trends in Scholarship." *Journal of Stained Glass XXIV* (2000): 62-79.

———. *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages*. London: Routledge, 1993.

———. "Windows, Wills and Words: The Language of Instruction and Inscription in Late Medieval Glazing Bequests." in *Word and Image: Corpus Vitrearum 27th International Colloquium 7-11 July 2014*, 55-65. York: Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi of Great Britain, 2014.

McClendon, Muriel C., Joseph P. Ward, and Michael MacDonald, *Protestant*

Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1999.

McHardy, A. K., "Some Patterns of Ecclesiastical Patronage in the Later Middle Ages." In *Studies in Clergy and Ministry in Medieval England* edited by David Smith, 20-37. York: University of York, 1991.

Meadows, Peter and Nigel Ramsay, *A History of Ely Cathedral*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.

Mendyk, Stanley G., *Speculum Britanniae: Regional Study, Antiquarianism, and Science in Britain to 1700*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Merritt, J. F., "The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641." in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl Strafford 1621-1641*, edited by J. F. Merritt. Strafford Papers Project (Sheffield, England). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Michael, Michael A., *Stained Glass of Canterbury Cathedral*. London: Scala, 2004.

———. *Images in Light: Stained Glass, 1200-1550*. London: Sam Fogg, 2002.

Milner-White, Very Revd. Eric, *Sixteenth Century Glass in York Minster and in the Church of St. Michael Le Belfrey*, St. Anthony's Hall Publications, 17. York: St Anthony's Press, 1960.

———. *York Minster: An Index and Guide to the Ancient Windows of the Nave*. York: H. Morley for The Friends of York Minster, 1959.

———. "The Resurrection of a Fourteenth-Century Window", *The Burlington Magazine* 94, no.589: 108-112.

Milton, Anthony, "Religion and community in pre-civil-war England" in *The English Revolution c.1590-1720: politics, religion and communities* edited by Nicholas Tyacke, 62-80. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007

Milton, John, *Paradise Lost. A Poem, the Author John Milton. To Which Are Added, Paradise Regain'd, Lycidas, L'allegro, Il Penseroso. Vol. I.* Paris: printed by Didot the eldest; and sold by J. N. Pissot Barrois, junior, 1780.

Moorhouse, Geoffrey, *The Pilgrimage of Grace: The Rebellion That Shook Henry VIII's Throne.* London: Weidenfield & Nicholson, 2002.

Morgan, John, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560-1640.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Murray, Hugh M. A., *The Great Chamber at Gilling Castle.* St Laurence Papers viii. York: Ampleforth Abbey Archives, 1996.

Myrone, Martin, and Lucy Peltz, *Producing the Past: Aspects of Antiquarian Culture and Practice, 1700-1850.* Aldershot, Hants; Brookfield, Vt.: Ashgate, 1999.

Norton, Christopher, "Richard Scrope and York Minster." in *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr*, edited by P. Jeremy Piers Goldberg, 138-213. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2007.

O'Connor, David E., "John Petty, Glazier and Mayor of York: An Early Sixteenth-Century Memorial Window formerly in the South Transept of York Minster." in *Glas. Malerei. Forschung: Internationale Studien Zu Ehren Von Rüdiger Becksmann*, edited by Ivo Rauch and Daniel Hess, 30-75. Germany: Deutsche Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 2004.

- . "Debris from a Medieval Glazier's Workshop." in *Interim: Bulletin of the York Archaeological Trust*. (1973): 11-17.
- O'Connor, David, and Jeremy Haselock, "The Stained and Painted Glass." in *A History of York Minster*, edited by Gerald Aylmer and Reginald Cant, 313-394. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Orme, Nicholas, *The History of England's Cathedrals*. Exeter: Impress Books, 2017.
- Owen, Dorothy, "From the Restoration until 1822." in *A History of York Minster*, edited by Gerald Aylmer and Reginald Cant, 233-271. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Palliser, David M., *Medieval York: 600-1540*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- . *Tudor York*. Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- . *The Reformation in York 1534-1553*, Borthwick Papers No.40. York: St. Anthony's Press, 1971.
- Palliser, David M. and Mary Palliser, *York as They Saw It: From Alcuin to Lord Esher*. York: Sessions for the C. and J. B. Morrell Trust, 1979.
- Parry, Graham, "Earliest Antiquaries." in *Making History: Antiquaries in Britain, 1707-2007*, edited by David R. M. Gaimster, David Starkey and Society of Antiquaries, 37-39. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007.
- . *Glory, Laud and Honour: The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006.

- . *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Pattison, Ian, and Hugh Murray, *Monuments in York Minster: An Illustrated Inventory*. 2 ed. York: The Friends of York Minster, 2001.
- Pedersen, Sarah, "Piety and Charity in the Painted Glass of Late Medieval York" *Northern History* 36, No.1 (2000): 33-42.
- Peltz, Lucy, "Aestheticizing the Ancestral City: Antiquarianism, Topography and the Representation of London in the Long Eighteenth Century." *Art History* 22, no. 4 (1999): 472-494.
- Peover, Michael, "The Stained Glass in Sir John Soane's Museum – an Overview." *Journal of Stained Glass XXVII Special Issue "The Stained-Glass Collection of Sir John Soane's Museum (2004): 118-130.*
- Perring, Stefania, "The Cathedral Landscape of York: The Minster Close C.1500-1642." University of York, PhD thesis, 2010.
- Phillips, John, *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England 1535-1660*. Berkeley, Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1973.
- Pogson, Fiona, "Making and Maintaining Political Alliances During the Personal Rule of Charles I: Wentworth's Associations with Laud and Cottington." *History* 84, no. 273 (1999): 52-73.
- Quintrell, Brian, "The Church Triumphant? The emergence of a spiritual Lord Treasurer, 1635-36" in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl Strafford 1621-1641* edited by J. F. Merritt, 81-108. Strafford Papers Project (Sheffield, England). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Raguin, Virginia Chieffo, and Mary Clerkin Higgins, *The History of Stained Glass: The Art of Light, Medieval to Contemporary*. London Thames & Hudson, 2003.

Ramsay, Nigel, *Heralds and Heraldry in Shakespeare's England*. Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2014.

Rawlinson, Richard, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Rochester. Containing I. The Local Statutes of That Church. II. The Inscriptions Upon the Monuments, Tombs, and Grave-Stones. III. An Account of the Bishops, Priors, Deans, and Arch-Deacons. IV. An Appendix of Monumental Inscriptions in the Cathedral Church of Canterbury, Supplementary to Mr. Somner's and Mr. Batteley's Accounts of That Church. V. Some Original Papers, Relating to the Church and Diocese of Rochester*. London: printed for E. Curll, at the Dial and Bible near St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-Street, 1719.

— — —. *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral-Church of Salisbury, and the Abbey-Church of Bath*. [in English] London: printed for E. Curll, in Fleetstreet, 1719.

— — —. *The History and Antiquities of the City and Cathedral-Church of Hereford: Containing an Account of All the Inscriptions, Epitaphs, &c. Upon the Tombs, Monuments, and Grave-Stones. With Lists of the Principal Dignitaries; and an Appendix, Consisting of Several Valuable Original Papers*. London: printed for R. Gosling, at the Mitre and Crown against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-Street, 1719.

Rees Jones, Sarah, ed. *The Government of Medieval York: Essays in Commemoration of the 1396 Royal Charter*. York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York, 1997.

- Reeves, Eileen Adair, *Galileo's Glassworks: The Telescope and the Mirror*. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Reilly, Lisa A., *An Architectural History of Peterborough Cathedral*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Rosser, Gervase, *The Art of Solidarity in the Middle Ages: Guilds in England, 1250-1550*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Rowse, A. L., "Bishop Thornborough: A Clerical Careerist." in *For Veronica Wedgwood these: Studies in Seventeenth-Century History*, edited by Richard Lawrence Ollard and Pamela Tudor-Craig, 89-108. London: Collins, 1986.
- Rudebeck, Andrew, "John Thornton and the Stained Glass of St Mary's Hall, Coventry." *Journal of Stained Glass XXXI* (2007): 14-34.
- Rushton, John, *Yorkshire in the Reign of Elizabeth I*. Blackthorn History of Yorkshire Vol. 6. Pickering: Blackthorn Press, 2008.
- Salzman, Louis F., *Building in England down to 1540: A Documentary History*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, repr. 1967.
- . "The Glazing of St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster, 1351-2." *Journal of Stained Glass* 1, no. 4 (1926): 14-18; no. 5: 31-35; no. 6: 38-41.
- Sanders, Julie, and Ian Atherton, eds. *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- Sangha, Laura, "The Thoresby Society's Ducatus Tercentenary Volume I, Miscellany: A Celebration of Ralph Thoresby." Book review in *Yorkshire*

Archaeological Journal 88, no. 1: 256-58.

Saunders, O. M., *Minster and Parish: The Sixteenth Century Reconstruction of the Church of St. Michael-Le-Belfrey in York*. University of York, MA Dissertation, 1996.

Scott, Geoffrey (O.S.B), "A Benedictine Conspirator: Henry Joseph Johnston." *Recusant History* 20, no. 1 (1990): 58-75.

Stone, Laurence, "Social Mobility in England 1500-1700" in *Seventeenth-Century England: Society in an Age of Revolution* edited by Paul Seaver, 26-70. New York: New Viewpoints, 1976.

Shapin, Steven, *Never Pure: Historical Studies of Science as If It Was Produced by People with Bodies, Situated in Time, Space, Culture, and Society, and Struggling for Credibility and Authority*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010.

———. *The Scientific Revolution*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

———. *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Shawe-Taylor, Desmond, *The Georgians: Eighteenth-Century Portraiture & Society*. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1990.

Singer, Charles, Eric John Holmyard, A. Rupert Hall, eds. *A History of Technology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

Smiles, Sam, "The Art of Recording." in *Making history: Antiquaries in Britain, 1707-2007*, edited by David R. M. Gaimster, David Starkey and Society of

Antiquaries, 123-125. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007.

Smiles, Sam, "Data Documentation and Display in Eighteenth Century Investigations in Exeter Cathedral." *Art History* 25, no. 4 (2002): 500-519.

Somner, William, *The Antiquities of Canterbury. In Two Parts. The First Part. The Antiquities of Canterbury; or a Survey of That Ancient City, ... Sought out and Published By ... William Somner. The Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged by Nicolas Battely, ... The Second Part. Cantuaria Sacra: Or the Antiquities I. Of the Cathedral ... V. Of the Monastery of St. Augustin; ... By Nicolas Battely.* London: printed for R. Knaplock, 1703.

Spelman, Sir Henry, *Villare Anglicum, or, a Viewv of the Tovvnes of England*, edited by Roger Dodsworth. London: Printed by R. Hodgkinsonne, dwelling in Thames-street neere Baynards-Castle, 1656.

Sprakes, Brian, "The Armorial Stained Glass at Temple Newsam." *Leeds Arts Calendar* 92 (1983): 22-27.

Sterne, Laurence, *A Political Romance, 1759*. Menston: Scolar Press, 1971.

Stranks, C. J., *This Sumptuous Church: The Story of Durham Cathedral*. 3rd edn. London: SPCK, 1993.

Swanson, Heather, *Building Craftsmen in Late Medieval York*. Borthwick Institute of Historical Research Paper 63. York: University of York, 1983.

Sweet, Rosemary, "Antiquarians and History" in *Making History: the changing face of the profession in Britain*

<http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/resources/articles/antiquarianism.html>

— — —. "Founders and Fellows" in *Making history: Antiquaries in Britain, 1707-*

2007, edited by David R. M. Gaimster, David Starkey and Society of Antiquaries, 53-55. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007.

———. *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. London: Hambledon and London, 2004.

———. "History and Identity in Eighteenth-Century York: Francis Drake's *Eboracum* (1736)." in *Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society*, edited by Mark Hallett and Jane Rendall, 13-23. Borthwick Text and Calendar 30. York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, University of York, 2003.

———. *The Writing of Urban Histories in Eighteenth-Century England*. Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Sykes, Norman, "Episcopal Administration in England in the Eighteenth Century." *The English Historical Review* XLVII, no. CLXXXVII (1932): 414-446.

Tatton-Brown, Tim, and John Crook, *Salisbury Cathedral: The Making of a Medieval Masterpiece*. London: Scala, 2009.

Taylor, Joseph, *A Journey to Edenborough in Scotland*. Edited by William Cowan. Edinburgh: William Brown, 1903.

Thomas, Keith, "Art & Iconoclasm in Early Modern England", in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 16-40. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006.

———. *The Perception of the Past in Early Modern England: The Creighton Trust Lecture 1983, Delivered before the University of London on Monday 21 November 1983*. London: University of London, 1983.

Thompson, A. Hamilton, and Alexander Hamilton Thompson. *York Minster Historical Tracts, 627-1927*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1927.

Tittler, Robert, *The Reformation and the Towns in England: Politics and Political Culture, c. 1540-1640*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Toy, John, *A Guide and Index to the Windows of York Minster*. York: The Dean and Chapter of York, 1985.

Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *Archbishop Laud 1573-1645*. 2 ed. London: Phoenix Press, 2000.

Trewman, R., *The Antient History and Description of the City of Exeter; Containing, the Antient History, &C. Of the City; Together with an Account of the Sundry Assaults Given Thereto from Time to Time, and the Sieges It Has Sustain'd, Viz. By the Romans, under Vespasian, A. D. 49 ;- by Penda, King of Mercia, in 632 ;- by the Danes, in 858, 877, 1001, and 1004 ;- by William the Conqueror, in 1068 ;- by the Earls of Devon, in 1137, and 1378 ;- in 1469, During the Civil Wars between the Houses of York and Lancaster ;- by Perkin Warbeck, in 1497 ;- by the Rebels of Devonshire and Cornwall, in 1549, &C. &C. Also a Curious Account of the Antiquity, Foundation, and Building of St. Peter's Cathedral Church. With a Catalogue of All the Bishops of Tawton, Crediton; and Exeter, and Authentic Memoirs of Their Lives. To Which Are Added, the Offices and Duties (as of Old) of the Sworn Officers of the City. Compiled and Digested from the Works of Hooker, Izacke, and Others. Exeter: printed and sold by R. Trewman, behind the Guildhall; by whom all Manner of Printing-Work is neatly and expeditiously performed on the most Reasonable Terms, 1765?*

- Tringham, Nigel J., *Charters of the Vicars Choral of York Minster II: County of Yorkshire and Appropriated Churches to 1538*. Leeds; Woodbridge: Yorkshire Archaeological Society & The Boydell Press, 2002.
- Turnbull, William B.D.D., ed. *Account of the Monastic Treasures Confiscated at the Dissolution of the Various Houses in England by Sir John Williams, Late Master and Treasurer of the Jewels to His Majesty King Henry VIII*. Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club.
- Turner, Stephen P. "Forms of Patronage" in *Theories of Science in Society*, edited by Susan E. Cozzens and Thomas F. Gieryn, 185-211. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Tyacke, Nicholas, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590-1640*. Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- . *The English Revolution c.1590-1720: Politics, Religion and Communities*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Upton, Anthony Frederick, *Sir Arthur Ingram, c.1565-1642: A Study of the Origins of an English Landed Family*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Venn, John, A., *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A Biographical List of All Known Students, Graduates and Holders of Office at the University of Cambridge, from the Earliest Times to 1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.
- Voragine, Jacobus de, *The Golden Legend*, edited by Helmut Ripperger and Ryan Granger. New York: Arno Press, 1969.
- Warrington, William, *The History of Stained Glass, from the Earliest Period of the Art to the Present Time: Illustrated by Coloured Examples of Entire*

Windows in the Various Styles. London: published by the Author, 1848.

Webb, Christopher C., "Cathedral Patronage: York Minster 1625-1677." in *Patronage and Recruitment in the Tudor and Early Stuart Church*, edited by Claire Cross, 148-168. Borthwick Studies in History 2. York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, 1996.

Webster, Charles, ed. *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*. London: Routledge, 1974.

Weever, John, *Ancient Funerall Monuments within the United Monarchie of Great Britain, Ireland and the Islands Adjacent*. London, 1631.

Welander, David, *The Stained Glass of Gloucester Cathedral*. Gloucester: Gloucester Cathedral, 1995.

Wells, Edward, *A Paraphrase with Annotations on the New Testament: In Two Volumes. The First Containing the Four Gospels, and the Acts of the Holy Apostles. To Which Is Added a Treatise Concerning the Harmony of the Gospels. The Second, All the Epistles, and the Revelation: And a Paraphrase on the Book of Daniel. ... B Edward Wells, D.D. Rector of Cotesbach in Leicestershire*. London]: Printed for James and John Knapton, at the Crown in St.Paul's church-yard. London, 1730.

Wells-Cole, Anthony, "Who was Walter Geddes?", *Furniture History* XXVI, (1990): 183-190.

Whibley, Leonard, ed. *The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason, and Letters of Richard Hurd to Thomas Gray*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932.

Widdrington, Thomas, *Analecta Eboracensia : Or, Some Remaynes of the Ancient City of York*, edited by Revd. Caesar Caine. London: C.J. Clark, 1897.

Williamson, Paul, *Medieval and Renaissance Stained Glass in the Victoria and Albert Museum*. London: V&A Publications, 2003.

Willis, Browne, *A Survey of the Cathedrals of York, Durham, Carlisle, Chester, Man, Lichfield, Hereford, Worcester, Gloucester and Bristol--: Giving an Account of Their Foundations, Builders, Antient Monuments, and Inscriptions; Endowments, Alienations, Sales of Lands, Patronages. Dates of Consecration, Admission, Preferment, Deaths, Burials, and Epitaphs of the Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Precentors, Chancellors, Treasurers, Archdeacons, and Prebendaries, in Every Stall Belonging to Them. With an Exact Account of All the Churches and Chapels in Each Diocese; Distinguished under Their Proper Archdeaconries and Deanries; the Patrons of Them, to What Religious Houses Impropriated, and to What Saints Many of Them Dedicated. The Whole Extracted from Numerous Collections out of the Registers of Every Particular See, Old Wills, Records in the Tower, and Rolls Chapel: And Illustrated with 20 Curious Draughts of the Ichnographies, and Uprights of Every Cathedral; Newly Taken to Rectify the Erroneous Representations of Them in the Monasticon, and Other Authors*. London: R. Gosling, 1727.

Wilson, Barbara, and Francis Mee, *The Medieval Parish Churches of York: The Pictorial Evidence*. York: York Archaeological Trust, 1998.

Wilson, Christopher, *The Gothic Cathedral: The Architecture of the Great Church 1130-1530*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1990.

Wilton, Andrew, "Post tenebras lux: J.M.W. Turner, James Wyatt and the importance of stained glass", *The Burlington Magazine* 154, no.1310: 322-329.

Withington, Phil, "Views from the Bridge: Revolution and Restoration in Seventeenth-Century York." *Past and Present* 170 (2001): 121-51.

Woodforde, Christopher, *The Stained Glass of New College, Oxford*. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

Woodward, Donald, *Men at Work: Labourers and Building Craftsmen in the Towns of Northern England, 1450-1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Woolf, Daniel, "Images of the Antiquary in Seventeenth-Century England." Chap. 2 In *Visions of Antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries of London, 1707-2007*, edited by Susan M. Pearce, 11-43. London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 2007.

Wrightson, Keith, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain, 1470-1750*. London: Penguin, 2002.

Web-native resources not otherwise listed

For Tong Hall dates see

<http://www.britishlistedbuildings.co.uk/en-337209-tong-hall>

<http://www.measuringworth.com>

Grinling Gibbons in *A Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain, 1660-1851*

hosted by the Henry Moore Foundation at

<http://217.204.55.158/henrymoore/sculptor/browserecord.php?-action=browse&-ecid=1062>

<http://www.worshipfulglaziers.com>

For Cardinal Wolsey's tomb, see

<http://collections.rmg.co.uk/collections/objects/119543.html>

Entry for Dean John Fountayne in

<http://venn.lib.cam.ac.uk>

University of York interdisciplinary AHRC project, *St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster: visual & political culture 1292-1941*

<https://www.virtualststephens.org.uk/>