

York Minster's Chapter House and its Painted Glass Narratives

Volume 1 of 3

Ann Hilary Moxon

PhD

University of York

History of Art

December 2017

Abstract

This thesis focuses on the late thirteenth-century narrative glazing scheme of the chapter house in York Minster and the political and religious context of its design. Created as an intrinsic and integrated part of one of the most elaborate and important buildings in the period, the glass has suffered interventions affecting both its appearance and the positions of its narrative panels. By examining the glass in the context of contemporary visual and textual material, it has been possible to reconstruct the original order of the panels and to identify the selection of episodes the lives of the saints, some for the first time. The study has demonstrated the extent to which the iconography was rooted in liturgy and theology relevant to the period which, in turn, reflected the priorities of a dominant group among the active members of Chapter for whose use the building was constructed and, by extension, the contemporary Church. Further, the glass shows strong Mariological themes which reflected features in the rest of the decorative scheme and the architecture of the chapter house, indicating that the glazing scheme may have been conceived as part of the architectural whole.

The conclusions are supported by parallel research into the prosopography of the contemporary Chapter which additionally suggests that the conception of the programme may have had its roots in the baronial wars of the 1260s.

Table of Contents

Volume 1

Abstract	3
List of Tables	5
Acknowledgements	6
Declaration	8
Chapters	9
Abbreviations	11
Glossary	12

Volume 2

Appendix A	13
Appendix B	14
Appendix C	15
Appendix D	19
Appendix E	19

Volume 3

Figures	20
Bibliography	25

List of Tables:

Table 2.1:	The locations of the most easily identifiable panels in CHs2	110
Table 2.2:	The locations of the less certain panels in CHs2	112
Table 2.3:	Suggested original locations of the panels in CHs2	114
Table 2.4:	The suggested sequence for the more secure identifications and locations in Chn2	116
Table 2.5:	The suggested sequence for Option 1 (CHn2:26 with an original A and CHn2:28 with an original B border)	119
Table 2.6:	The suggested sequence for Option 2 (CHn2:26 with an original B and CHn2:28 with an original A border)	119
Table 3.1:	Panels associated visually and/or thematically in each window	139

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to so many people for helping me with this project.

My supervisors, Professor Jane Hawkes and Dr Jeanne Nuechterlein, rescued the thesis at a difficult time and set it on track. I cannot thank them enough for their professionalism, intellectual rigour and their generosity of spirit. In this bracket I also include Sarah Brown, both in her capacity as my Thesis Advisory Panel member and as Director of York Glaziers Trust. Professor Christopher Norton's generosity in sharing his current research into the architecture of the Minster has been of enormous assistance.

For other academic support, in alphabetical order, I am grateful to Aileen Bloomer, the late Professor Barrie Dobson, Oliver Fearon, Dr John Gough, Dr Louise Hampson, Dr Stuart Harrison, Dr Katherine Lewis, Dr Chloe Morgan, Professor Robert Swanson and Mark Williamson. I obviously take full responsibility for the use I have made of their valuable advice.

For practical assistance, I thank, above all, Nick Teed and Anna Milsom for their photography, Nick for his refinement of the images in the run up to the final printing and Anna for her editing of the photographs and her advice on how to determine the age of glass. At York Minster Library and Archives, I have been helped by Peter Young, Steven Newman and Kirsty Mitchell. At York Minster, as well as Chapter, I should like to thank Andrew Arroll, John David, Paul Greene and the Scaffolding Team.

For information and material, I am grateful to Greer Ashman, Dr James Hillson, Dr David Johnson, Ivan Martin, Jill and the late Hugh Murray, Beverley Parrish, Professor Virginia Raguin, Dr James Richardson and Dr Zoe Robinson. For practical assistance with the mysteries of IT, I thank Wendy Adams, Izzy Armstong-Frost, Mike Dunn, Mark Parvin and Matt Pidcock; for additional

photography I am grateful to Geoff Green and Katie Harrison, and, for proof-reading, Veronica Wallace.

For personal support, I am indebted to Carol Clarke, Jonathan and Adi French, Ros Ibbison, Wendy Johnson, Linnie Marris, Susan Mason, John Rushton, and especially Howard Gregg, Dr Heather Swanson and Dr Dorothy Nott. Finally, this project would not have been possible without the expertise and dedication of Mr John Mancey-Jones and the Breast Cancer team at York District Hospital nor without the care of Dr Stephen Bilsborough at Priory Medical Group, York.

Above all, I thank my husband, Chris Adams, for his practical assistance, for his patience, for his encouragement and for staying cheerful throughout.

Declaration:

I declare that this thesis is a presentation of original work and I am the sole author. This work has not previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, University. All sources are acknowledged as References.

Chapters

<u>Introduction</u>	27
1.1 Aims of the project	32
1.2 Methodology	33
1.3 The body of the research	37
<u>Chapter 1: The History of the Chapter House and its Glass</u>	39
1.1 Introduction	39
1.2 Patronage and construction	40
1.2.1. Key dates in the Chapter House construction	40
1.2.2. Responsibility for the project	46
1.2.3 Motivation: a focus on the transepts	53
1.2.4 Suggestions for the management of the project after Dean Langton's death	57
1.3 Introduction to the glazing interventions	60
1.4 Analysis of the glazing interventions	62
1.4.1 From installation to the testimony of James Torre, 1690-91	63
1.4.2 From James Torre to the description by John Browne, 1690-91 to 1844-45	69
1.4.3 From John Browne, 1844-45, to the descriptions by J.W. Knowles, 1890-1920	73
1.4.3.1 The chapter house restoration of 1844-45	75
1.4.3.2 The plan to copy the glass	76
1.4.3.3 The mid-nineteenth century	77
1.4.4..From J.W. Knowles to the reinsertion campaign after World War II.	78
1.4.4.1.The re-leading exercise, 1929-32	79
1.4.4.2 The reinsertion of the chapter house windows	81
1.5 Conclusion	86
<u>Chapter 2: Reconstructions of the original windows</u>	91
2.1 Introduction	91
2.2 Three straightforward windows: CHs3, CHn4 and CHs4	95
2.2.1 CHs3: Narrative of Paul	95
2.2.2 CHn4: Narrative of Katherine of Alexandria	97
2.2.3 CHs4: Narratives of the Five Saints	99
2.3 Four problematic windows: CH1, CHs2, CHn2 and CHn3	102
2.3.1 CH1: The Passion and Resurrection window	102
2.3.2 CHs2: Narrative of Peter	107
2.3.2.1 Reconstruction	109
2.3.3 CHn2: Narrative of the Virgin	115
2.3.4 CHn3: Narrative of William of York	122
2.3.4.1 Reconstruction	125
2.4 Comments on the heraldic scheme	131
2.5 Conclusion	134
<u>Chapter 3: A unified glazing scheme</u>	137
3.1 Introduction	137

3.2	Theological influences	137
3.2.1	Narrative structures: central positions (4c and 6c)	138
3.2.2	Narrative structures: corner positions (2e and 8a)	147
3.2.3	Narrative structures: corner positions (2a/b and 8e)	155
3.2.4	Possible theological underpinnings	160
3.2.5	Deliberate or coincidental?	166
3.3	Liturgical influences	172
3.3.1	The narrative of Peter	172
3.3.2	The Assumption of the Virgin Mary	176
3.4	Conclusion	183
<u>Chapter 4: A Marian and virginal focus</u>		187
4.1	Introduction	187
4.2	Focus on the Virgin Mary	187
4.2.1	The importance of CHn2: the Life of the Virgin	187
4.2.2	The relationship between CHn2 and CH1	191
4.2.3	The Virgin Mary in the painted decoration of the chapter house	194
4.2.3.1	Flora and foliage	197
4.2.3.2	Construction analogies	202
4.2.4	The Virgin Mary: a pervasive theme	205
4.3	The links between the virgin saints and the Virgin Mary	206
4.3.1	Katherine of Alexandria	208
4.3.2	Margaret of Antioch	214
4.3.3	Significance of the location of the female saints	217
4.3.4	Virginal associations of the male saints	219
4.3.5	Theological underpinning	222
4.4	Sculptural context	224
4.5	Architectural context	231
4.6	Reassessment of the Five Saints Window	238
4.7	Conclusion	241
<u>Conclusion</u>		245
C.1	The windows	245
C.1.1.	The narrative of the Passion and Resurrection	246
C.1.2.	The narrative of St Peter	249
C.1.3.	The narrative of the Virgin Mary	251
C.1.4.	The narrative of St Katherine	254
C.1.5	The narratives of the Five Saints	257
C.1.6.	The narrative of St Paul	258
C.1.7.	The narrative of St William	260
C.2.	The context	262
C.3.	Future research	268

Abbreviations

BAA	British Archaeological Association
BL	British Library
BLTT	British Library Thomason Tract
CCR	Calendar of Close Rolls
CPR	Calendar of Patent Rolls
CVMA	Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi
DBA	Thomas Woodcock and Sarah Flowers, <i>Dictionary of British Arms: Medieval Ordinary</i> . Vol. 1 (London: The Society of Antiquaries, 1992-2014)
FYMAR	<i>Friends of York Minster Annual Reports</i>
HMSO	Her Majesty's Stationery Office
JBAA	<i>Journal of the British Archaeological Association</i>
RCHME	Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England
SPAB	Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
TRHS	<i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i>
Volume 2	This is used in the footnotes in Volume 1 to denote the Appendices in Volume 2 of this thesis
YAJ	<i>Yorkshire Archaeological Journal</i>
YAS	York Archaeological Society
YCL	York City Libraries
YMA	York Minster Archives

Glossary

- “Cloak” and “tunic” In Appendix C, quotations of descriptions of garments give the terminology as used by the original writer which means that there is occasional inconsistency. Note, in particular, Knowles normally uses “tunic” for the long undergarment and “robe” or “cloak” for the outer garment. Very occasionally he uses the word “robe” for the undergarment. To attempt to avoid confusion, in words written by the author for the current work, “tunic” is used for the undergarment and “cloak” for the outer garment.
- “Light-type” Throughout the thesis, the term “light-type” has been coined to identify the two lights in each window which share similar grisaille and border designs.
- “Shrine-like tomb” The term “shrine-like tomb” has been adopted to indicate the higher structure that was constructed at some stage in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century over William’s tomb in the nave, and distinguishes this from the “shrine” of all or part of his relics at the east end of the Minster after 1284.
- “Strip feature” Also throughout the thesis, in connection with windows CHn2 and CHs2, the term “strip feature” has been coined to identify the glazing features which occur outside the medallion edge but inside the inner iron rectangle in each panel.
- “Textual affiliates” The term has been devised to avoid any suggestion of direct source material. Madeline H. Caviness, “Biblical Stories in Windows: Were they Bibles for the Poor?” in *The Bible in the Middle Ages: Its Influence on Literature and Art*, ed. Bernard S. Levy (Tempe, Ariz: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1992), 127 uses the term “visual affiliates” in the same context. This term has been modified to create a term “textual affiliates” to indicate an unproven relationship between the images and relevant texts.

Volume 2

Contents

Appendices

Appendix A: Chronological list of identified repair projects and descriptions of the chapter house windows, together with transcriptions of the Fabric Rolls and Accounts for the main interventions

<u>Overview</u>	279
<u>Appendix A.1. Entry in the Fabric Rolls for the year 1399 for work done by John Burgh</u>	282
<u>Appendix A.2. Entry in the Fabric Rolls for the year 1582-83 for work done by Robert Thompson</u>	282
<u>Appendix A.3. Entry in the Fabric Rolls for the year 1611-12 for work done by Robert Thompson</u>	282
<u>Appendix A.4. Accounting extracts from the Fabric Rolls for 1661</u>	282
<u>Appendix A.5. Work might be fabric rolls and/or accounts by Edward Crosby, 1670</u>	282
<u>Appendix A.6. Work by Charles Crosby in the Chapter House, 1693-97</u>	283
A.6.1. Article of Agreement between Charles Crosby and Robert Oates, dated 2 January 1692 [1693]	284
A.6.2. Extracts of the receipted account in the Fabric Rolls presented by Charles Crosby 12 October 1693	285
A.6.3. Extract from the Fabric Accounts indicating the payment for the bill of 12 October 1693	286
A.6.4. Extract from the Fabric Rolls of a receipted account presented by Charles Crosby relating to work completed June to October 1695	287
A.6.5. Entry in the Fabric Accounts for 1695 relating to a payment of £28 1s 2d	288
A.6.6. Entry in the Fabric Accounts for 1697 relating to a payment of £12 12s 5d	288
<u>Appendix A.7. Bill presented by William Peckitt in 1757/8</u>	288
<u>Appendix A.8. Extracts from the Fabric Rolls relating to work carried out in 1762-71 by Thomas Sanderson</u>	288
A.8.1. Fabric Rolls for 1762-63	289
A.8.2. Fabric Rolls for 1767-68	290
A.8.3. Fabric Rolls for 1768-69	290
A.8.4. Fabric Rolls for 1770-71 (first account)	290
A.8.5. Fabric Rolls for 1770-71 (second account)	290

<u>Appendix A.9. Letter of Sydney Smirke to Revd S. Creyke, Chairman of the Restoration Subcommittee, dated 4 September 1844</u>	290
<u>Appendix A.10. Extract from the Fabric Rolls for work by William Noton in 1844</u>	292
A.10.1. Account of William Noton for glazing work carried out in August 1844	292
A.10.2. Account of William Noton, paid 14 November 1844	292
<u>Appendix A.11. Material relating to the 1855-56 repairs</u>	292
A:11.1. Account of William Noton, 1855-56	292
A:11.2. Extract from the Hornby Scrapbooks commenting on the Noton repairs of 1855	295
<u>Appendix A.12. Extract from the Fabric Rolls relating to work by Joseph Robinson in 1882 and 1885</u>	295
A.12.1. Account of Joseph Robinson, 1882	295
A.12.2. Account of Joseph Robinson, 1885	296
<u>Appendix A.13. Interventions in the course of the re-leading exercise, 1929-32</u>	296
A.13.1. CHn2	296
A.13.2. CHn3	298
A.13.3. CHn4	298
A.13.4. CHs2	299
A.13.5. CHs3	300
A.13.6. CHs4	301
<u>Appendix A14. Transcription of the description of the narrative panels in the chapter house glass from the 1690-91 account by James Torre: YMA L1/7, James Torre, 'The Antiquities of York Minster Collected out of the Records of the Said Church and Some Other Authorities', 1690-91, 123-30</u>	301
Window identified as CHn4: Katherine of Alexandria	301
Window identified as CHn3: William of York	303
Window identified as CHn2: the Virgin Mary	305
Window identified as CH1: Passion and Resurrection	307
Window identified as CHs2: Peter	308
Window identified as CHs3: Paul	310
Window identified as CHs4: the Five Saints	311

Appendix B: The Window Catalogue

<u>Key for Appendix B</u>	315
<u>Window descriptions:</u>	3175
<u>B.1: Passion and Resurrection (CH1)</u>	317
Visual features	317

<i>Original panel sequences</i>	318
<i>History of the window</i>	320
<u>B.2: The Life of the Virgin Mary (CHn2)</u>	323
<i>Visual features</i>	323
<i>Original panel sequences</i>	325
<i>History of the window</i>	328
<u>B.3: St William of York (CHn3)</u>	333
<i>Visual features</i>	333
<i>Original panel sequences</i>	336
<i>History of the window</i>	337
<u>B.4: St Katherine of Alexandria (CHn4)</u>	345
<i>Visual features</i>	345
<i>Original panel sequences</i>	345
<i>History of the window</i>	348
<u>B.5: St Peter (CHs2)</u>	351
<i>Visual features</i>	351
<i>Original panel sequences</i>	353
<i>History of the window</i>	355
<u>B.6: St Paul (CHs3)</u>	359
<i>Visual features</i>	359
<i>Original panel sequences</i>	361
<i>History of the window</i>	362
<u>B.7: The Five Saints (Saints Margaret, Nicholas, Thomas Becket, John the Baptist and Edmund)(Chs4)</u>	365
<i>Visual features</i>	365
<i>Original panel sequences</i>	368
<i>History of the window</i>	369

Appendix C: The Panel Catalogue

<u>Key for Appendix C</u>	373
<u>CH1: Passion and Resurrection</u>	375
CH1:6: (Probably) the Agony in the Garden	375
CH1:7: Christ healing Malchus's ear	379
CH1:8: Judas plotting with the High Priests	383
CH1:9: Noli me Tangere	387
CH1:10: The Harrowing of Hell	391
CH1:16: The Flagellation of Christ	395
CH1:17: The Arrest of Christ	399
CH1:18: The Crucifixion of Christ	403
CH1:19: The Entombment	407
CH1:20: Via Crucis: carrying the cross to Calvary	411
CH1:26: The Three Marys at the Tomb	415
CH1:27: Christ in Judgement	419
CH1:28: The Resurrection of Christ	423
CH1:29: Doubting Thomas touches the wounds of the risen Christ	427
CH1:30: Entry into Jerusalem	431
CH1:36: The Ascension	435
CH1:37: The Deposition	441
CH1:38: The Coronation of the Virgin	445

CH1:39: Raising the Dead at the Last Judgement	449
CH1:40: Pentecost	453
<u>CHn2: The Life of the Virgin Mary</u>	457
CHn2:6: The Annunciation	457
CHn2:7: The High Priest healing the blind from Jerusalem or the Jew watching the funeral procession (Option 2)	465
CHn2:8: The Visitation	473
CHn2:9: The Nativity	479
CHn2:10: The Magi on horseback following the star	483
CHn2:16: The Adoration of the Magi	487
CHn2:17: The Magi before Herod	493
CHn2:18: The Purification	499
CHn2:19: The Virgin and Child receiving gifts from the Magi	505
CHn2:20: The Angel appearing to the Shepherds	511
CHn2:26: Herod observing the Massacre of the Innocents	517
CHn2:27: The Flight into Egypt	523
CHn2:28: The Assumption of the soul of the Virgin	525
CHn2:29: The Apostles witnessing the Assumption	533
CHn2:30: The Magi warned in a dream	539
CHn2:36: The Coronation of the Virgin	545
CHn2:37: The Funeral Cortège	551
CHn2:38: The moment of the Virgin's death	559
CHn2:39: The Apostles at the Virgin's deathbed	565
CHn2:40: Christ taking Mary's soul	571
<u>CHn3: St William of York</u>	577
CHn3:6: The Ouse Bridge Miracle	577
CHn3:7: <i>Lost [Suggestion] William dies</i>	583
CHn3:8: Enthronement	585
CHn3:9: Besing overwhelms Ralph	591
CHn3:10: [Suggestion] A trumpeting angel	595
CHn3:16: Ralph and Besing fighting	597
CHn3:17: [Suggestion] William greeted outside the Minster	601
CHn3:18: Ralph's blindness cured	607
CHn3:19: Woman brought to the tomb on a cart	613
CHn3:20: [Suggestion] Woman on the cart cured	619
CHn3:26: Blind girl from Leeds healed	623
CHn3:27: <i>Lost [Suggestion] A single miracle panel, eg healing with mortar, curing lepers, curing the mad</i>	620
CHn3:28: Several people who are crippled or dumb are healed	631
CHn3:29: <i>Lost [Suggestion] either a double miracle or a the first part of a single miracle</i>	637
CHn3:30: William is canonised or otherwise honoured/welcome or his Translation	639
CHn3:36: William's corpse is unscathed	645
CHn3:37: An early part of the drowning boy miracle or William comes to the aid of sailors	651
CHn3:38: William saves a drowning boy	657
CHn3:39: A boy drowns in the well and is shown revived	663
CHn3:40: <i>Lost [Suggestion] Second part of a double miracle</i>	669

or a single miracle

<u>CHn4: St Katherine of Alexandria</u>	671
CHn4:6: An angel visits Katherine in prison	671
CHn4:7: Katherine protesting to Maxentius	677
CHn4:8: Katherine escorted to prison	683
CHn4:9: Beasts brought to be sacrificed	687
CHn4:10: Maxentius and advisers hatching the plot	693
CHn4:16: Katherine brought from prison	699
CHn4:17: Messenger and philosophers	703
CHn4:18: Philosophers presented to Maxentius	707
CHn4:19: Maxentius sends a messenger to gather philosophers	711
CHn4:20: Katherine faces Maxentius and the philosophers	715
CHn4:26: Katherine returned to prison	721
CHn4:27: Katherine before Maxentius	727
CHn4:28: The scourging of Katherine	733
CHn4:29: Philosophers thrown into flames	739
CHn4:30: Maxentius leaves the City	745
CHn4:36: Martyrdom of Katherine	749
CHn4:37: Christ visits Katherine in prison with angels	755
CHn4:38: Katherine saved from the wheels	759
CHn4:39: The Empress and Porphyrius visit Katherine in prison	763
CHn4:40: Katherine's soul carried to heaven by angels	769
<u>CHs2: St Peter</u>	773
CHs2:6: Christ's selection of Peter in "on this rock"	773
CHs2:7: Peter healing with his shadow	779
CHs2:8: Peter and John before the High Priest	785
CHs2:9: Christ leads Peter and Andrew away	791
CHs2:10: The Call of Peter and Andrew	797
CHs2:16: Christ asks Peter to walk on water	803
CHs2:17: Ananias and Sapphira bring their reduced sale proceeds to Peter, or the good followers bring their sale proceeds to Peter	807
CHs2:18: The cripple at the Gate asks for Peter's help	813
CHs2:19: The cripple at the Gate is healed	817
CHs2:20: A preaching scene? Or specifically Signs and wonders were done among the people [...] in Solomon's Portico?	823
CHs2:26: Simon Magus falling between Peter and Nero	829
CHs2:27: Simon Magus flying before Peter and Nero	835
CHs2:28: Angel leading Peter to the gates of the city	839
CHs2:29: Angel freeing Peter from prison	845
CHs2:30: The punishment of Ananias and Sapphira	851
CHs2:36: The Vision of Cornelius	857
CHs2:37: The Baptism of Cornelius	863
CHs2:38: Peter and Paul before Nero and Simon Magus	869
CHs2:39: Peter arrested and brought before Nero or Agrippa	875
CHs2:40: The Crucifixion of Peter	879

<u>CHs3: St Paul</u>	883
CHs3:6: Paul given letters by the High Priest	883
CHs3:7: The Conversion on the road to Damascus	889
CHs3:8: Paul led blind into the City	895
CHs3:9: Paul baptised	901
CHs3:10: Paul preaching to the Jews in Damascus	907
CHs3:16: Paul fleeing from Damascus	913
CHs3:17: Barnabas with Paul meeting Peter in Jerusalem	919
CHs3:18: Paul stoned in Lystra	925
CHs3:19: Paul taken from the city as if dead	931
CHs3:20: Paul reviving with his disciples	935
CHs3:26: The evil spirit driven from the slave girl in Philippi	941
CHs3:27: The slave girl's owner taking Paul and the slave girl to the Magistrate	947
CHs3:28: Paul beaten in Philippi	953
CHs3:29: Paul freed by the earthquake in Philippi: the gaoler dismayed	957
CHs3:30: The Magistrates in Philippi begging Paul to leave	961
CHs3:36: Fall of Patroclus or Eutychus	965
CHs3:37: Revival of Patroclus or Eutychus	971
CHs3:38: Shipwreck on Malta	977
CHs3:39: Miracle of the viper	961
CHs3:40: Martyrdom	985
<u>CHs4: The Five Saints (Sts Thomas Becket, Margaret, Nicholas, John the Baptist and Edmund)</u>	991
CHs4:6: Thomas Becket consecrated Archbishop	991
CHs4:7: Margaret facing Olybrius	997
CHs4:8: Nicholas giving alms to the three girls	1003
CHs4:9: John in prison, greeted by angel holding palm leaf	1009
CHs4:10: Edmund rides out to meet the Danes	1013
CHs4:16: Thomas Becket facing the King over the criminous clerk	1019
CHs4:17: Margaret emerging from the dragon	1025
CHs4:18: Nicholas saving sailors in a storm	1031
CHs4:19: Salome dances for Herod	1037
CHs4:20: Edmund shot at with arrows	1041
CHs4:26: Thomas Becket leaving or, more probably, embarking to return to England	1045
CHs4:27: Margaret prevailing over the dragon	1051
CHs4:28: The Host murdering three clerics	1055
CHs4:29: John the Baptist martyred	1061
CHs4:30: <i>Lost [Suggestion] The Martyrdom of Edmund</i>	1065
CHs4:36: Thomas Becket martyred	1069
CHs4:37: Margaret martyred	1075
CHs4:38: Nicholas bringing three clerics back to life	1081
CHs4:39: Salome handing Herodias John's head in a dish	1087
CHs4:40: The discovery of Edmund's head	1091

Appendix D:	1095
Summary of the features associated with the three Workshops involved in the production of the chapter house glass	
Appendix E:	1099
Summary of the identifications, current locations and suggested original locations of the narrative panels in the chapter house glazing	

Volume 3:

List of Figures:

- Figure 1: External views of the east end of the Minster: 1111
1a: Reconstruction of the Minster, ca. 1290, showing the Chapter House and Vestibule (Stuart Harrison and Christopher Norton, *York Minster: An Illustrated Architectural History 627-c1500* (York: The Chapter of York, 2015), 37
1b: Current view of the east end of the Minster (photograph: Hilary Moxon)
- Figure 2: External views of the Chapter Houses at: 1112
2a: Lincoln Cathedral (photograph: Hilary Moxon)
2b: Westminster Abbey (photograph: Alec and/or Marlene Hartill)
2c: Lichfield Cathedral (photograph: Alec and/or Marlene Hartill)
2d: Salisbury Cathedral (photograph: Hilary Moxon)
- Figure 3: Internal stalls in the Chapter Houses at: 1114
3a: York Minster (photograph: Hilary Moxon)
3b: Lincoln Cathedral (photograph: Hilary Moxon)
3c: Westminster Abbey (photograph: Alec and/or Marlene Hartill)
- Figure 4: Window locations and design: 1116
4a: Floorplan of the Chapter House, showing the identifications of the narratives in the windows (by Hilary Moxon, adapted from Plan of York Minster: ground level, drawn by Wladislav Masiewisz, ca. 1977, courtesy of Crown Copyright, NMR, from Sarah Brown, *Our Magnificent Fabrick: York Minster, an Architectural History, c. 1220-1500* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2003), 267
4b: Sample window design, adapted from John Britton, 1819, *The History and Antiquities of the Metropolitan Church at York*, Pl. XXXII: CHn3, adapted by Hilary Moxon
- Figure 5: The current appearance of the Chapter House windows (all photographs: Nick Teed and Anna Milsom): 1118
5a: Passion and Resurrection (CH1)
5b: The Virgin Mary (CHn2)
5c: William of York (CHn3)
5d: Katherine of Alexandria (CHn4)
5e: Peter (CHs2)
5f: Paul (CHs3)
5g: Five saints (Margaret, Nicholas, Thomas Becket, John the Baptist and Edmund)

Figure 6:	Band windows across CHn2, CHn3 and CHn4 (photograph: Hilary Moxon)	1125
Figure 7:	Window and architectural features from St-Urbain, Troyes: 7a: Sample narrative panel, indicating the band window from St-Urbain, window 4 (photograph: Hilary Moxon) 7b: Piscina in the choir at St-Urbain (photograph: Katie Harrison) 7c: Tracery in a sample window at St-Urbain (photograph: Hilary Moxon) 7d: Crenellation in the piscina at St-Urbain (photograph:Hilary Moxon)	1126
Figure 8:	Drawing of William de Langton's monument by William Dugdale, 1641, from Dugdale <i>Book of Yorkshire Arms</i> , folio 111v (photograph courtesy of the College of Arms)	1128
Figure 9:	The geographical relationship between the Archbishop's Palace and the Chapter House and visible external features: 9a: Extract of Map showing the relationship between the Archbishop's Palace and the Chapter House, adapted from Peter Addyman, (ed.) <i>British Historic Towns Atlas</i> , <i>York</i> . (Witney: Lovell Johns Ltd, 2015), Map 6 9b: View of the Chapter House from the direction of the site of the Archbishop's Palace (photograph: Hilary Moxon) 9c: Drawing showing the external visibility of a sample band window, from Browne, <i>History</i> , Vol. 2, Pl. 76, identified as CHs3 by Hilary Moxon	1129
Figure 10:	Plan showing the distribution of features in the Transepts and the Chapter House which were associated with Walter de Gray, William de Langton and John de Craucumbe. Based on a reconstruction of the floorplan by Stuart Harrison and Christopher Norton, <i>York Minster: An Illustrated Architectural History 627-c1500</i> (York: The Chapter of York, 2015), 21	1131
Figure 11:	The <i>Agnus Dei</i> boss in the ceiling of the former Chapel to St Edward the Confessor in the south transept: 11a: Photograph: Geoff Green 11b: Drawing by John Browne, <i>History</i> , Vol.1, Pl. XL	1132
Figure 12:	Label stop on the east-facing side of the west wall of the north transept: 12a: Label stop in the north transept (photograph: Nick Teed) 12b: One of two "Sculptures in the North Transept", in John Browne, <i>History</i> , Vol. 2, Pl. LVI 12c: Painted decoration seen on the badge at the base of	1133

the label stop by John Browne, *History*, Vol. 1, 76

- Figure 13: Donors carved in the piscina at St-Urbain, Troyes: 1134
13a: Pope Urban IV
13b: Cardinal Ancher Pantaléon (photographs: Hilary Moxon)
- Figure 14: *Agnus Dei* bosses in the Chapter House complex: 1135
14a In the centre of the Chapter House ceiling (photograph: Hilary Moxon)
14b. In the corner of the Vestibule (photograph: Hilary Moxon)
- Figure 15: Plan showing the approximate location of chantries 1136
created in the Transepts by or for canons and archbishops involved in the Minster during the thirteenth century. Based on a reconstruction of the floorplan by Stuart Harrison and Christopher Norton, *York Minster: An Illustrated Architectural History 627-c1500* (York: The Chapter of York, 2015), 21 and from information in Stuart Harrison and Christopher Norton, *An Architectural History of York Minster c. 1070-1220* (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, forthcoming), Part 5, Chapter II.
- Figure 16: Coloured etching of the west side of the Chapter House 1137
from Drake's *Eboracum* (1736), facing page 476
- Figure 17: Figures of kings and archbishops formerly painted on the 1138
west wall of the chapter house, recorded by John Carter in 1790 (BL, Add Ms 29929, fol. 100) adapted from Sarah Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, Plate 2.2, 245
- Figure 18: Shield of Amaury de Montfort in CHs2: D1 (lower) 1138
(photograph: Hilary Moxon)
- Figure 19: The interior of the Chapter House, ca. 1795, from Joseph 1139
Halfpenny, *Gothic ornaments in the Cathedral Church of York*, Pl. 102
- Figure 20: Drawing of CHn3, the William Window, by John Britton, 1140
1819, *The History and Antiquities of the Metropolitan Church at York*, Pl. XXXII
- Figure 21: "Chapter House, restored 1843 [sic]," in The Restoration 1141
of York Minster (February, 1899), 15
- Figure 22: "Example of the Exterior decay in parts of the Tracery and 1142
Mullions of the Chapter-House fractured by expansion of the iron saddlebars, now restored," in York Minster Restoration: Eighth Occasional Paper (Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1905), 39, identified as CHn3 by Hilary Moxon

- Figure 23: St William Window, photographed by W.Watson, ca. 1915 1143
(YMA, Green Photographic Collection © Dean and Chapter of York)
- Figure 24: Appearance of the windows after the re-leading exercise 1144
and before World War II (all photographs from YMA,
Green Photographic Collection):
24a: Passion and Resurrection (then known as the
Passion, 58)
24b: The Virgin Mary (then known as the Early Life of
Christ and the Death of the Virgin Mary, 57)
24c: William of York (then known as Thomas Becket, 56)
24d: Katherine of Alexandria, 55
24e: Peter, 59
24f: Paul, 60
24g: The Five Saints (Thomas Becket, then known as
Denis, Margaret, Nicholas, John the Baptist and Edmund,
61)
- Figure 25: “Sketch to accompany Para. 3 of the York Glass Report 1151
1928, to show the Quantity of Glass covered by the Lead
now in use” (SPAB York Glass File 1927-30)
- Figure 26: Reconstructions of the suggested original narrative 1152
sequences:
26a: Reconstruction of the Passion and Resurrection
window (CH1)
26b: Reconstruction of the Virgin Mary window (CHn2)
26c: Reconstruction of the William window (CHn3)
26d: Reconstruction of the Katherine of Alexandria
window (CHn4)
26e: Reconstruction of the Peter window (CHs2)
26f: Confirmation of the reconstruction of the Paul
window (CHs3)
26g: Reconstruction of the Five Saints window, showing
Margaret, Nicholas, Thomas Becket, John the Baptist
and Edmund (CHs4)
(all reconstructions, except CHn4, by Hilary Moxon,
based on photographs by Nick Teed and Anna Milsom.
Reconstruction of CHn4 by Chloe Morgan).
- Figure 27: Representations of headgear denoting “Jewishness” or 1160
“otherness” in the Minster glass (photographs: David
O’Connor for 16a, Nick Teed and Anna Milsom for 16b-
e):
27a: Image of the leading Philosopher depicted as a Jew
in a Katherine narrative in n23:2b, York Minster
27b: Type-1: Cap denoting “Jewishness”
27c: Type-2: Cap denoting “Jewishness”
27d: Type-3: Cap denoting “Jewishness”
27e: Type-4: Cap denoting “Jewishness” or “otherness”

Figure 28:	Image of the parody of the funeral of the Virgin in n25:1a, York Minster (photograph: Hilary Moxon)	1161
Figure 29:	Effect of pillars supporting the Chapter House ceiling (photograph: Hilary Moxon)	1162
Figure 30:	The trumeau and inscription at the entrance to the Chapter House: 30a: Trumeau Virgin and sight lines to CH1 and CHn2 from the Vestibule (photograph: Hilary Moxon) 30b: Inscription, "Ut rosa flos florum sic est domus ista domorum", at the entrance to the Chapter House (photograph: Hilary Moxon) 30c: Plan indicating the approximate location of the inscription in the floor of the Chapter House at Westminster Abbey, "Ut rosa flos florum sic est domus ista domorum", based on the diagram in Lawrence Keen, "The chapter house decorated tile pavement," in <i>Westminster Abbey Chapter House: the history, art and architecture of 'a chapter house beyond compare'</i> , eds. Warwick Rodwell and Richard Mortimer (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 2010), 213, marked in red by Hilary Moxon	1162
Figure 31:	Panel in St-Urbain showing flower heads in roundels (Bay 0:4a) (photograph: Hilary Moxon)	1164
Figure 32:	Three sample foliage bosses from the Chapter House ceiling (photographs: Hilary Moxon)	1164
Figure 33:	Entrance to the Chapter House complex from the north transept, showing possible Marian fleurs-de-lys (photograph: Hilary Moxon)	1165
Figure 34:	Imagery associated with Katherine: image of the towers indicating Katherine's prison in n23:5a (photograph: David O'Connor)	1165
Figure 35:	Diagram showing the relationship between the ceiling panels over the entrance to the Chapter House, and glazing and the group of female saints (based on a photograph by Hilary Moxon)	1166
Figure 36:	Three sample carvings from the Chapter House stalls (photographs: Hilary Moxon)	1167

<u>Bibliography:</u>	1168
<u>Primary sources</u>	1168
Unpublished primary sources	1168
Published primary sources	1171
Electronic primary sources	1178
<u>Secondary sources</u>	1184
Printed secondary sources	1184
Electronic secondary sources	1220

INTRODUCTION

The chapter house is arguably one of the most impressive parts of York Minster, and “may be accounted one of the Glories [...] famous for the Curiosity of its Work”.¹ It was completed towards the end of the thirteenth century, with the first unambiguous record of its existence being the account of a document signed “in novo capitulo Ebor” on 22 April 1295.² Most of the oaks for the roof beams were felled in 1288,³ and Sarah Brown has concluded that the design for at least part of the heraldic scheme was completed before John Balliol’s accession to the throne of Scotland in 1292.⁴ It constituted what must have been one of the most significant buildings in medieval England (Figures 1a and b), constructed to an extraordinary degree of precision. In the fifteenth century Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, later to be elevated as Pope Pius II, praised the Minster, but “especially for a fine lightsome chapel, with shining walls, and small thin wasted pillars quite round”,⁵ which may well have been the chapter house. Its beauty would have satisfied the Augustinian aesthetic that it should provide a sign of heaven,⁶ and met the Thomist standards of “proportion, integrity and clarity”.⁷

¹ YMA L1/7, James Torre, ‘The Antiquities of York Minster Collected out of the Records of the Said Church and Some Other Authorities’, 1690-91, 117.

² *The Register of John le Romeyn, Lord Archbishop of York 1286-1296*, ed. William Brown, Part II, Surtees Society, 128 (Durham: Andrews, 1917), 23.

³ Sarah Brown, ‘Our Magnificent Fabrick’. *York Minster: an Architectural History 1220-1500* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2003), 294-97.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 53.

⁵ Francis Drake, *Eboracum or An Accurate Description and History of the Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of St Peter York from it’s [sic] Foundation to the present year* (York: printed by G. Peacock, 1790), 477. Original text dated 1736.

⁶ Bernard McGinn, “From Admirable Tabernacle to the House of God: Some Theological Reflections on Medieval Architectural Integration,” in *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings*, ed. Virginia Chieffo Raguin, Kathryn Bush and Peter Draper (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 41; Robert J. O’Connell, *Art and the Christian Intelligence in St Augustine* (Cambridge, Mass: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 29.

⁷ Umberto Eco, *The Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas* (London: Radius, 1988), 64-65.

Built in the emerging English polygonal chapter-house type, as at Lincoln, Lichfield, Salisbury and in Westminster Abbey (Figures 2a-d), the chapter house is octagonal in shape, with a high pyramidal roof that almost doubles the exterior height of the building: its ceiling is supported by an ingenious internal suspended timber structure which meant that, unlike contemporary comparators, there was no need for a central pillar. It is around 62ft (18.9m.) in diameter from the glass surfaces⁸ and 66ft 5in. (20.1m.) high into the ceiling.⁹ It was and, for formal occasions still is, used for the administrative meetings of the Chapter at York: each prebendary had his own seat in an articulated niche of ornate carvings, in marked contrast to the simple examples elsewhere (Figures 3a-c). Six seats are incorporated into each of seven sides of the building, with an extra two flanking the entrance on the eighth.

Above each of the seven rows of seats there is a window (Figure 4a), given as “about 46ft high” by “17ft 6in.wide”,¹⁰ all following a similar design (Figure 4b). The main part of each window (Figure 5a-g) consists of five lights, two pairs flanking a central, taller light (marked up the sides by wider mullions), all with decorative, mainly foliate borders, and across which are ranged four rows of narrative panels. The inclusion of these narrative sequences, along with the lack of a central pillar and the structure of the roof, is one of the many features which differentiate York’s chapter house from many others. With the exception of the canopies in the current left-hand light in CHs4, the narrative medallions show variations on a quatrefoil theme, alternated with five rows of

⁸ John Browne, *The History of the Metropolitan Church of St Peter, York: illustrated by extracts from authentic records, by plans, sections and engravings of architectural and sculptural details.* York, Vol. 1 (York: R.Sunter and the author, 1847), 100. Confirmed by laser measurements taken 3 October 2017 with Dr John Gough and Chris Adams.

⁹ Measurement taken 3 August 2017.

¹⁰ John Browne, *Representation and Arms on the Glass in the Windows of York Minster* (Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1917), 33.

grisaille, itself painted with fruit and leaves of identifiable plants.¹¹ Because the narrative and grisaille panels were aligned with each other across the windows, the effect is that of rows of coloured and grisaille glass encircling the building (Figure 6), creating the earliest surviving examples of “band windows” in England.¹² As expected given the date of its creation, all the original glass is painted and glass showing silver stain is the result of later repair and intrusion.

At the top, in the tracery, are the arms of earls and barons of England, surmounted with a royal shield, and surrounded by glazed openings showing mainly floral motifs. Six windows have been repaired on several occasions, while the narrative of the seventh, that to the east facing the grand entrance, exists only as a copy, now in the nave clerestory, with a solitary original panel still in its original window.

This copied window showed scenes from the Passion and Resurrection of Christ (Figure 5a). As shown in Figure 4a, in its original location it was the focus of the surviving windows, which contain episodes from what is described here as Life of the Virgin Mary, and the narratives of St William of York and St Katherine of Alexandria (respectively, CHn2, CHn3 and CHn4 in Figures 5b-d) to the north and Saints Peter and Paul to the south (CHs2 and CHs3, in Figures 5e and f). The final window to the south-west breaks the pattern in that it presents scenes from the lives of five saints, one in each light (CHs4 in Figure 5g). These are now, from the left, Thomas Becket, Margaret of Antioch, Nicholas, John the Baptist and King Edmund. Of these, Nicholas and John the Baptist featured in the relic collection of the Minster as recorded in the mid-

¹¹ Browne also drew images of the grisaille, suggesting that the second and fourth lights all showed a grotesque at the bottom edge, out of the mouths of which the foliage emerged. There is little other evidence of the existence of these figures, Browne, *History*, Vol. 2, Pl. LXXIX.

¹² Richard Marks, “Stained Glass, c. 1200-1400,” in *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England, 1200-1400*, ed. Jonathan Alexander and Paul Binski (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987), 143. For the discussion of earlier examples in France, see Meredith P. Lillich, “The Band Window: a Theory of Origin and Development,” *Gesta*, 9, no.1 (1970): 26-33.

thirteenth century,¹³ but there were altars to Becket and Edmund in what would have been the recently constructed transepts.¹⁴ The significance of the glass is that it is the oldest surviving “comprehensive and unified glazing scheme” in York Minster,¹⁵ and is in marked contrast to the non-narrative glazing in contemporary chapter houses.

In the course of repairs made over the last seven centuries, significant changes have been made to the appearance of the glass. One hundred and five of the one hundred and forty narrative panels have been moved to different locations, sometimes several times, of which seventeen (mainly in CHs3) have been moved back to their original position. Five of the panels have been lost (in addition to nineteen of the copied CH1 panels which have been included in the one hundred and five panels above), while interventions to the contents of the surviving medallions have confused their imagery. Only thirty panels have remained in their original position throughout. The result is that certain details of the narratives have disappeared, in turn hiding the original iconographic scheme, meaning that, in subsequent repair exercises, the plumbers or glaziers involved had little guidance about the original meaning. The mystery surrounding the original appearance is compounded by the fact that neither the dates of the construction of the building nor its patronage were recorded: this thesis represents the first research into the latter issue.

Despite (or, perhaps, because of) the fact that so much of the glass and other decoration of the chapter house has survived, academic attention has generally focused only on discrete aspects. While Brown, O'Connor and

¹³ *The Fabric Rolls of York Minster*, ed. James Raine, Surtees Society, 35 (Durham: Andrews, 1859), 150.

¹⁴ Christopher Norton, Professor of Medieval Art History at the University of York, who has written extensively on York Minster, pers. comm., 12 August 2016.

¹⁵ David O'Connor and Jeremy Haselock, “The Stained and Painted Glass,” in *A History of York Minster*, eds. Gerald E. Aylmer and Reginald Cant (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 334.

Haselock have written about the glass in recent years as part of wider surveys of the Minster windows,¹⁶ there has been no in-depth examination of the entire scheme. Morgan worked on the Katherine window,¹⁷ and Gray on Peter's.¹⁸ While the main part of Morgan's article is the result of scholarly research and immaculate logic, in other respects these latter studies adopt a methodology which does not sit easily with that preferred here, which prioritises the testing of ideas within relevant contemporary contexts. Work on the glazing schemes of other chapter houses includes Ayers on Wells and Brown on Salisbury Cathedrals. Ayers has also researched the slightly later glass in the chapel at Merton College, which, while not a chapter house, was created within a similar intellectual milieu.¹⁹

Among the most significant contributions on other aspects of the iconography is an article by Norton, who reconstructed the original painted ceiling and blind window above the entrance,²⁰ and concluded that they were "an integral part of the original programme of imagery".²¹ McCarter also worked on the ceiling,²² while Harrison has examined the polychromy on both the trumeau Virgin at the entrance and the doors. There have been two published attempts to interpret the carvings, both making valuable contributions but

¹⁶ Brown, *Magnificent Fabric*, 46-86 and 291-293; O'Connor and Haselock, "Stained glass," 334-341.

¹⁷ Chloe Morgan, "A Life of St Catherine of Alexandria in the Chapter-House of York Minster," *JBAA*, 162 (2009):146-78.

¹⁸ Charlotte Gray, "A Contextual Study of the St Peter Window in York Minster Chapter House," MA Dissertation, Courtauld Institute, 2007.

¹⁹ Tim Ayers, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Wells Cathedral*, 2 vols. (Oxford: published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2004); Sarah Brown, "*Sumptuous and Richly Adorn'd: The Decoration of Salisbury Cathedral* (London: HMSO, RCHME, 1999) and Tim Ayers, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Merton College*, 2 vols. (Oxford: published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2013).

²⁰ Christopher Norton, "The medieval paintings in the chapter house," *FYMAR* (1996): 34-51.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 47.

²² Charles B. McCarter, "The Chapter House Ceiling," *FYMAR* (1992): 31-38.

neither of which is totally convincing.²³ More recently, however, Williamson has written an essay, regrettably not published, which opens a significant new line of enquiry in respect of the larger carvings, and one that complements the conclusions presented here about the glazing scheme.²⁴ In addition, Givens has explained the selection of flora, with helpful socio-economic observations, but she did not seek to explain their iconographic role.²⁵ Perring examined only some iconographic aspects of the architecture.²⁶ Finally, Dawton is the only writer to have suggested virginity as an overall theme, based on the trumeau virgin and the resemblance of the chapter house to the church of the Virgin at Josephat.²⁷ The research presented here partly redefines his conclusions and attempts to base them on a more solid and detailed underpinning (see Chapter 4).

1.1 Aims of the project

This study thus presents the first reconstruction of the narrative panels across five windows and confirms the reconstructions of two others. This has enabled an assessment of the iconographic programme in the context of the wider chapter house and an examination of the likely patronage of and motivation for the scheme.

²³ John Aberth, "Sculpted Heads and Figures inside the Chapter House of York Minster," *JBAA*, CXLII (1989), 37-45; Hannah McLaughlin, "'Monstrous beauties and lovely deformities': The marginal sculptures of the York Minster chapter house," *York Historian* XV, (1998): 2-15.

²⁴ I am grateful to Mark Williamson for giving me a copy of his MA essay, "The Sculpted Figures of the York Minster chapterhouse: the five senses in the terrestrial *house of houses*," University of York, 2009.

²⁵ Jean A. Givens, "The garden outside the walls: Plant forms in thirteenth-century English sculpture," in *Medieval Gardens: Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture*, ed. Elizabeth B. MacDougal (1986), 189-98.

²⁶ Stefania Merlo Perring, "Iconography of Buildings and the Politics of Crusading: York Minster Chapter House at the Eve of the Jewish Expulsion," *Church Archaeology*, 15 (2011): 17-34.

²⁷ N. Dawton, "The York Chapter House: notes on the trumeau virgin and the iconographic significance of the building," in *Essays in Honour of John White*, eds. Helen Weston and David Davies (London: University College London, 1990), 48-54.

The large scope of the project inevitably means that clear parameters had to be set, so it is important to stress what is not the focus for the study. The architecture and other decoration of the chapter house are studied insofar as they provide the physical and historical context for the glazing scheme, but this work does not attempt to analyse the building as a whole. Similarly, the emphasis is on the narrative panels: the heraldic scheme in the tracery is discussed only in the light of the dating and funding of the later stages of the building, just as the grisaille is only considered in the context of one aspect of the iconography emerging from the narrative panels. Nor does the thesis consider the four non-narrative windows in the vestibule which appear to be connected to the chapter house scheme, showing standing religious figures (CHn5, n6, n7 and s5). Finally, it does not attempt a condition survey, despite the fact that the glazing insertions made during restoration projects have been examined in order to establish general explanations for the current appearance of the scheme. Such a survey is best left to glazing experts in the future.

1.2 Methodology

Much of the research presented here focuses on the original order and meaning of the panels in order to ascertain the extent to which they reflected “those underlying principles which reveal the basic attitude of [...] a period, [...] a religious or philosophical persuasion”.²⁸ In addition to a detailed examination of the glass and its restoration histories,²⁹ other medieval representations of the same themes and narratives, whether hagiographic, Mariological or theological

²⁸ Erwin Panofsky and Gerda Panofsky, *Studies in Iconography: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* (New York, Westview Press, 1939), 7.

²⁹ I am extremely grateful to the assistance given by Nick Teed and Anna Milson, respectively Senior Conservator and Conservator at York Glaziers Trust, in identifying the approximate ages of the glass in the medallions. Any errors are, of course, my responsibility.

have been explored.³⁰ The visual affiliates are primarily those of painted glass windows, mainly in French cathedrals and great churches³¹ and illuminated manuscripts.³² These vary in number: as might be expected, there are numerous surviving windows and manuscript illuminations showing scenes from the Life of the Virgin Mary and the Passion and Resurrection, but there are relatively few showing, for example, Paul, and a William narrative exists only in York.³³

In addition to the visual contextualisation, texts which may have informed the content of the windows have also been consulted. As expected, with the exception of the material in the Missal and Breviary of the Use of York and the York accounts of the life of St William, it has not been possible to identify any directly relevant sources,³⁴ but extending the texts examined to prevailing theological, hagiographic and Mariological material available in the thirteenth century has enabled conclusions to be drawn about the relationship between such concepts and the way these may have been indicated in the images. In order to achieve this, it has been necessary to examine the way the windows probably appeared in the late thirteenth century, in the identification of the panels, an analysis of the way these scenes have been depicted and a consideration of the way the panels were linked in creating the narratives.

This approach has further enabled conclusions to be made concerning a unifying theology underpinning the construction of all the narratives and partly

³⁰ In this, an attempt has been made to follow Binski's approach, using national and international sources, Paul Binski, *Becket's Crown: Art and Imagery in Gothic England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004), xiv.

³¹ These are available at the *Online Medieval Stained Glass Archive*, "French sites," <http://www.therosewindow.com/pilot/intro-france2.htm>.

³² Specific manuscripts are cited in the relevant sections of Chapter 2.

³³ In the window n7 in the north choir aisle, dating from about 1415.

³⁴ Hence the creation of the term "textual affiliates" as described above. No records of the library holdings at York from the thirteenth century survive. The Use of York has been used as a source of references and terminology, but has not been subject to a more scholarly investigation in this study: see Richard W. Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 445-462.

explains the choice of religious topics, although the reasons for the selection of saints for the Five Saints window (CHs4), has depended as much on a prosopographical study of members of Chapter in the second half of the thirteenth century as on iconographic analysis. In particular, the narratives were devised to highlight scenes in specific locations in the corners and the centre of each window, demonstrating relationships between them and hence establishing the significance of some of the hagiographic issues raised. By examining the theological and liturgical context prevailing in the late thirteenth century it is possible to relate this devotional focus to the emphases that have been detected in the glazing. Specifically, notions of the unity and diversity of the Church and its members, emanating ultimately from the writings of St Paul, emerge as providing a plausible explanation. These had not only dominated the evolution of Christian thought but the ideas had received renewed attention in the steps taken after the Church Council, Lateran IV, in 1215 to reform and unify the Church and its practices.

The move towards internal cohesion in the Church focused attention on those outside its remit. Inevitably, as part of this development, the Jews became a particular target. Their increasing marginalisation led inexorably to their perception as a threat, articulated particularly through resistance to their attacks on the reputation of the Virgin Mary and all virgins. These attitudes manifested themselves in the glazing in the way motifs were presented and the exaggeration of Jewish features for many of the figures who were perceived as being outside the Church.

Inevitably decisions concerning these matters would have been made by the original patrons of the chapter house windows. While the glazing and other aspects of the decoration appear to demonstrate considerable cohesion, the

analysis of members of Chapter in the key period of 1265 to the early 1290s makes it clear that they were disunited to the point of being, at times, dysfunctional. Hence any attempt to correlate a picture of unity of the Church with a notion of peaceful harmony within the York Chapter would be misleading.

What has been achieved is a set of tentative conclusions about the specific focus of the iconography of a unified glazing scheme based on the original selection and ordering of the panels, and depicting what Binski has described as a “literal translation of conventional metaphors into physical form”.³⁵ Inevitably, given the paucity of direct information, the conclusions presented here are based on what can most simply be described as circumstantial evidence, coincidences and anomalies, both in the way the narratives have been constructed and in the way they relate to each other. Nevertheless, there is some triangulation in that they sit well with the suggested patronage of the project and can be related to the overall decoration of the space and even its architecture. This means that, as far as possible, the research follows traditional scholarship, and conclusions are based on empirical approaches to the evidence. The justification for this approach is twofold: first, the chapter house glass has been so neglected that basic research is long overdue and, second, the studies that have been conducted are unhelpful because they do not take into account the evidential framework which underpinned the original selection and design of the glass. This study attempts to provide that basis so that future scholars can conceptualise further on researched material.

³⁵ Binski, *Becket's Crown*, 11.

I.3 *The body of the research*

To achieve its aims according to this methodology, this study is set out as follows. Initially, in Chapter 1, the possible history and creation of the scheme are examined, including the churchmen involved in the Minster in the second half of the thirteenth century who may have had most interest in the design of such an iconographic scheme. It argues that the construction and decoration of the chapter house can be considered in the historical context of the time, at local, national and international levels, providing insights into the motivation informing the patronage albeit with only circumstantial evidence about the windows. The main repairs and other interventions that have taken place since the windows were originally inserted are discussed: the research underpinning the latter is set out in Appendices A and B.³⁶ Appendix A lists the chronology of the interventions and descriptions for ease of consultation as well as transcripts of relevant records, and Appendix B shows the overall impact of the interventions on each window. Following this, in Chapter 2, the windows are explored to determine the original sequence and appearance of the narrative panels. Supporting material is found in Appendices B and C, the latter comprising a catalogue of the panels, while a summary of the identification of the panels is set out in Appendix E.³⁷

Having established the original glazing scheme as far as possible, the iconography is considered in more detail in Chapters 3 and 4. Chapter 3 suggests that there was a similar narrative structure across six of the seven windows, possibly reflecting theological notions current by the end of the thirteenth century, such as Pauline concepts of unity and diversity within the Church (and, by extension, Chapter), and contemporary attitudes to Divine

³⁶ Volume 2, 279-313 and 315-72.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 1099-1103.

foreknowledge and predestination. Indications that the glazing reflects liturgical priorities relevant to York are also explored. Chapter 4, additionally, considers the way aspects of the glazing iconography may have complemented the sculptural and architectural programme in relation to a pervasive theme concerning virginity in general and the Virgin Mary in particular. The result is a thesis where the elements contribute to a coherent whole and, as such, indicate the significance of the chapter house to modern iconographic study.

CHAPTER 1: THE HISTORY OF THE CHAPTER HOUSE AND ITS GLASS

1 Introduction

Key to understanding the iconographic choices in the chapter house is its patronage, while key to understanding the current appearance of the glass is an analysis of the interventions that have taken place since its insertion. Hence the early history of the building and subsequent treatment of its glazing needs to be examined.

The complex nature of the reasoning behind the decoration is explored below, and Chapters 3 and 4 will indicate and elaborate the clear role of ecclesiastical influences in the glazing scheme. Although these do not preclude lay donations towards the end of the project, which may be reflected in the heraldic scheme, the degree of erudition and intellectual sophistication would appear to exclude purely lay origins.¹ The subsequent treatment of the glass in terms of both the priorities in the way panels were reinserted after removal and any specific identifiable repairs to individual narrative panels assist in assessing the likely original location and identification of the scenes.

This chapter will thus initially investigate the creation and relevant history of the chapter house. The links between those who can be identified as active, residentiary members of the York Chapter in the second half of the thirteenth century are explored and placed in the context of national, ecclesiastical and papal politics. The chapter then examines the modifications to the glass and explains its current appearance.

¹ In the classification created by Julian M.Luxford, this means that at least the initial patronage was “internal”, Julian M.Luxford, *The Art and Architecture of English Benedictine Monasteries* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005), xxi.

1.2 *Patronage and construction*²

The earliest surviving York windows which contain a reference to their donors are those dating from the early fourteenth century in the nave.³ Given that there is no direct visual or documentary evidence about the creation of the glazing scheme in the chapter house, beyond a possible alteration to the design of CHs4, this research is underpinned by the arguments in Chapter 3 that the glazing is part of an integrated overall design. Thus the patronage of the building itself is investigated as the main means of examining the glazing as part of the whole. The contribution here is, therefore, a study of the social and political context of the chapter house construction, which, it is hoped, will supplement architectural investigations.

1.2.1 Key dates in the chapter house construction

Given the lack of direct documentary evidence about patronage, absolute conclusions will have to remain uncertain. There are no obvious visual references to Chapter donors as is the case elsewhere: in the choir and transepts of Chartres, for example,⁴ or at Wells, where Dean Huse, largely in charge of the final stages of their chapter house, was honoured in the glass under his associated saint, Edward the Confessor, while other canons whose contributions assisted the project were also displayed in the glazing.⁵ However, there is extensive if circumstantial evidence from contemporary documentation (in this case it has been possible to expand the information contained in the

² I am grateful to the late Professor Barrie Dobson for his comments on an early draft of the following two sections.

³ Brown, *Magnificent Fabric*, 288-9.

⁴ See, for example, the representations of canons in Chartres Cathedral, Claudine Lautier, "The Canons of Chartres: Their Patronage and Representation in the Stained Glass of the Cathedral," in *Patronage, Power and Agency in Medieval Art*, ed. Colum Hourihane (Princeton: Penn State University Press, 2013), 99-118.

⁵ Tim Ayers, *Wells Cathedral*, Part 2, 487. Ayers also suggests that individual members of Chapter were commemorated in inscriptions (*ibid.*, 484).

*Ecclesiae Anglicanae*⁶ and the *York Minster Fasti*⁷ to a database of almost 3,000 entries, extracted by the writer from administrative and ecclesiastical documents from the second half of the thirteenth century) and conclusions from this can be supported by aspects of the decoration.

This section develops the arguments advanced elsewhere about the patronage of the chapter house, based on this database.⁸ The results are inevitably circumstantial, but the entries for many of the 159 ecclesiastics in the second half of the thirteenth century indicate their allegiances, roles elsewhere and the loci of their activities, showing those who were most prominent at York and who were likely to have been central to the chapter house project. These can throw light on the different threads to the concept of patronage, including the roles of initiator, driving force, manager and funder or fund-raiser, the complexities of which have been explored by Hourihane,⁹ Caskey¹⁰ and Luxford,¹¹ among others. In this study, patronage is seen as “the commission and financing of a work of art”.¹²

Questions of patronage are, of course, inevitably bound up with the date of the building. Brown has summarised the current approach: “traditionally [...] [the chapter house’s] place in the chronology of the Minster’s architectural

⁶ John Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1066-1300: VI York*, comp. Diana E. Greenway (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1991), *passim*.

⁷ *York Minster Fasti. Being Notes on the Dignitaries, Archdeacons and Prebendaries in the Church of York prior to the year 1307*, ed. Charles Travis Clay, YAS, Record Series, cxxiii (1957): Vols. cxxiii and cxxiv, *passim*.

⁸ Hilary Moxon, “The Patronage of the Chapter-House in York Minster,” submitted for possible inclusion in *Art, Architecture and Archaeology in Late Medieval York, British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions for the year 2017*, eds. Tim Ayers, Sarah Brown and Sarah Rees Jones (Oxford: Taylor and Francis, forthcoming).

⁹ Colum Hourihane, “Introduction,” in *Patronage*, ed. Hourihane, xix.

¹⁰ Jill Caskey, “Medieval Patronage and Its Potentialities,” in *Patronage*, ed. Hourihane, 4. Caskey talks of patronage and its role in the production process, describing “webs of interaction that led to the creation of works of medieval art,” *ibid.*, 13.

¹¹ Julian M. Luxford, “The Construction of English Medieval Patronage,” in *Patronage*, ed. Hourihane, 33; Julian M. Luxford, “The Patronage of the Church and its Purposes,” in *History of British Art*, ed. David Bindman. Vol. 1, *History of British Art 600-1600*, ed. Tim Ayers (London: Tate, 2008), 82-105.

¹² Luxford, *Art and Architecture*, xvii.

history has been established by comparative stylistic analysis”.¹³ Coldstream suggested that “there was nothing in the style of the chapter house to prevent a date of 1280”.¹⁴ Spraker, under Dr Peter Newton’s supervision, also surveyed the dating history,¹⁵ concluding that it “was probably begun 1260-65 and finished between 1280-85 [...] implying a date of ca. 1285-90 for the glass”.¹⁶ These suggestions correspond to the date of 1295 for when the chapter house was functioning as a “new” building.

These approximate end-dates have been upheld by the subsequent results of dendrochronological analysis of the beams in the chapter house roof, most of which were from trees felled in 1288 and used in the green.¹⁷ In addition, the difficulties in establishing the original heraldic scheme have been highlighted by Brown, although she draws attention to the fact that “there is generally [...] a degree of homogeneity, which suggests that the glazing was executed and installed within a relatively short period”, and that this was likely to have been “well before 1300”.¹⁸ This supplements her comments about the inclusion of John Balliol’s shield as it appeared before he became King of Scotland in 1292,¹⁹ and is reinforced by research conducted for this thesis into the rest of the heraldic display which also suggests a likely date from the late 1280s and early 1290s (see Chapter 2 and Appendix B).

If these dates indicate when the chapter house was under construction and completed, the time-frame for its start can be inferred from the number of features adopted from the church of St-Urbain in Troyes, founded by Pope

¹³ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 51.

¹⁴ Nicola Coldstream, “The York Chapter House,” *JBAA*, 3rd series (1972): 22.

¹⁵ Cynthia M. Spraker, “The East Window of York Minster’s Chapter House.” 2 vols. MA Dissertation, University of York, 1985, Vol. 1, 2-10.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁷ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 297.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 52-53.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

Urban IV, which was underway in its current form from the end of the 1260s.²⁰ The similarities with the vestibule in York Minster were first observed by O'Connor and Haselock.²¹ Marks indicated the stylistic closeness between St-Urbain and the chapter house itself, including the first use in England of the band window design (Figure 7a).²² Binski pointed out the battlement figures over the crenellations to the stalls by the entrance to the chapter house, resembling the piscina at St-Urbain in Troyes (Figures 7b).²³ For Wilson, the emphasis is on the architectural similarities, notably the tracery design of the windows (Figures 7c), the articulation of the piscina in Troyes compared with the chapter house stalls (Figure 7d) and the wall passage.²⁴ He went even further, contending that the master mason of the chapter house "was very well-informed about both phases of the building [St-Urbain] which I am proposing was one of his principal sources".²⁵ The reasons underpinning the similarities have, however, remained a mystery.²⁶

As argued elsewhere,²⁷ Cardinal Ancher Pantaléon, who continued the building work after his uncle's death, pursued three increasingly valuable prebends in York during the seven years that he was dealing with a funding

²⁰ Michael T. Davis, "On the threshold of the Flamboyant. The Second Campaign of Construction of Saint-Urbain, Troyes," *Speculum* 59 (1984): 847-84, *passim*; Julian Gardner, "Cardinal Ancher and the Piscina in Saint-Urbain at Troyes," in *Architectural Studies in Memory of Richard Krautheimer*, ed. Cecil L. Striker (Mainz am Rhein: Zabern, 1996), 79; Jane Hayward, "The Church of Saint-Urbain at Troyes and its Glazing Program," *Gesta*, 37(1998): 165-77, *passim*.

²¹ O'Connor and Haselock, "Stained Glass," 341.

²² Marks, "Stained Glass," 144-50.

²³ Paul Binski, "The Imagery of the High Altar Piscina of Saint-Urbain at Troyes," in *Architecture, Liturgy and Identity: Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley*, eds. Zoë Opačić and Achim Timmermann (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 267-68.

²⁴ Christopher Wilson, "Not without Honour save in its own Country? Saint-Urbain at Troyes and its Contrasting French and English Posterities," in *The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture*, eds. Alexandra Gajewski and Zoë Opačić (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 115 and 120.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 115.

²⁶ Wilson, "Saint-Urbain," 115.

²⁷ Moxon, "Patronage," unpaginated.

shortfall in construction costs in Troyes.²⁸ In so doing, he caused significant difficulties for the archbishop, Walter Giffard (1266-79) and the latter's relations, with, in turn, Pope Clement IV (Urban IV's successor and protégé) and Henry III, both of whom had been instrumental in Giffard's original appointment to the See. His failure to satisfy papal demands, in particular, would have been an embarrassment because it involved his inability to wield influence over the canons the two target prebends, namely William Wickwane (chancellor until 1279 and archbishop until his death in 1285) and Thomas de Ludham (the brother of Giffard's predecessor, Godfrey de Ludham, who had died in 1265).²⁹

What is unknown is whether, at the time of the negotiations in the late 1260s or early 1270s, Ancher had provided information about any of the designs or plans that he had for the construction work there, or whether he even visited York. It appears that he came to England twice in the early 1260s, and again in 1269, when he was given simple protection on 9 February.³⁰ Given there are no records of other activities by Ancher in England at the time, other than what appears to have been an inactive stall at Salisbury Cathedral,³¹ it is likely that this last visit was in connection with the York dispute, which appeared to have been resolved at that stage,³² although it actually lasted a further four years, when Gregory X went over Giffard's head, deprived Wickwane of his

²⁸ *Les Registres de Gregoire X et de Jean XXI: Recueil des Bulles de ces Papes*, ed. E. Cadier and J. Guiraud (Paris: Boccard, 1960), No.81; *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland. Papal Letters*, I, 1198-1304, ed. W.H.Bliss (London: HMSO, 1893), 442-3; *The Register of Walter Giffard, Lord Archbishop of York 1266-1279*, ed., William Brown, Surtees Society, 109 (Durham: Andrews, 1904), 6, 7, 110, 117 (the correct 100 marks erroneously given or transcribed as 1000 marks a year), 116-18, 138 and 224-5; *Court of Chancery, Calendar of Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III 1266-72 Preserved in the Public Record Office* (London: HMSO, 1901-13), 243-4 and 259.

²⁹ *CPR, 1266-72*, 259; *Walter Giffard*, 6, 170.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 34. Here he is referred to only as the "Cardinal Deacon of Sta-Prassede".

³¹ John Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1066-1300: IV Salisbury*, comp. Diana E. Greenway (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1991), 67.

³² *Walter Giffard*, 224.

prebend of North Newbald, and installed Ancher.³³ This coincided with a general improvement in the financial situation at Troyes,³⁴ after which Ancher largely disappears from the York scene.

There is only one other date which might be significant in the chapter house construction. Previous identifications of the now-lost (and hence unverifiable) carvings of bears around the parapet of the chapter house,³⁵ noted by Coldstream,³⁶ have been partly attributed to Edward I's "Great Cause" hearings at Berwick-on-Tweed in 1291-92. However, this ignores the possible association with Cardinal Giovanni Caetani degli Orsini, prebendary of Fridaythorpe from the early 1250s until 1277. Orsini was the leader of the Roman faction at the Curia in the 1260s and 1270s in opposition to the French, who had been represented by Popes Urban IV and Clement IV. In 1277, the cardinal unexpectedly satisfied his long-standing ambitions, and was elected as Pope Nicholas III (1277-80).³⁷

As pope, he proceeded to do "all he could to wrest power in Rome from Charles [of Anjou] and assert papal authority in its place".³⁸ He demonstrated an early and public distrust of Giffard, Clement IV's appointee as Archbishop of York, by appointing a group including the dean of Lincoln and its precentor, John Romeyn (future archbishop of York, 1286 until 1295), neither of whom had

³³ *Gregoire X*, No. 81; *Calendar*, 442-3.

³⁴ Davis, "Saint-Urbain," 875-6; Gardner, "Saint-Urbain," 79.

³⁵ The animals were unrecognisable in the 1970s, when new carvings were made (but deemed too small). The current carvings were created in 2007, Simon Trotter, the Minster stonemason and carver responsible for the carvings in 2007, pers. comm., 25 April 2017.

³⁶ Coldstream, "York Chapter House," 16; Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 48 and 54.

³⁷ Thomas Wykes. *Annales Monastici de Oseneia, Chronicon vulgo dictum Chronicon Thomas Wykes. Annales prioratus de Wigornia*, ed. Henry Richard Luard, Rolls Series, 4. London, 1864-69, 272.

³⁸ Paul Hetherington, "Pietro Cavallini, Artistic Style and Patronage in Late Medieval Rome," *The Burlington Magazine*, 114, No. 826 (1972): 4.

York connections at that time,³⁹ to ensure that an appropriate successor to himself was installed as prebendary of Fridaythorpe.⁴⁰ It is, therefore, possible that the decoration of the parapet with Orsini-type bears may suggest an interest in papal politics in York after Nicholas's accession in 1277 and an anticipation of an improvement in relations between some factions in Chapter and the Papacy.

Hence a start date for construction of the chapter house in the late 1260s/early 1270s with a completion by the mid-1290s is plausible, meaning that there must have been a long construction period, possibly with interruptions for financial, managerial or engineering reasons. The late 1280s or early 1290s is therefore a reasonable date for the narrative glazing designs.

1.2.2 Responsibility for the project

The danger in studying a successfully completed building such as the chapter house without examining its historical context is that there may be an assumption that the process was as harmonious as the end result. Any such initial impression is contradicted by the evidence from York.

Thirteenth-century English chapters, according to Brentano, comprised “a comparatively neat little body of non-resident canons [who] ran the church at home, and a larger body of non-resident canons [who] drew its income from away”.⁴¹ York was no exception: indeed, the number of residentiary canons at

³⁹ Romeyn was collated, by Wickwane, to Warthill in December 1279, *The Register of William Wickwane, Lord Archbishop of York 1279-1285*, ed. William Brown, Surtees Society, 114 (Durham: Andrews, 1907), 2.

⁴⁰ *Les Registres de Nicolas III, 1277-1280: Recueil des Bulles de ce Pape*, ed. Jules Guy (Paris: Librairie des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 1898), No. 215, 456.

⁴¹ Robert Brentano, *England and Italy in the Thirteenth Century*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), 102.

York was traditionally even lower than most.⁴² In addition, York's constitution was the only one in England which did not permit the archbishop/bishop to be a chapter member. The longer the construction period the more certain it was that the personnel would change, so to assume a unity of purpose among such a disparate group risks an oversimplification of group dynamics.

From an analysis of the evidence from the database, it seems that there were sub-groups in Chapter, contributing to tensions which in the normal course of events may have subsided but, where there were particularly uncompromising characters or the occurrence of exacerbating events, may have become entrenched and therefore perpetuated. At York this may well have been made worse by several partisan collations during the prolonged archiepiscopal vacancy in 1265, baronial at first and royalist from when Henry III was freed in August 1265, reflecting the fraught political situation from 1264 onwards.⁴³ This context may well explain to Pope Nicholas IV's tantalising reference to the difficulties that the archbishops of York had with their Chapters until 1290.⁴⁴

It has been concluded elsewhere that, by a process of elimination, the most likely person to have initiated the project within this time scale was William de Langton, nephew of the archbishop Walter de Gray, who was appointed dean in 1262 and died relatively early in the suggested construction timescale, in 1279,⁴⁵ having declined election as Bishop of Carlisle the previous year.⁴⁶

⁴² The figure is estimated as being between six and eight in R.Barrie Dobson, "The Later Middle Ages 1215-1500," in *York Minster*, eds. Aylmer and Cant; 50.

⁴³ James Richardson has discussed the use of Crown patronage in Hereford and Worcester in "A Bishop and his Diocese: politics, government, and careers in the Hereford and Worcester dioceses 1282-1317," PhD dissertation, University of York, 2016, 38-64.

⁴⁴ *Calendar*, 500. From this research, it appears Giffard's problem was with the majority in Chapter, including the dean, Langton, while, for Wickwane and Romeyn the obstacle was the following dean, Scarborough, himself relatively isolated in Chapter

⁴⁵ Moxon, "Patronage," unpaginated.

⁴⁶ *Nicolas III*, No. 636, 283-284.

As well as his wealth, which must have been considerable given that his flourishing career in the Minster started by 1245 and the fact that, as the favoured relative,⁴⁷ he may have been a beneficiary of Gray's will, his interest in visual culture is shown in the grandeur of his bronze, lost-wax tomb, described by Badham as being "in the first rank of medieval monuments".⁴⁸ It is now known only from a drawing by Dugdale before its destruction in the Civil War (Figure 8).⁴⁹ Equally significantly, however, in 1292 his third chantry was created by his tomb, at Edward the Confessor's altar,⁵⁰ witnessed by no fewer than six leading members of Chapter.⁵¹ Given that 1292 was probably the final date for the completion of the heraldic design it is plausible that this major grant marked both the imminent end of the chapter house project and contributions made by the late dean. In this, it possibly reflected a similar institutional creation of Walter de Gray's chantry in the nearby chapel of St Michael in 1241.⁵²

If Langton were responsible for initiating the chapter house, it has been argued that the adoption of such a building project may have arisen as a result of disappointment at his rejection by Clement IV as archbishop in 1265 and a subsequent hostility to the successful candidate, Walter Giffard.⁵³ His failure was almost certainly the result of his support for Simon de Montfort in the

⁴⁷ *Les Registres d'Innocent IV: Recueil des Bulles de ce Pape*, ed. Elie Berger (Paris: Libraire des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 1911), No.8236, 544; *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland. Papal Letters*, I, 1198-1304, ed. W.H.Bliss (London: HMSO, 1893), 308; R. Barrie Dobson, "The Later Middle Ages 1215-1500," in *York Minster*, eds. Aylmer and Cant, 47; *Walter Gray*, 68 and 267.

⁴⁸ Sally Badham, "A lost bronze effigy of 1279 from York Minster," *Antiquaries Journal* 60 (1980): 63.

⁴⁹ College of Arms, William Dugdale's Yorkshire Arms, 1641, fol. 111v.

⁵⁰ *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 283.

⁵¹ *Charters of the Vicars Choral of York Minster: I City of York and its suburbs to 1546*, ed. Nigel John Tringham, Yorkshire Archaeological Society. Record Series, clviii (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1993), 295. Royal permission for the grant of the land was obtained after an Inquisition in Mortmain (Court of Chancery, *Calendar of Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward I, 1281-92* (London: HMSO, 1893), 506). The writ in connection with this was dated 30 September 1290, (*Yorkshire Inquisitions*, Vol. II, ed. William Brown. YAS, Record Series, xxiii (1897): 115-16); and even in 1364, after the fall in land values in the aftermath of the Black Death, it was yielding £5 6s 8d a year (*Charters*, 295).

⁵² Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 15.

⁵³ Moxon, "Patronage," unpaginated.

baronial conflicts of the mid-1260s,⁵⁴ especially given Clement's well-known antagonism to the rebels as the then papal legate.⁵⁵ It is this involvement in national politics that seems to have upset any previous equilibrium in Chapter: two protagonists to emerge after 1265 were Langton and the then archdeacon of the East Riding, and later dean, Robert de Scarborough, who was appointed to several royal projects after the resumption of power by Henry III.⁵⁶ Both had previously been executors of Godfrey de Ludham's will, but this was the last indication of their working together.

The key players in Chapter in the late 1260s and 1270s, in addition to the dean and Scarborough, were the chancellor, William de Wickwane, and Thomas de Ludham. Two other less powerful probable residentiaries appear to have been John le Gras⁵⁷ and Stephen de Sutton,⁵⁸ while Thomas de Wythene, Simon de Evesham and Gilbert of Sarum seem to have kept relatively aloof from Chapter matters. As well as Langton, a dominant element among the residentiary canons may also have supported the baronial cause. Amaury de Montfort, Simon's son, had been briefly collated to the treasury during Henry III's incarceration in 1264-65. Within four days of Henry III's release, he ordered

⁵⁴ Langton had been summoned to de Montfort's Parliament held January to March, 1265 (William Henry Dixon and James Raine, *Fasti Eboracenses: The Lives of the Archbishops of York* (London: Longman, 1863), 7). It was sufficiently important for him to attend for him to delay the election as archbishop until March (Wykes, *Chronicon*, 161). Royal assent was forthcoming in the period when the king was under the control of Simon de Montfort and Thomas de Cantilupe, at some stage a canon of York and strong supporter of the barons, held the royal seal as Chancellor (*ibid.*).

⁵⁵ J.R. Maddicott, "The Mise of Lewes, 1264," *The English Historical Review*, 98, No. 388 (1983): 595; Charles Bémont, *Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, 1208-1265*, trans. E.F. Jacob. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), 225; Sophie Ambler, "The Montfortian bishops and the justification of conciliar government in 1264," *Historical Research*, 85 (2012): 204-6.

⁵⁶ Court of Chancery, *Calendar of Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III 1258-66 Preserved in the Public Record Office* (London: HMSO, 1901-13), 345.

⁵⁷ *Walter Giffard*, 134 and 257; *Charters*, 73-4 and 180.

⁵⁸ *Walter Giffard*, 257.

Amaury's removal,⁵⁹ while Chapter's reluctance to comply can be deduced from the king's eventual expression of amazement at their dilatory tactics.⁶⁰

Langton, Wickwane and Ludham, with Sutton and le Gras to a lesser extent worked together,⁶¹ but there is no evidence that Scarborough co-operated with any of the other residentiary canons, despite the allegiances he may have had within the wider Chapter. It is reasonable to infer that he was a supporter of the king, along with several others from amongst the non-residentiaries,⁶² including Anthony Bek,⁶³ William of Chauvent,⁶⁴ Adam de Belstede (after a brief flirtation with the barons' cause),⁶⁵ William and Richard de Clifford,⁶⁶ Edmund Mortimer⁶⁷ and Robert Burnell.⁶⁸ Later, in 1288, Scarborough was assisted in his resignation negotiations with Romeyn by Clement IV's protégé and another long-term Crown supporter in Chapter, William de Corner.⁶⁹ Scarborough was clearly an ally of the beleaguered Giffard,⁷⁰ and, in January 1279, shortly before his own death in April, Giffard engineered his election to succeed William de Langton as dean.⁷¹ This

⁵⁹ *CPR*, 1258-66, 436.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* The reluctance of Chapter to comply was despite the fact that the dean, Langton, was away from York at the Curia at the time.

⁶¹ For example, *Walter Giffard*, 134 and 225; *Charters*, 73-74. See *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 206, when Wickwane made a major settlement to secure the financial security of future archbishops, it was made "pro animabus bonae memoriae domini Walteri de Grey praedecessoris nostris, et Willelmi de Rotherfield quondam decani Eboracensis" ("Rotherfield" being Langton's alternative name).

⁶² Detected from direct references or cross-referring the dates of collation against who was in control of the political situation in England in the event of any vacancy (Henry III or Simon de Montfort).

⁶³ *CPR*, 1258-66, 553.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 658.

⁶⁵ Belstede had been a supporter of de Montfort, but reverted to the King's camp (*CPR*, 1258-66, 574).

⁶⁶ Respectively, *CPR*, 1258-66, 66 and 523 and *CPR*, 1292-1301, 94.

⁶⁷ *CPR*, 1258-66, 404.

⁶⁸ Chancellor of England, 1274-92.

⁶⁹ *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 393.

⁷⁰ *Walter Giffard*, 30 and Court of Chancery, *Calendar of Patent Rolls of the Reign of Edward I 1272-81 Preserved in the Public Record Office* (London: HMSO, 1901-13), 254.

⁷¹ *William Wickwane*, 1 and 3.

appointment was unsuccessfully challenged by Wickwane as soon as he became archbishop in 1279.⁷²

Scarborough's hostility, particularly to Wickwane, was evident, culminating in his opposition to Wickwane's election as archbishop in 1279 when he was one of only two to vote for another candidate, as opposed to the eighteen who voted in Wickwane's favour.⁷³ It is notable that the first collation Wickwane made as archbishop was that of John Romeyn,⁷⁴ presumably seen as a sympathetic appointment. Judging from the speed with which Romeyn acted against Scarborough after his own consecration in 1286,⁷⁵ differences between them may have predated Romeyn's elevation, culminating with Scarborough's being goaded, disciplined and sacked by the new archbishop in 1287.⁷⁶ This occurred a year before the timber for the chapter house roof was felled,⁷⁷ by which time it is clear that the dean had lost any support in Chapter.

A key question is therefore whether the chapter house was a conventual project, agreed and paid for by the thirty-three members of Chapter (on similar lines to the decision at Wells Cathedral),⁷⁸ or whether it was the initiative of an individual such as Langton, with political or financial support from at least some of his colleagues.⁷⁹ The apparently unified glazing scheme and its possible integration with the sculpture, wall painting and architecture might suggest the

⁷² Dixon, *Fasti*, 354.

⁷³ *Nicolas III*, No. 559, 230-231.

⁷⁴ *William Wickwane*, 2.

⁷⁵ *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 197.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 367. His dismissal was not actually finalised until an agreement reached in 1290 when he resigned.

⁷⁷ Brown, in his preface to Part II of Romeyn's register (xxxiii) contradicted his margin note to Part I (365-66) and claimed, erroneously, that Chapter had attempted to excommunicate the citizens of York.

⁷⁸ Ayers, *Wells Cathedral*, Part I, lxxxii.

⁷⁹ Westminster Abbey's centrally planned chapter house was funded by Henry III, (David A. Carpenter, "King Henry III and the chapter house of Westminster Abbey," in *Westminster Abbey Chapter House: the history, art and architecture of 'a chapter house beyond compare'*, eds. Warwick Rodwell and Richard Mortimer (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 2010), 34-35.

former (see Chapters 3 and 4), but this is belied by the evidence of these tensions. They appeared to last until 1290, the date given by Nicholas IV as when difficulties between Romeyn, as archbishop, and Chapter were resolved, shortly after the major settlement made as part of Scarborough's final resignation from the deanery.⁸⁰

This conclusion is reinforced by the experience of Southwell Minster where an agreement had clearly been reached for the canons to bear their share of their chapter house building costs because, from 1287 until at least September 1290, Romeyn was exercised in enforcement.⁸¹ Three canons had failed to pay (one being Henry Newark, a canon of York and shortly to be elected as dean of York) and the fruits of their prebends eventually had to be sequestered on Romeyn's orders. If raising the funds for the Southwell chapter house were to prove so difficult, especially with recalcitrant canons, how much more so would have been a similar arrangement for York? Given the number of absentee canons,⁸² notably, but far from exclusively, famously avaricious Italians,⁸³ the status of many of their family connections, the alacrity with which many of them, such as Ancher Pantaléon, engaged in litigation to protect or further their interests and the fact that several of them had appointed agents in York to monitor activities,⁸⁴ it would have been remarkable if they had all, without exception, paid any required contribution without demur. It would be

⁸⁰ *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 385 and 373.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 364 and 391.

⁸² The activities of Bogo de Clare, a son of the Earl of Gloucester and Hereford, in this respect are detailed by John R.H. Moorman, *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1946), 26-28.

⁸³ Brentano quoting Matthew Paris, Brentano, *England and Italy*, 5. A total of twenty-three canons with Italian names have been identified at the Minster between 1260 and the 1290s, continuing a tradition that was manifest in the early thirteenth-century, Jane E. Sayers, *Papal Government and England during the Pontificate of Honorius III (1216-1227)*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 177-78.

⁸⁴ Bartholomew Ferentino was agent for Adenulphus dei Conti of Anagni, while Gilbert de Sarum and Thomas de Hedon acted for Giordano and Napoleo Orsini.

reasonable to conclude that the chapter house at York was funded differently from Southwell's.

The most reasonable conclusion is that the funds were already in place for the early stage of construction, borne at least mainly by someone like Langton, just as the north transept had been paid for by Romeyn's father, John Romanus.⁸⁵ This does not exclude personal contributions from some members of Chapter, but there is no evidence of any joint decision by Chapter until the 1290 settlement in which Chapter and Romeyn agreed terms in which the latter could, finally, formally hold visitations in York Minster.⁸⁶

1.2.3 Motivation: a focus on the transepts

On the assumption that Langton was instrumental in the original design, his motivation may have been two-fold. First, as discussed, it can be interpreted as a deliberate attempt to draw attention to the embarrassing situations in which Giffard found himself, with its St-Urbain window tracery, band windows and possible Orsini bears, its location meaning it was clearly visible from the adjacent archbishop's palace (Figures 9a-c).

However, if Langton's ambition and disappointment explain the adoption of external features, internally the chapter house can be seen as an expression of both family pride and an assertion of unity among a dominant group from the residentiary canons in Chapter. The choice of access to the chapter house from the north transept may have been determined by the existing building layout around the Minster,⁸⁷ or, if the location were deliberately chosen, it can be seen as a culmination of Gray-

⁸⁵ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 11.

⁸⁶ *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 393.

⁸⁷ Christopher Norton, "The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral at York and the Topography of the Anglian City," *JBAA*, 151 (1998), 14.

related features, celebrating the contribution of Gray and his colleagues to the life of the Minster (Figure 10) and his role in setting Chapter on a secure basis.⁸⁸

Across the transepts there is evidence that there was a religious focus on the tomb of St William, whose formal canonisation was finally achieved by Gray, and, to a lesser extent, on St John the Baptist, Langton's favoured saint.⁸⁹ This latter is indicated sculpturally by the distinctive foliate *agnus dei* motif linking the transepts to the chapter house through the boss over Langton's tomb (Figures 11a and b), over the intriguing label stop in the north transept with an ecclesiastical figure in the same pose as Langton's effigy (Figures 12a-c), possibly fulfilling the same role as the donor portraits above the piscina in St-Urbain (Figures 13a and b), and the bosses above the corner in the vestibule and in the centre of the chapter house itself (Figures 14a and b).

One of the many imponderables in the history of the Minster is why there was no move to translate William to the east end after his canonisation in 1226.⁹⁰ It is feasible that Gray wanted the focus of William's cult to remain in the vicinity of his rebuilt transepts, as opposed to the twelfth-century choir, enhanced by the burials of himself and his successors as archbishop, Sewal de Boville and Godfrey Ludham and the creation of eighteen or nineteen chantries (out of the twenty-two whose locations can be identified) in the transepts by or for canons who were involved with the Minster in the thirteenth century (Figure

⁸⁸ Dobson, "Later Middle Ages," 46-53.

⁸⁹ *Fabric Rolls*, ed. Raine, 290.

⁹⁰ It was normal for canonised saints to be translated, as were Thomas Becket (1220), Hugh of Lincoln (ca.1220) and Edmund Rich (1246), John Crook, *English Medieval Shrines* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2011), 213, 223, 240 and 234. Crook comments that the failure to translate William on his canonisation was surprising, *ibid.*, 247.

15).⁹¹ However, any social and religious emphasis on the transepts and its religious focus on William would have been undermined by the 1284 translation to the east end, paid for by Anthony Bek on his consecration as Bishop of Durham and while Robert de Scarborough was dean, suggesting the possibility that the translation may have been a deliberate act which also served to reduce the status of the transepts. This might account for the fact that the translation only received a passing reference in Wickwane's register, unexpected considering the status of the event and the presence of Edward I.⁹²

The culmination of this collection of features would have been the chapter house complex, the belated plans for its construction explaining the fact that the recently completed north wall of the north transept shows no signs of preparation for an entrance.⁹³ Its location has already been discussed: according to the argument presented here, it may have been deliberately placed so that it opened from the area of the Minster associated with Gray (and John Romanus, who built the north transept and the tower, doubtless with Gray's encouragement).

A possible Gray theme continues into the vestibule and chapter house. Along with many of the other prominent bishops of the thirteenth century who had been educated at Oxford, Gray had been taught by Edmund Rich,⁹⁴ a rare image of whom appears in CHs5, while Brown has suggested that the "St Rob"

⁹¹Stuart Harrison and Christopher Norton, *An Architectural History of York Minster c. 1070-1220*, (forthcoming), Part 5, Chapter II. I am grateful to Stuart Harrison for sight of his unpublished report, "The Attribution of the Tombs of Archbishops Sewal de Bovill d.1258 and Godfrey de Ludham investigated and reassessed for The Chapter of York Minster," (2015 and revised 2016).

⁹² *William Wickwane*, 294.

⁹³ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 16; Brown's suggestion is that the position of the chapter house may have had some connection with a need for public access: "the Dean and Chapter had ensured that on occasion this spacious amenity could be entered from the west and thus made available to the laity without disturbing the liturgical life of the cathedral," *ibid.*, 58. Norton has suggested that there were plans for a chapter house entered from the door into what is now Chapter House Yard.

⁹⁴ Dixon, *Fasti*, 281.

in the same window may represent Robert Grosseteste,⁹⁵ whose unsuccessful canonisation was supported by Romeyn in a letter to Pope Honorius IV,⁹⁶ and who had been a correspondent of Walter de Gray.⁹⁷ The theme might have culminated in the chapter house itself, with the figure in the centre of the lower row of the lost paintings on the west wall (Figure 16), described by Drake (after a conversation with Roger Gale) as,

the picture of an archbishop [..], which, by having a serpent under his feet, into the mouth of which his crosier enters, exactly corresponds with the like representation of Walter de Gray on his monument.⁹⁸

The accompanying etching also shows an animal at the base, as does John Carter's illustration of the central figure depicted in 1790 (Figure 17),⁹⁹ although it was lost by 1798.¹⁰⁰ Nevertheless, in the most scholarly assessment of the wall paintings, Norton suggested various possibilities, including that Gray could have been depicted because of his role in organising the York Chapter.¹⁰¹ The argument presented here modifies and extends the possible reasons for his inclusion and is developed further in connection with the glazing in Chapters 3 and 4 below.

Thus one possibility is that the chapter house was a belatedly conceived project, forged as the result of personal disappointment but also designed to honour Gray's achievements and qualities and to represent a culmination of his architectural and liturgical activities. In these connections, it is relevant to note the discussion of the significance of the culmination of the William narrative in

⁹⁵ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 71.

⁹⁶ *Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers*, ed. James Raine, 1873, 87.

⁹⁷ Ambler, *Bishops*, 16

⁹⁸ Drake, *Eboracum*, 476. Britton also pointed out the similarity between the wall painting and Gray's effigy and concluded that it represented Gray, but was painted after his death, John Britton, *The History and Antiquities of the Metropolitan Church of York* (London, 1819), 32.

⁹⁹ Reproduced in Norton, "Medieval paintings," 36.

¹⁰⁰ Browne, *History*, Vol. 1, 94.

¹⁰¹ Norton, "Medieval paintings," 40.

Chapters 2 and 3, the analysis of the way the glazing scheme was unified in Chapter 3 and the emphasis on virginity in the narratives in Chapter 4. In this there are resonances of Carruthers's suggestions about the way iconography could be used to "journey [...] through a work of art", especially in the way the *ductus* was used as a guide to memory.¹⁰²

For chapter houses to honour former associates is not unknown: at Salisbury, for example, what Brown suggests would have been twelve former bishops may have been honoured alongside former kings in the tracery lights.¹⁰³ At Wells, Ayers believes that certain figures may have been a reminder of absent canons.¹⁰⁴ It is thus reasonable to suggest that something similar may have been intended at York, especially given the additional organisational, financial and legal work that Gray undertook to "revitalise" Chapter.¹⁰⁵ The links between Gray and St William would have been posthumously stressed, while Langton, as instigator, would have anticipated being associated with both. Subsequently, in 1284, five years after the death of the last Gray family member to hold senior office and before the chapter house was completed, at least some of St William's bones had been translated to the east end.

1.2.4 Suggestions for the management of the project after Dean Langton's death

After Langton's death there is an unusual pattern of activity concerning the administration of his estate. While any ante-mortem payments would not necessarily feature in surviving documents, administering his estate brought

¹⁰² Mary Jean Carruthers, *Rhetoric Beyond Words: Delight and Persuasion in the Arts of the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Carruthers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 193.

¹⁰³ Brown, "Salisbury Cathedral Chapter House," 134.

¹⁰⁴ Ayers, *Wells Cathedral*, Part 1, xciii.

¹⁰⁵ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 12.

financial transactions into a public arena. After a few payments and receipts in 1279 and 1280, there is no sign of activity until 1286 when, within two years, major transactions took place involving his executors. Funds totalling possibly £1,635 3s 4d were moved around, shortly after Romeyn's arrival in York as archbishop,¹⁰⁶ and a few months before the trees for the chapter house roof were felled. Transactions then obviously continued at a much lower level until the estate was wound up in around 1291-92.

In this connection and in view of Langton's relatively early death during the construction project, it is now necessary to address who might have managed its completion. While his executors would have had a role in providing the main funds for the work, none of them was a member of Chapter and therefore would not have enjoyed the necessary prestige.¹⁰⁷ More likely would have been a leading member or members of Chapter.

The process of elimination needs to be summarised. As archbishop, Wickwane showed no interest in construction generally and died in 1285. Ludham had already died in 1283. The sub-dean, Gilbert of Sarum also appears to have died in the early 1280s: notably, while it is unlikely he would have taken over responsibility for the project, Chapter created a chantry for him at the altar of St Katherine so he may have had some involvement in her window,¹⁰⁸ but Chapters 3 and 4 conclude that there was an overall glazing scheme affecting six of the windows so, if funds were forthcoming on his behalf, this did not affect the overall design. For reasons already discussed, it is unlikely that Robert de Scarborough was involved. Of the probable residentiary canons by the 1280s, the others who are also unlikely include Thomas de Corbridge and Henry of

¹⁰⁶ *John le Romeyn*, Part II, 155 and 162; Dixon, *Fasti*, 321 and 331.

¹⁰⁷ *John le Romeyn*, Part II, 155.

¹⁰⁸ *Fabric Rolls*, 292.

Newark, both subsequently deans and archbishops, but who showed no interest in building works.

Of the remaining candidates, the most prominent was John de Craucumbe. He had arrived in York by 1270, probably as one of Giffard's relations.¹⁰⁹ In 1279, Giffard appointed him to liaise with Chapter over the election of Robert de Scarborough as dean,¹¹⁰ and he then succeeded Scarborough as archdeacon of the East Riding.¹¹¹ However, while he may have arrived as an appointee of Giffard, he seems eventually to have distanced himself from any faction after Giffard's death. He had a long and distinguished career at the Minster enjoyed a high reputation.¹¹² He acted as the archbishop's official for both Wickwane and Romeyn.¹¹³ He was almost certainly the canon delegated by Chapter to approach Romeyn about a pardon for the citizens of York who responded to Chapter's call for help during Scarborough's household's assault on Romeyn's clerks in the Minster in 1287.¹¹⁴ In 1304, he was also honoured with the third of the thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century institutional chantries, following Gray's and Langton's, at the nearby altar of St John of Beverley.¹¹⁵

The most likely canon to assume practical responsibility for the chapter house project was John de Craucumbe, for which there is possible supporting evidence in CHs4 (see Chapter 4). Romeyn himself was to demonstrate his

¹⁰⁹ *Walter Giffard*, 124, 217 and 255; Giffard's aunt was a "de Craucombe", Gibbs and Lang, *Bishops*, 192.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1-2.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹¹² "Dire à l'apostoye les playnes veritez", *Chronicle of Pierre Langtoft: in French Verse from the Earliest Period to the Death of King Edward I*, ed. Thomas Wright (London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1866), 214-15.

¹¹³ Brentano, "Late medieval changes in the administration of vacant suffragan dioceses: province of York," *YAJ*, 38 (1955): 500.

¹¹⁴ Romeyn's register refers to a canon called "R. de Craucumbe", for whom there is no other reference and hence is likely to be a transcription error, such as also appears in a later error of "J de Scarborough" for the Dean, Robert, *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 365.

¹¹⁵ *Charters*, 273-74.

interest in construction with, probably, the vestibule and, certainly, the nave, and would also have been in a position to assist with theological niceties after his arrival in York as archbishop.

1.3. Introduction to the glazing interventions

The evidence surrounding the patronage of the glass may be circumstantial, but research is on firmer ground with the essentials of glazing interventions (although until the twentieth century the details remain elusive). What follows is a summary of the conclusions on the topic as far as the narrative panels are concerned: the limited nature of the interventions to the heraldry mean that these will only be referred to in Chapter 2.

If the windows were complete by the mid-1290s at the latest, this section will consider the impact of subsequent interventions, in order to establish the extent and nature of any repair programme, the rationale for the movement of panels, and the details of any possible changes. The importance of this exercise is that it assists in narrowing down the options for the panels' original locations and contributes to justifying the reconstructions in Chapter 2, particularly necessary in view of the large number of panels which have been moved. Without any such investigation, there would be no indications of the original design of the windows and hence no justification for the suggestions about the iconographic emphases.

The research into the impact of the interventions is based on descriptions or visual representations of the glass. The glass has been described,¹¹⁶

¹¹⁶ YMA L1/7, Torre, 120-31; 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, 1730), 49-53; John Browne, *Representation*, 9-82; J.W.Knowles, "Manuscript Notes on stained glass in York Minster, forming the first draft for works on the Stained Glass on York Minster," York City Libraries, ca.1890-1920, Vol. 2; 60

illustrated (Figures 16, 19 and 20),¹¹⁷ and, more recently, photographed (Figures 21-23 and Appendix C).¹¹⁸ References to repair work can be found in a variety of documentation held by the Minster, such as the Fabric Rolls¹¹⁹, the Fabric Accounts,¹²⁰ Chapter Acts,¹²¹ special project files,¹²² Minster correspondence,¹²³ private notes,¹²⁴ restoration reports,¹²⁵ and the Friends of

J.W.Knowles, "Historical Notes, on the stained glass in York cathedral," Victoria and Albert Museum, Special Collections: 86.EE6 and 7, Vol. 1, fol. 48r-fol.107v; George Benson, "Ancient painted glass windows in the Minster and city of York," *Annual Report of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society for 1914* (Leeds: privately printed for the Yorkshire Parish Register Society, 1915), 14-27; Frederick Harrison, *The Painted Glass of York* (York: York Minster, 1927), 48-54; Dean Eric Milner White in the Friends of York Minster Annual Reports from 1942-62; O'Connor and Haselock, "Stained Glass," 313-94 and Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 291-93. Other writers, such as Celia Fiennes in *The Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, ed. Christopher Morris (London: Cresset, 1957), 78, wrote a complimentary description of the windows, but without providing details.

¹¹⁷ Drake, *Eboracum*, facing page 476 (Figure 16); Joseph Halfpenny, *Gothic ornaments in the Cathedral Church of York* (York, 1795: new edition, York, 1831), Pl.102 (Figure 19); Britton, *History*, Pl. XXXII (Figure 20).

¹¹⁸ Arthur Perceval Purey-Cust, *The Restoration of York Minster* (Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1899), unpaginated (Figure 21); photograph of a cracked mullion in CHn3 (Figure 22); also from CHn3 there is an undated photograph by Watson, likely to have been taken by the mid-1910s (Figure 23); there is an undated photograph by Knowles of the right-hand lights of CHn2 juxtaposed with the left-hand lights of CH1 in York City Libraries (currently inaccessible); the first complete set of photographs was taken by R.C.Green between 1929 and 1932 and is held in the YMA Green Photographic Collection (Appendix C, Volume 2, 373-1094, *passim*); further photographs were taken before and after the post-World War II reinsertion campaign by Milner White, also held in the Green Photographic Collection (included in Appendix C as relevant); the RCHME Photographic Collection contains images from 1969 and 1976, which have only been included if they add information to the earlier photographs. It is, of course, the case that only with the photographs can we be confident of their accuracy but their dating is not always precise.

¹¹⁹ The main rolls are to be located at YMA E3/59- E3/81A-251, Fabric Rolls, ca.1360-1886, which also contain large numbers of craftsmen's vouchers. See also *Fabric Rolls*, ed. Raine, *passim*. They differ from the Fabric Accounts in that they sometimes include details about the bills of individual craftsmen.

¹²⁰ YMA E4/(a)-(j) Fabric Accounts, 1661-1931; YMA E3/M1-3 (Account of Henry Johnson, 1661-62).

¹²¹ YMA H9/2/1-H11/4 Chapter Acts, 1756 to 1914.

¹²² YMA B3/1/1-3 (Documents relating to Charles Crosby's repairs in the Chapter House, 1693-95); YMA B3/4/1-24 Restoration, 1844; YMA B3/5/1-14 Repair Accounts, 1842-43.

¹²³ SPAB York Minster Correspondence File 1899-1935; SPAB York Glass Correspondence File, 1920-27; SPAB York Glass File, 1927-30; YMA M-W/II/6-7 Papers of Dean Eric Milner White.

¹²⁴ YMA Misc. Add. 91, Hornby Large Scrapbook.

¹²⁵ YMA D10/F Windows Restoration Fund; YMA D10/FAB/G Chapter Subject Files, Glass; York Minster Restoration, (First Occasional Paper. Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1899), York Minster Restoration: Fourth Occasional Paper (Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1902), York Minster Restoration: Sixth Occasional Paper (Leeds, Richard Jackson, 1903), York Minster Restoration: Seventh Occasional Paper (Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1904), York Minster Restoration: Eighth Occasional Paper (Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1905), York Minster Restoration: Ninth Occasional Paper (Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1907), and York Minster Restoration: Eleventh Occasional Paper (Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1908).

York Minster Annual Reports.¹²⁶ These are supplemented by newspapers and other local sources.¹²⁷ More documentation relating to the debate about appropriate techniques in the interventions of the 1920s is preserved by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, after which the earliest complete set of photographs was taken.¹²⁸ Finally, during the reinsertion of the glass after World War II, the Dean, Eric Milner White, made several changes, which, as he only occasionally documented them, have to be deduced from a comparison between the locations and appearance before and after his interventions, and from notes written by Minster Glazier, Oswald Lazenby.¹²⁹

1.4 Analysis of the glazing interventions

It is clear that there have been numerous interventions, many of which are alluded to in the Fabric Rolls and the Fabric Accounts. In total, there is evidence of twenty-three interventions to the glass, of which all are listed in the Overview in Appendix A, but only the main ones are discussed here.¹³⁰

These are, fortunately, interspersed with descriptions of the glass, with the exception of the period 1690-91 to 1845 during which there were two main repair exercises. This means that the movement of panels can generally be plotted from the locations of the glass provided in the descriptions, and patterns of reinsertion policies can be identified. Full details of the results can be seen in Appendix B.

In order to describe the movement of the panels, a numbering system has been devised which provides a means of identifying each panel, while the

¹²⁶ FYMAR, various reports, 1928-63.

¹²⁷ For example, the *Yorkshire Gazette* and the *York Courant*, 1762-1803, *passim*.

¹²⁸ YMA Green Photographic Collection.

¹²⁹ Oswald E.Lazenby, "York Minster windows: record of movement of window panels during Dean Milner White's restoration of the Minster Glass, 1942-1963".

¹³⁰ See Volume 2, Appendices A, 279-297, which also itemise smaller repair exercises not considered in this chapter.

location of each panel within the window uses the CVMA numbering system. This system is presented visually in Figure 4b, while small grids showing only the narrative rows (normally 2, 4, 6 and 8, but occasionally, where relevant, also 1 and 9) are used to present visually the locations on any one occasion in the thesis and in the appendices. Material showing the interventions to each window is presented in Appendix B, while the impact on each panel is in Appendix C.

1.4.1 From installation to the testimony of James Torre, 1690-91

Before the first description of the glass, by James Torre in 1690-91,¹³¹ there are a few references to interventions that can be identified as occurring in the chapter house. The only one recorded before the Reformation was by John Burgh.¹³² Post-Reformation interventions occurred in 1582-83 and 1611-12, carried out by the long-serving plumber, Robert Thompson,¹³³ and by his successors, the Crosby family, whose members were responsible for work both before and immediately after the Civil War.¹³⁴

Significantly, as part of the negotiations for the surrender of the Royalists to the Parliamentary forces in 1644, General Fairfax issued orders to the occupying troops that “neither Churches, nor other buildings, be defaced”,¹³⁵ an

¹³¹ YMA L1/7, Torre, 120-31.

¹³² John Burgh, “glasenwright”, in *The Register of the Freemen of the City of York, from the City Records*, ed. Francis Collins. Surtees Society, 96 (Durham: Andrews, 1897), 74. See Appendix A.1 (Volume 2, 282).

¹³³ YMA E3/58 Fabric Rolls, 1582/83 and YMA E/3/62/2 Fabric Rolls, 1611/12. See Appendices A.2 and A.3 (Volume 2, 282).

¹³⁴ YMA E3/62/3 Fabric Rolls, 1623/4, YMA E3/64 Fabric Rolls, 1639 and YMA E3/M1-3 (Account of Henry Johnson, 1661/2). See Appendices A.4 and A.5 (Volume 2, 282).

¹³⁵ Simeon Ashe. *A Continuation of True Intelligence From the English and Scottish Forces in the North for the service of King and Parliament, and now beleaguering York from the 16th of June to Wednesday the 19th of July, 1644*, BLTT, E.4[6]. It is undeniable that the Minster suffered at some stage, but the targets of which we are aware were sculpture and metal, rather than glass. Of relevance to the Chapter House were the of William de Langton in the south transept, Drake, *Eboracum*, 492-94; the heads of the trumeau Virgin and Child and some of the carved heads under CHn4, on the left of the entrance, Aberth, “Sculpted Heads,” 37.

instruction which may not have been totally obeyed but is generally believed to have prevented much damage in the City. During the Commonwealth, the management of the Minster passed to the Commonwealth Committee for York and the Ainsty.¹³⁶ Although the Committee's ultimate interest in the building was as a venue for preaching, they demonstrated their concern for its condition: on 23 October 1645 they noted "the present need that the fabricke of the church is in want of repairs" and authorised payments.¹³⁷ By March 1646 they agreed to petition the House of Commons to let them spend those moneys that were not earmarked for the support of the four preachers on "the fabricke of the Cathedrall [which is] in want of repare".¹³⁸ Their concern for the Minster was intensified later that year, when they reported petty vandalism because of lack of security.¹³⁹

By 1648 the Committee had resolved to place the upkeep of the Minster on a more organised footing, under the management of the Parliamentarian, Edmund Gyles, whose responsibilities already included what amounted to that of City Engineer and Militiaman. They ordered the Lord Mayor to "deposit into the hands of Edmond Gyles soe much money as is necessary for the present repayre of the Minster".¹⁴⁰ He was still there, managing two plumbers, in 1655.¹⁴¹ As well as his other interests, his main trade was that of a glazier, for which he had been given the freedom of the city in 1634.¹⁴² If knowledge of the

¹³⁶ *Proceedings of the Commonwealth Committee of York and the Ainsty*, ed. Angelo Raine, YAS. Record Series, cxviii (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1951): 1-12.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁴¹ *Extracts from York City House Books XXXVI and XXXVII*, ed. Angelo Raine, YAS. Record Series, cxviii (Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1951): 28.

¹⁴² John Trevor Brighton, "Henry Gyles: Virtuoso and Glasspainter of York 1645-1709," *York Historian*, 4 (1984): 3. The assumption is that "Edmund" and "Edward" were the same person, given that there is no evidence of two separate Parliamentarians with the distinctive surname of "Gyles" operating as a glazier.

craft of stained glass painting in York had declined after the Reformation,¹⁴³ an early revival was to come with the activities of Edmund and particularly his son, Henry.¹⁴⁴ As overseer of the Minster, Edmund would have been responsible for the date of “1657” inscribed in window s35 in the nave,¹⁴⁵ and the inscription of “1658”, which Torre noted in the top partition of the Katherine window (CHn4).¹⁴⁶ The irony of the situation is that, far from being the time when there was least respect for the glass, it is likely that it was the only period in the history of the Minster when its entire fabric was in the care of a glazier as opposed to a mason or an architect.

The earliest unambiguous reference to repair work after the Restoration was in October 1661, when plumbers and glaziers were paid for a total of thirty-eight days, doubtless to enable the building to be prepared for the newly re-established Chapter.¹⁴⁷ The glaziers involved were predominantly members of the Crosby family, Marmaduke, and two sons, Edward and George. Marmaduke Crosby had been employed at the Minster on his own in 1623 and later with his sons in 1639.¹⁴⁸ Edward and his son, Charles, in turn became the main glaziers at the Minster in the later seventeenth century. At the Restoration they were re-appointed, probably to replace Edmund Gyles and doubtless others associated with the Commonwealth.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴³ This is in contrast to research conducted in the Low Countries, where the craft continued until the late eighteenth century, Joost M.A. Caen, *The Production of Stained Glass in the County of Flanders and the Duchy of Brabant from the XVth to the XVIIIth Centuries: Materials and Techniques* (Antwerp: Brepols, 2009), 29.

¹⁴⁴ John Trevor Brighton, “The Enamel Glass-Painters of York: 1585-1795,” DPhil Dissertation, University of York, 1978, Vol. 1, 77, credits Henry Gyles with all the experimentation, but it is likely that he was too young to have initiated all the experiments and his father, Edmund Gyles may have played a part.

¹⁴⁵ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 290.

¹⁴⁶ YMA L1/7, Torre, 123.

¹⁴⁷ YMA E3M/3 Fabric Rolls, August 1661/February 1662.

¹⁴⁸ YMA E3/62/3 Fabric Rolls, 1623/4 and E3/64 Fabric Rolls, 1639.

¹⁴⁹ The Crosbys were involved immediately after the Restoration, and, again, when work was done on the stonework and the glass in 1669-70. See Appendices A.4 and A.5 (282).

In 1690-91, James Torre wrote his description of the Minster glass (Appendix A.14).¹⁵⁰ The main advantage of his work is that he described systematically what he saw in the narrative panels and only rarely identified the scene as an alternative. The reconstructions set out in Chapter 2 are based on an assessment of the cumulative impact of all the repair programmes, together with further exploration of images and writings created or available in the thirteenth century. Anticipating these conclusions, Torre's descriptions give the first indication of the type of interventions that had taken place since the windows' initial installation.

Compared with the suggested original order of the panels as suggested in Chapter 2, by 1690-91, 79 or 80 panels (depending on Option 1 or Option 2 for CHn2 as considered in Chapter 2 below and Appendix B.2)¹⁵¹ were in their original place, while the remaining 60 or 61 had been moved or lost.¹⁵² Of the latter, in CHn3, nine panels had disappeared (five from the lowest grisaille row).¹⁵³ The disorder in CHs3 was clearly the result of the repairs to the stonework in the intervening mullions in 1669-70 and a series of errors when the panels were reinserted.¹⁵⁴ A further two panels in CHn2 (Herod observing the massacre of the infants in CHn2:26 and the Assumption of the soul of the Virgin in CHn2:28)¹⁵⁵ had been switched to a different light-type if Option 1 were the original design, but not for Option 2, the preferred option (see the discussion

¹⁵⁰ YMA L1/7, Torre, 120-31.

¹⁵¹ Volume 2, 323-331

¹⁵² Those in their original place were as follows (compare the original order of the glass with the analysis of Torre's description in Appendix B): CH1:7, 8, 9, 10, 18, 20, 28, 37, 38 and 40; CHn2 (Option 1): 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, one of 26 or 27, 29, 40 or CHn2 6, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 27, 28 and 40 (Option 2); CHn3:6, 8, 10, 16, 19, 38; CHn4: all; CHs2: 8, 9, 10, 18, 19, 28 and 39 (Torre did not describe panel 40, but the only available location would have been its original); CHs3:9, 19, 28, 29, 38 and 39; CHs4: nineteen panels, the twentieth (in CHs4:6e) had been lost).

¹⁵³ YMA L1/7, Torre, 120-31.

¹⁵⁴ YMA E4(a) Fabric Accounts, fol. 6r.

¹⁵⁵ Volume 2, 517 and 527.

in Chapter 2 and Appendix B:2).¹⁵⁶ A twelfth-century panel had been intruded in 6e of the Five Saints Window (CHs4:30) to replace an original that must have been damaged beyond repair.¹⁵⁷ In the heraldry, the most serious disruption was in the larger occuli of CHn4 (see Chapter 2).

It is unknown when these movements were carried out, although it is likely not to have pre-dated the Reformation, given that, before then, there might have been some understanding of the lives of the saints that were depicted. Of the more serious damage, particularly to CHn3, it is unclear how much was cumulative or whether it was the result of hostilities during and after the siege of York by Parliamentary forces in 1644.¹⁵⁸ If the latter, despite the perception of a high level of cannon assault on the City and the Minster during the siege of York,¹⁵⁹ which lasted from 23 April until the City's surrender on 15 July 1644,¹⁶⁰ the chapter house was not within reach of any of the recorded battery positions of the three besieging Parliamentary armies.¹⁶¹ Whether any damage was the result of iconoclasm at the fall of the City is unclear, but it would have been counter to Fairfax's orders to the troops that "neither Churches, nor other buildings, be defaced".¹⁶² There might be some reason for iconoclasts to attack CHn3 (as William was a local saint and archbishop), but there is no suggestion that the more prominent n7 in the choir north aisle suffered, so it is considered unlikely.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 323.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 1065.

¹⁵⁸ Dr Louise Hampson has concluded that the panels had been removed from the demolished Chapel of the Holy Sepulchre in the 1620s by Robert Thompson, pers. comm., 25 May 2017.

¹⁵⁹ Peter L. Wenham, *The Great and Close Siege of York, 1644* (York: Sessions Book Trust, 1970), 69-70.

¹⁶⁰ Henry Slingsby, *Original Memoirs written during the Great Civil War* (London: Murray, 1806), 45 and 53.

¹⁶¹ Wenham, *Siege*, 144-50, lists the battery locations. Details can also be found in Simeon Ashe, *An Exact Relation of the Siege before Yorke*, 6 and 7 June 1644, *An Exact Relation of the Siege before Yorke*, 6 and 7 June 1644. BLTT, E.50 [30], *passim*.

¹⁶² Ashe, *Continuation*, E.4[6].

The only other recorded possibility for interventions at this time was collateral damage resulting from a skirmish at Monk Bar, when some of the Royalists made a sally from the City, probably on 24 June 1644.¹⁶³ Drake implied this was a major incident, involving 600 men, who “furiously assaulted the Earl of Manchester’s quarters, but after a sharp conflict were driven back with loss”.¹⁶⁴ There may have been damage to the chapter house windows facing north and east on the other side of the City Wall given the Clifton location of Manchester’s “quarters” and the probable route taken by Newcastle’s forces back into the city,¹⁶⁵ hence possibly accounting for the damage to CHn3 and the heraldy in CHn4.

The main outcome of these interventions is that there was a common pattern in the treatment of most of the glass in the course of the four centuries after its original insertion.¹⁶⁶ If windows were removed for attention, there was no guarantee that they would be replaced in their previous locations. Appendix B shows that most of those that had been moved remained in their original light or light-type, meaning that plumber/glaziers used the borders to determine where the panels should be reinserted rather than the contents: for the C light this meant that panels were retained in their correct light, albeit at times in a different row, while in the paired lights of A and B, several panels were moved to the alternative light-type.

¹⁶³ Wenham, *Siege*, 76.

¹⁶⁴ Drake, *Eboracum*, 166.

¹⁶⁵ Peter Addyman, *British Historic Towns Atlas, York* (Witney: Lovell Johns Ltd, 2015), Map 9: York ca.1700.

¹⁶⁶ The pattern of change can be seen in diagrammatic form in Appendix B (Volume 2, 315-372).

1.4.2 From James Torre to the description by John Browne, 1690-91 to 1844-45

The second significant description of the glass was written by John Browne in 1844-45,¹⁶⁷ eventually published in 1917 as the *Representation and Arms on the Glass in the Windows of York Minster*. In the intervening decades since 1690-91, three etchings had been produced, namely by T. Haynes in Drake's 1736 *Eboracum* (Figure 16),¹⁶⁸ Joseph Halfpenny in his *Gothic ornaments in the Cathedral Church of York* from 1795 (Figure 19),¹⁶⁹ and John Britton's *The History and Antiquities of the Metropolitan Church of York*, dated 1819 and showing only CHn3 (Figure 20). The first two indicate some of the changes that had been made between 1690-91 and 1844-45, but neither portrays the whole of the chapter house. Their main value is in Norton's reconstruction of the ceiling paintings, the comparison of the grisaille pattern in CHn4 and a comparison of the position of the narrative panels originally in the central light in CHs4.

Browne identified most of the panels and provided some illustrations of the grisaille. However, unlike Torre, he did not always describe their appearance, so it is not easy to determine which panel he is referring to and, confused by the subject matter of the Katherine window (CHn4), he simply described it as "St Agnes" and gave no further details.¹⁷⁰ In addition, on occasion he failed to specify the location of the panels he was describing.¹⁷¹

A comparison between Torre's and Browne's accounts clarifies that there had been major changes to the appearance and order of the panels. Several more panels had been moved to their alternative light-type and some entire

¹⁶⁷ Browne, *Representation*, 9-82.

¹⁶⁸ Drake, *Eboracum*, facing page 476.

¹⁶⁹ Halfpenny, *Gothic ornaments*, Pl. 102.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 33 and 35.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 42 and 75.

lights shifted. However, because there are no written descriptions between the 1690s and 1845, it is not usually possible to ascertain if they were carried out by Charles Crosby in 1693-97 or Thomas Sanderson between 1762 and 1771 (with the exception of the movement of lights in CHn4 and CHs4, which can be detected from Drake's and Halfpenny's illustrations). In Appendices B and C changes that may have been made in both exercises are suggested, to explain the locations of the panels in 1845. These are, inevitably, tenuous, but they do account for situations when two separate movements must have been made (for example, when a panel was moved to its alternative light-type and then the light itself was moved), although it is accepted that both moves could have occurred on the same occasion.

Charles Crosby's work on the windows was between 1693 and 1697,¹⁷² shortly after Torre's description of the glass. Panels were obviously removed from their mullions and both contemporary and re-cycled old glass used to fill gaps. Further switches of panels within lights and between light-types were also probably made.¹⁷³

Thomas Sanderson (1736-1803) was the main glazier at the Minster in the third quarter of the eighteenth century.¹⁷⁴ Only in one voucher did he specify that he was working in the chapter house,¹⁷⁵ but, by associating his bills with those of workmen in other trades, such as masons, blacksmiths and whitesmiths, who provided more details about the location of their activities, it is

¹⁷² YMA B1/1/1 (Account for Glass Work done by Charles Crosby the Minster Bill no ye 4th 92). See Appendix A.6.1 (Volume 2, 284). See Appendix A.6.1-6 for the complicated details of the programme (Volume 2, 283-288). The conclusion about a seventh window is based on the fact that one of the bills is described as the "4th" in Appendix A.6.2 (Volume 2, 285), which may be a window for which there is no other record. I am grateful to Dr Louise Hampson for sharing her thoughts on Charles Crosby, pers. comm., 7 August 2009.

¹⁷³ Appendices B and C provide details of the possible interplay of the movement of panels between the Crosby and Sanderson repairs.

¹⁷⁴ According to the Freeman's Register, a Thomas Saunderson was made free of the City in 1758, *Register*, ed. Collins, 280.

¹⁷⁵ YMA E3/129V Fabric Rolls, 1762/63 (Account of Thomas Sanderson).

clear that in five other cases he was working on six windows.¹⁷⁶ On average he was claiming up to a possible maximum of 300 days per window, excluding any additional assistance from Thomas Dobson, the labourer, who submitted separate invoices. This amounts in total to almost twice the time spent by Charles Crosby in the 1690s.

The main outcomes of the work of either or both Crosby and Sanderson were repairs to the glass and movement of the panels. On balance, it is assumed here, possibly unfairly, that any inadvertent errors were made in the course of the Crosby repairs, because what we know about the Sanderson interventions suggests they were managed quite systematically. For example, in the Sanderson programme, there was a general reorganisation to create more system and order in the windows' appearance. As Morgan has pointed out, the original B-B-C-A-A border/grisaille design in the lights of the Katherine window (CHn4) was reorganised to create the A-B-C-B-A pattern of most of the other windows between 1736 and 1844-45,¹⁷⁷ and this study indicates that similar switches, of the second and fifth lights in CH1, and of the three left-hand lights in CHs4, were also made.¹⁷⁸

Intervention to the Five Saints window (CHs4) seems to contradict this focus on symmetry. There were five different types of grisaille and borders to the panels, hence making a design of A-B-C-D-E and thus impossible to move into a symmetrical pattern. In 1736, there had been symmetry which was probably original, not in the grisaille and borders but in the shapes containing the narratives: those in the central light (showing scenes from the life of Thomas Becket) were located under a canopy as opposed to within a medallion.

¹⁷⁶ YMA E3/129V Fabric Rolls, 1762/63 (Account of Elizabeth Bateson); YMA E3/129V Fabric Rolls, 1762/63 (Account of Samuel Hicks); YMA E3/129V Fabric Rolls, 1762/63 (Account of William Silcock).

¹⁷⁷ Morgan, "Catherine," 156.

¹⁷⁸ See Volume 2, Appendices B.1 and B.7, 317-22 and 365-72.

However, at some point after 1736, probably in the 1760s, this central light was moved into the first light, and the then first and second lights were each shifted one space to the right, thus destroying the medallion/canopy symmetry. This apparently unusual step can be explained by the colours in the borders. Four of the designs contain a background of red glass, one of these showing half red and half green. The post-1736 rearrangement created a situation where those three lights whose borders were predominantly red were placed in the outside and central lights, alternating with the lights whose borders were respectively blue and green/red, suggesting that the emphasis was on symmetry in relation to the colour of the borders rather than the grisaille or the medallion/canopy designs.

Sanderson also reorganised the panels in CH1 and CHs3, creating alternating rows of red and blue backgrounds to the medallions, and resulting, in the case of CHs3 (Paul), in a re-creation of what was almost its perfect original sequence,¹⁷⁹ on this occasion reliance was placed on the alternating red and blue backgrounds to the panels. One uncertainty revolves around the switch of background colour between Christ's Arrest in CH1:17¹⁸⁰ and him in Judgement in CH1:27¹⁸¹ for which the most likely explanation is that the panels were placed in an inappropriate row for their background and medallion rim colours in the 1690s or the 1760s (the former being more likely as an inadvertent error), with their colours probably switched over to suit these incorrect positions in the 1760s or 1844-45. A second problem concerns a switch of borders between Herod observing the massacre of the Innocents in CHn2:26¹⁸² and the Assumption of the soul of the Virgin in CHn2:28¹⁸³ for the

¹⁷⁹ Volume 2, 359-64. Only CHs3:7 and 9 were left in the wrong locations.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 399.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 419.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 517.

preferred Option 2 (see Chapter 2). In this case, it is plausible that, unusually, the two panels had been inserted in the wrong light-type, probably in the 1690s and then, possibly in the 1760s or the 1840s, the borders were changed to fit their new light-type positions.

The Sanderson repairs appear to have been the final occasion when panels were moved to a different location until Milner White's intervention after World War II. The only exception is CHn3, whose descriptions are unclear, but the small movements between the first and second lights may have occurred in on-going mullion repairs in the early twentieth century (see Figure 22 and Appendix B.3).¹⁸⁴

In 1770 John Carr was able to report that the windows were in good condition.¹⁸⁵

1.4.3 From John Browne, 1844-45, to the descriptions by J.W. Knowles, 1890-1920

After Browne, the next major descriptions of the glass were two accounts made at the turn of the twentieth century by practising York glazier, J.W.Knowles. The first, referred to here as Knowles's "Manuscript Notes", provides detailed observations and constituted initial thoughts and comments for what was to be a published volume on the Minster glass.¹⁸⁶ The document was compiled over time, judging by the reworking in different colours of ink, but has been given a date prior to 1903 because the majority of the notes on the chapter house

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 527..

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 333-43.

¹⁸⁵ YMA A4/1/a1 g2 "A report of the State of the Minster at York Made by John Carr 1770 then Lord Mayor of York".

¹⁸⁶ Knowles, "Manuscript Notes," fol.137r-fol.202r. I am grateful to Mrs Jill Murray, granddaughter of J.W. Knowles, for allowing me to compare my transcription with her own and to the late Hugh Murray for letting me have copies of the photographs he took of Knowles's sketches in this work.

appear to have been made before the insertion of protective glazing from 1903 onwards and may have dated from the time that Knowles was briefly working there in 1896.¹⁸⁷ As a collection of jottings, it can be rather confusing to decipher: the notes are jumbled as well as being at times illegible, but it is more comprehensive than his second version. It also includes occasional summaries of some of the windows, which do not always conform to his written descriptions and are described here as “schemas”.¹⁸⁸

The second document, here called the “Historical Notes”, was probably compiled between 1915 and 1929, but closer to the earlier date judging from the strength of Knowles’s handwriting (compared with a 1929 example of his handwriting), and is a more polished, but shorter, version of the original, prepared as the draft for a book.¹⁸⁹ It does not seem to have been compiled with reference to the notes now held in York, seen from the contradictions and inconsistencies between the two, especially relating to the distribution of panels and the iconography of CHs2 and CHs3 (Peter and Paul). Both versions, but especially that held in York, provide detailed accounts of the appearance of the glass, with helpful comments about previous restorations. On balance, although they are more difficult to decipher, the “Manuscript Notes” are more reliable than the “Historical Notes”.

The interventions between Browne and Knowles included the chapter house restoration of 1844-45, the creation of the copy of CH1 and subsequent repair exercises of a relatively minor nature.

¹⁸⁷ Knowles, “Manuscript Notes,” fol.107v.

¹⁸⁸ See Appendix C, *passim*.

¹⁸⁹ Knowles, “Historical Notes,” fol.48r-fol.107v.

1.4.3.1 The chapter house restoration of 1844-45

In 1844, Dr Stephen Beckwith bequeathed £5,000 to the Minster, but of the £2,500 allocated to the chapter house, only £15 19s 10d was spent on the glass.¹⁹⁰ Sydney Smirke outlined his reasons for not including the glass in the project in his letter to Revd S. Creyke, the chairman of the Restoration Subcommittee, a letter which provides the earliest assessment of the windows to survive.¹⁹¹ Smirke explained that he was not proposing to devote much attention to the windows, because of the potential costs involved.

Consequently, Smirke was happy to employ the Minster jobbing plumber/glazier, William Noton. Given that only sixty-four days were spent on the entire glazing scheme, it would amount to an average of slightly over nine days for each window, which was insufficient time to do anything more than running repairs.¹⁹² These probably involved interventions to the narrative scenes, borders or heraldry because of the purchase of a small amount of mainly coloured glass.

The main emphasis was on cleaning and making good, with some essential repairs involving figured glass and other glass from the Minster stores. Some panels would have been removed for the work to the mullions, but the degree of intervention must have been far less than in the 1690s and 1760s and any panels removed were replaced in the position whence they had been taken.

¹⁹⁰ Appendices A.10.1 and 2 (Volume 2, 292).

¹⁹¹ YMA B.3.4.73 Bankers' Book (Letter lodged inside). Letter dated 4 September 1844. See Appendix A.9 (Volume 2, 290).

¹⁹² I am grateful to Nick Teed, Senior Conservator at the York Glaziers Trust, pers. comm., 2 November 2010, for his suggestion that, as well as removing some panels, the work would have been extremely limited, possibly to spot repairs, mending leads (or strap leads), some cleaning, and some bench repairs.

1.4.3.2 The plan to copy the glass

A matter of weeks after the latter of the two Noton accounts was submitted and while the restoration was still in hand,¹⁹³ Chapter agreed that John Barnett was “to be desired to execute a compartment of one of the windows in the chapter house to be selected by the canon in residence”.¹⁹⁴ John Browne was obviously the instigator and supervisor of the project:¹⁹⁵ after “undertaking to superintend the execution of the work”, he was “to be answerable for an adherence to the original designs”.¹⁹⁶ This was a new departure for the Minster because Chapter would have been aware that, by having glass “executed”, it was ordering a copy to be made, probably in the full knowledge that the medieval glass would be discarded. It is important to note that this project fell outside the Beckwith restoration, confirmed by the fact that Barnett’s payments were made out of the Repairs Account and not the Beckwith Bequest Account,¹⁹⁷ which was almost exhausted.

However, the project to copy CH1 was potentially fraught, given the emergence in the early nineteenth century of a controversy about the nature of stained glass conservation.¹⁹⁸ On the one side were those for whom the emphasis was on restoring the appearance of the windows (probably involving making a copy).¹⁹⁹ The other side of the debate was typified by Thomas

¹⁹³ Barnett’s first invoice was submitted four months before Smirke’s final account (April 15 and 12 August 1845 respectively).

¹⁹⁴ YMA H11/1 Chapter Acts, 1842-73, 130.

¹⁹⁵ Knowles, “Historical Notes,” fol.4r. Of Browne, Knowles said, “The Dean and Chapter depended on him to supervise the production of a new stained glass window for the Chapter House, stained glass being at this time but little understood.”

¹⁹⁶ Browne, *History*, Vol. 1, 329.

¹⁹⁷ YMA E3/81A-251 Fabric Rolls 1715-1886. The erroneous assumption that it was part of the 1844 Beckwith repairs has endured. See Spraker, “The East Window,” Vol. 1, 51-58.

¹⁹⁸ Sarah Brown, “Recovering the Past – Thinking about the future: Writing about stained glass in England c1750-c1850,” in *Le vitrail et les traités du Moyen Âge à nos jours: actes du XXIIIe colloque international du Corpus Vitrearum, Tours 3-7 juillet 2006*, eds. Karine Boulanger and Michel Héroid (Bern: Peter Lang, 2008), 278-280.

¹⁹⁹ This can be seen most acutely in connection with the east window at Winchester College, John Dolbel Le Couteur, *Ancient Glass in Winchester Cathedral* (Winchester: Warren, 1920), 69-70.

Willement, whose emphasis was on preserving the original glass as far as possible and who was working on the ceiling of the chapter house at the same time as the copy was being made.²⁰⁰

After producing one light of CH1 in April 1845, Barnett was authorised to complete the copy of the window at a reduced estimate of £45 for the tracery and £22 for each remaining light, amounting to £133, and hence a total cost of £163.²⁰¹ From the receipts, it can be seen that it was completed by 11 October 1845.²⁰² Initially the project gathered momentum: at the meeting of the Chapter Committee in May 1845, approval was given to Barnett's proposal to copy all the remaining chapter house windows at an annual cost of £180.²⁰³ However, by 2 December 1845 there was a complete reversal and the entire project was unceremoniously abandoned.²⁰⁴

1.4.3.3 The mid-nineteenth century

By the next decade the glass was obviously in need of attention. On 2 April 1855, the Dean and Chapter took the decision that "it is expedient to proceed with the Repair of the Windows in the Chapter House",²⁰⁵ and employed William Noton for this purpose. In an article in the *Yorkshire Gazette* of 11 August 1855, local pride was in full evidence when the local firm was deemed to be able to

²⁰⁰ Sarah Brown, "'So perfectly satisfactory': The Stained Glass of Thomas Willement in St George's Chapel," in *A History of the Stained Glass of St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle*, ed. Sarah Brown (Oxford: Dean and Canons of Windsor, 2005), 119.

²⁰¹ YMA H11/1 Chapter Acts, 1842-73, 139.

²⁰² YMA B3/6/1 Beckwith Restoration Fund (Receipts of John Barnett); YMA B3/5/2 York Minster Repairs account, 1842-45.

²⁰³ YMA H11/1 Chapter Acts, 1842-73, 145.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 167.

²⁰⁵ YMA H11/1 Chapter Acts, 1842-73, 307.

achieve what “a Metropolitan artist in glass-staining pronounced [...] to be beyond the efforts of restoration”.²⁰⁶

Two windows were completed between 2 April and 23 June,²⁰⁷ suggesting that an average of something in the order of eighty-one days was spent on each window. Given the total number of days worked, it seems that the remaining windows were also attended to for an average of seventy days each, or eighty days on the assumption that the recently copied CH1 needed minimal attention.²⁰⁸ This implies that the 1855 activity counted as a repair exercise but did not constitute as large a project as that of the 1760s.

1.4.4 From J.W. Knowles to the reinsertion campaign after World War II

The chapter house windows entered the twentieth century in a state of disrepair and were described in that condition by John W. Knowles. Despite the efforts made in the course of the nineteenth century, there had been no major intervention since Thomas Sanderson’s work in the 1760s.

George Benson produced an incomplete summary of the narrative panels in 1915, but was the first commentator to describe all the border designs, and here he is more helpful.²⁰⁹ Frederick Harrison’s volume on *The Painted Glass of York* followed in 1927,²¹⁰ using Benson as a starting point.²¹¹ He had already, in 1921, identified the main difficulty: “at present, [the windows] are so greatly in need of preservation that it is almost impossible to describe

²⁰⁶ YCL, *Yorkshire Gazette*, 11 August 1855, 3. The reference to the involvement of “a Metropolitan artist” in the *Yorkshire Gazette* is tantalising. Did it refer to Thomas Willement, the only person who could have been described as such?

²⁰⁷ YMA Misc Add. 91, Hornby Large Scrapbook, 320.

²⁰⁸ *Gazette*, 1855, 3.

²⁰⁹ Benson, “Ancient painted glass,” 14-27.

²¹⁰ Harrison, *Painted Glass*, 48-54.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, vii.

them in detail”.²¹² The descriptions of the narrative panels by Harrison are, like those of Benson, so brief that only rarely can one identify those concerned.

1.4.4.1 *The re-leading exercise, 1929-32*

Harrison’s work was followed by Green’s photographic survey of the glass, held in the Green Photographic Collection in York Minster Archives. Between 1899 and 1932, the Minster engaged in a significant restoration exercise, which evolved from repairing the Minster stonework, adding protective glazing to the chapter house windows between 1903 and 1908,²¹³ and, finally, re-leading nearly all the Minster’s medieval glass. The chapter house constituted the last part of this programme, being re-leaded between 1929 and 1932.

The photographs were taken while the panels were on the bench after being re-leaded in the course of the 1929-32 exercise.²¹⁴ They were not the first to be taken of the chapter house, but were the first to amount to a comprehensive set of almost all the panels. Controversially, no photographs seem to have been taken beforehand so it is not possible to ascertain what work was actually carried out, but something can be gleaned by comparing these 1929-32 photographs with Knowles’s earlier verbal descriptions.

Importantly, they constitute the last record of the windows before their removal during World War II.

During World War I, in 1916 some Minster windows were removed on the advice of Walter Tapper, who had succeeded George Bodley as the Minster

²¹² Frederick Harrison, *The Windows of York Minster* (York: York Minster Window Preservation Fund; W.H. Smith, 1921), 19.

²¹³ This was launched with a £100 donation by the Dean in 1902 and called the “Special fund for the protection and repair of the painted glass in the Chapter house,” in York Minster Restoration: Fourth Occasional Report of Contributions and Work (Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1902), 27. It continued to 1908 (York Minster Restoration, Eleventh Occasional Report of Contributions and Work (Leeds, Richard Jackson, 1908).

²¹⁴ Two photographs exist of panels before the re-leading exercise: CHn3:8 and one of the panel of Hercules, probably by Henry Gyles, which may have been inserted into 8e of CHn3 during installation of protective glazing, 1903-08, and was removed by Milner White.

Architect in 1908.²¹⁵ This removal had enabled closer inspection and showed that some of the glass “was almost to the thinness of paper”, that “the surface [...] was thickly coated with the dust of ages” and that “supporting leadwork was in [...] a deplorable condition”.²¹⁶

Consequently, by 1920, preparations had been made to establish the York Minster Windows Preservation Fund to raise money to complete the re-leading of all the medieval windows in the cathedral. However, despite the obvious condition of the chapter house glass, the York Minster Windows Restoration Fund Executive Committee decided, because of the existence of protective glazing, to delay the work.²¹⁷ Only in 1929 did Tapper confirm that the windows “are in urgent need of repair”,²¹⁸ and in 1932 Canon Harrison was to describe the success of the project,²¹⁹ somewhat in advance of the installation of the final window, CHs3, in 1932.

Despite the principle that, in addition to being re-leaded, the glass would receive minimal intervention and that any replacements would consist only of glass with a similar tone, a comparison between Knowles’s descriptions and photographs taken by Green after the chapter house panels had been re-leaded shows that, at least in the chapter house, practice may have been different from principle and that some changes were made (Appendix A.13).²²⁰ There does not appear to have been any alteration to the location of panels,²²¹ but by comparing pieces of glass with Knowles’s descriptions, it can be seen that a

²¹⁵ YMA H11/3 Chapter Acts, 1870-1914, 394.

²¹⁶ Frederick Harrison, *Stained Glass of York Minster* (London: The Studio New York: Studio Publications, 1937), 9.

²¹⁷ YMA MS D10/F (Executive Committee minutes, 3 March 1922).

²¹⁸ Walter Tapper, “Fabric Needs – Consulting Architect’s Report,” *FYMAR* (1929): 9.

²¹⁹ Frederick Harrison, “The Preservation of the Minster Windows: 1920-32,” *FYMAR* (1932): 55.

²²⁰ Volume 2, 296-301.

²²¹ Note that the photographs must subsequently have been catalogued after Milner White’s post-World War II reinsertion campaign, because they are labelled according to the positions after his re-ordering of the panels. The post re-leading pre-reinsertion positions can be seen in Figures 24a-g).

number present in Knowles's descriptions had vanished by the time of the re-leading photographs, some of the insertions themselves later being removed by Milner White after World War II.²²² It is not clear how many of these changes were unavoidable or were the result of convenience.

The appearance of the windows was affected by the techniques used in the course of re-leading the windows, which were much criticised by the Committee of Experts appointed by the Minster.²²³ These included the width of the lead used in York (Figure 25) and the use of cement to attach the lead to the glass. Both have had the effect of darkening the windows. They have not, however, affected the identification of the panels.

1.4.4.2 The reinsertion of the chapter house windows

The final intervention was the removal, and subsequent reinsertion of panels after the war, under the management of Dean Eric Milner White. Even greater than in the 1760s and the 1930s, it was the single largest project since the windows' creation. Some of the major changes were briefly summarised in the annual reports to the Friends of York Minster,²²⁴ but the majority can only be identified by comparing the post-reinsertion appearance in the post-World War II photographs, of various dates, with Green's black and white photographs from the 1930s (see Figures 24a-g and Appendix C). Subsequent identifications have been provided by O'Connor and Haselock,²²⁵ and Brown.²²⁶

²²² See Appendix A.13 (Volume 2, 296-301) and Appendix C. Those interventions which survived Milner White are entered in green on the Restoration History diagrams in Appendix C.

²²³ York Glaziers Trust, Joseph Spooner, "*Très Magnifique*: The Great East Window at York Minster", unpublished report for the Dean and Chapter (2009).

²²⁴ William Jesse Green, "Report of the Clerk of Works," *FYMAR* (1955): 37; Eric Milner White, "The Dean's Letter," *FYMAR* (1952): 11; Eric Milner White, "The Return of the Windows," *FYMAR* (1957): 29-40; Eric Milner White, "The Return of the Windows," *FYMAR* (1958): 39-41; Eric Milner White, "The Return of the Windows," *FYMAR* (1959): 30-35; Eric Milner White, "The Return of the Windows," *FYMAR* (1961): 17-20; Eric Milner White, "The Return of the Windows," *FYMAR* (1962): 29-33.

²²⁵ O'Connor and Haselock, "Stained Glass," 335-40. Milner White, "Return," 1962, 29-33.

With the outbreak of World War II less than a decade later, it was believed that the Minster was at risk of aerial bombardment. In 1940, as the hostilities intensified, the Friends of York Minster were informed that “such windows as can be removed” would be taken out and stored in a safer environment.²²⁷ This exercise was carried out over the following few months (with the exception of CH1 as a Victorian copy) and by 1942, the newly installed dean of York, Eric Milner White, was able to report that all the medieval glass, which included six windows from the chapter house, had been removed from the lower registers of the Minster.²²⁸

After 1945, the mammoth task of returning the windows commenced, funded largely by the Pilgrim Trust. It was slowed somewhat by the fact that Dean Milner White wanted to take “the opportunity of rearranging mutilated or jumbled panels” where “possible and desirable”,²²⁹ which modern commentators see as his giving himself *carte blanche* to do as he wished.²³⁰ As the funding came from a single source, there was no need for the Minster to involve the public in any appeal for funds, and probably explains why there was no external involvement by bodies such as the SPAB, who had been vigilant in the repairs of the early twentieth century. As a result, Milner White made fundamental changes to the chapter house glazing scheme without encountering external comment: the results, together largely with his identifications, are what is seen today.

²²⁶ Brown, *Magnificent Fabric*, 291-293.

²²⁷ Anon, “Preservation and Removal of the Windows,” *FYMAR* (1940): 8.

²²⁸ Eric Milner White, “Letter from the Dean,” *FYMAR* (1942): 5. See Appendix B for the storage locations of the individual windows.

²²⁹ Eric Milner White, “Letter from the Dean.” *FYMAR* (1946): 4.

²³⁰ Sarah Brown, in *Apocalypse: The Great East Window of York Minster* (London: Third Millennium Publishing, 2014), 19, wrote, for example, in connection with the 2008-16 conservation of the Great East Window, that, “It has been predominantly with the consequences of Milner White’s interventions that the York Minster Revealed project has had to contend”.

Monochrome photographs from after the reinsertion programme were taken, enabling an examination of at least some of Milner White's changes.²³¹ The written material, enabling some comparisons before and after the reinsertion exercises, consists of the reports by Milner White and the Clerk of Works, Mr W.J.Green,²³² in the *Friends of York Minster Annual Reports*, and the private correspondence of Milner White with the Pilgrim Trust,²³³ supplemented by Oswald Lazenby's notes about the movement of panels.²³⁴ With the exception of some greater detail provided for work done to the Peter window (CHs2), the entries in the *Friends of York Minster Annual Reports* only provide brief summaries. The correspondence with the Pilgrim Trust provides more detail and private commentary, but, in general, it is the sad case that Milner White gave very few details of or explanations for the three main changes he made.

Early in the reinsertion programme, in 1951, Milner White focused on the creation of what he described as a "real early fourteenth century Nave window",²³⁵ which he placed in s35.²³⁶ In total he moved ten panels from the chapter house into the nave, nine from CHn3 (William) and one from CHn2 (Peter), and the Henry Gyles panel (probably inserted during the re-leading campaign) from CHn3:8e was placed in storage. Five of the panels from CHn3 had been intruded into row 1, already in place in 1690-91 where they had replaced what would have been the original grisaille.

²³¹ Obviously, because all the photographs are monochrome, there are no means of checking on any changes to unpainted pieces of glass, especially if they retain the same cut-line. The changes that can be identified have been itemised in Appendix C, while the ones that have survived are marked in blue on the Restoration History diagrams in Appendix C.

²³² Milner White, "Return," 1951, 1952, 1954, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1961 and 1963.

²³³ YMA Papers of Dean Eric Milner White, M-W/II/6-7.

²³⁴ Lazenby, "York Minster windows," fol. 13 and 14.

²³⁵ Eric Milner White, "The Dean's Letter," *FYMAR* (1948): 7-8.

²³⁶ Milner White, "Return," 1951, 31.

Additional CHn3 panels to be moved were two pieces of intruded canopy (from CHn3:2b and 2e), and two which had already been intruded in 4b and 4d in Torre's description of CHn3. The panel moved from 1a in CHn2 (the Virgin Mary) was held by Milner White to be by the same artist. It was then necessary to find replacements, which meant that the William window (CHn3) constituted "the gravest chapter house problem".²³⁷ He filled the gaps in row 1 with reserves of grey glass and patches to simulate grisaille glass. For a central roundel here, Milner White used one which, as reported in 1952, had been given anonymously through the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland to the Minster and was, he was convinced, "a missing roundel from the chapter house", dating from 1300-10.

Of the remaining five gaps in CHn3, he filled 8e (which had contained the Henry Gyles panel) with a roundel of "good 14th-century scraps and coloured rosettes".²³⁸ For the other four, he was able to draw on another donation to the Minster to fill the gaps in 2b, 6b and 6d in CHn3, while an original medallion in 2e was filled with an intruded angel (CHn3:10). Thus it can be seen the panels moved by Milner White, mainly from CHn3, had all been insertions and did not belong to the original scheme, even if the argument associating them originally with s35 was based purely on a certain coincidence of dates in the glass of s35 and CHn4, adjacent to the window from which glass was removed.

Milner White was of the view that Barnett's copy of CH1 destroyed the aesthetics of the chapter house and so he removed the copied narrative panels from their borders and grisaille and relocated them in N19, N20, S21 and S22 in

²³⁷ Milner White, "Return," 1957, 38. For the panel he had removed from row 1 in CHn2, all he had to do was create a panel showing grisaille-effect.

²³⁸ Milner White, "Return," 1957, 39.

the nave clerestory.²³⁹ To replace these, he wrote to Lord Kilmaine of the Pilgrim Trust on 11 July 1958 to say that, in an unspecified location in the Minster, he had found what amounted to nine panels of glass from the 1530s,²⁴⁰ together with ten panels of fifteenth-century glass showing the Resurrection, taken from the choir, which had been acquired in the eighteenth century as part of the trend in circulating “old glass”.²⁴¹ By 24 February 1960, Milner White was able to report to Lord Kilmaine that these nineteen panels had been joined by the original panel of Christ’s Ascension from the late thirteenth century, which had been preserved in the course of the Barnett copying exercise.²⁴²

Barnett’s copied borders were retained in CH1, but the twenty-five copies of the grisaille were replaced by what Milner White had identified as original “fourteenth-century” ones from the Five Saints window (CHs4). He used these because he felt the light did not penetrate the latter window and so the original grisaille could be of more use in CH1.²⁴³ He replaced the grisaille in CHs4 with Barnett’s “better” copies of grisaille from CH1 and he made up the rest from scraps (a preliminary examination of Figures 5a and 5g with 24a and 24g suggests that not many of the copies were actually used). One apparently original pair of C borders from CH1 appears to have been inserted in its current location in 1a in CHs2 (Peter).

The end result is that CH1 acquired its current appearance. Two sets of unrelated glass panels were intruded, the Barnett narrative copies were moved to the nave clerestory, the Barnett border copies were left in CH1, while some of

²³⁹ Moxon, Hilary. “How ‘lost’ is the other East Window?” *FYMAR* (2014): 39. Given that the original of CH1:36 was retained in the copied window before Milner White’s involvement, he must have retrieved its copy, probably from store, to insert in N19:4a.

²⁴⁰ YMA M-W/II/6-7 Papers of Dean Eric Milner White (Letter dated 11 July 1958).

²⁴¹ Milner White, “Return,” 1960, 31.

²⁴² YMA M-W/II/6-7 YMA, M-W/II/6-7 Papers of Dean Eric Milner White (Letter dated 18 July 1958).

²⁴³ Milner White, “Return,” 1960, 31.

the Barnett grisaille copies were moved to CHs4. The original grisaille from CHs4 was inserted in CH1, the single surviving original panel of CH1 was retained in CH1 but moved to CH1:2c and an example of the original central border was preserved in CHs2:1a (Peter).

Milner White also changed the sequencing of the panels in CHn2 and CHs2. He felt that the medallion scenes in CHn2 should have been in a boustrophedon order,²⁴⁴ in this case meaning that the narrative went from 2a to 2e, 4e to 4a, 6a to 6e, finishing with 8e to 8a.

To achieve this, he switched the borders and grisaille of eight of the panels and created a scheme which began and ended with the Virgin Mary, the lower two rows of which he believed had been drawn from the Gospels of Luke and Matthew. He also identified an “abbreviated ministry series of four scenes” showing the Baptism of Christ, Christ teaches, Christ heals, and the Transfiguration, but none of these identifications is supported by this thesis.

He also changed the order of the panels in the Peter window (CHs2, Appendix B.5),²⁴⁵ although here he kept the panels in the border and grisaille surrounds he had inherited.

1.4.5 Conclusion

While there is no direct evidence about patronage of the building or its glass, nor of any specific patronage of any individual window, a considerable amount of circumstantial evidence, arguably at least satisfying the legal “balance of probabilities” standard of proof, suggests that it was initiated by an individual such as Langton and not by collective action by the entire Chapter. Evidence also indicates that the origins of the Chapter tensions lay in the allegiances

²⁴⁴ Milner White, “Return,” 1958, 39.

²⁴⁵ Volume 2, 345.

forged in the context of the baronial conflict of the 1260s. The implication is that, by the time of Langton's death, construction was well underway. Between 1280 and 1286 there may have been a gap, but, given the importance of the glazing features discussed below, it is likely that some of the narrative designs had already been created, meaning a memory of pre-1279 plans must have survived through to the post-1286 final version.

The impression from this extensive, albeit circumstantial, evidence is that Romeyn arrived in 1286 to find chapter house projects in both York and Southwell stalled and the York vestibule not started. To sort out the problems, he may have encouraged lay contributions to enable completion of the York chapter house and its glazing, engineered the removal of an obstructive dean, oversaw the construction of the vestibule and embarked on his own ambitions for the nave.

There is more information about the glazing interventions. In the course of numerous repairs to the chapter house glass, the position of many panels was changed and their contents modified. Even by the time of the first description by Torre, some of the panels were indecipherable and many had been moved, probably due to a lack of understanding of the subject matter of the windows and of the craft of glass painting after the Reformation. However, with very few exceptions, most of the panels were still in their original light or light-type and remained there until the Green photographs in 1929-32. This conclusion is of fundamental importance in reconstructing the original sequence of the panels in Chapter 2, and confirms Morgan's similar observation about CHn4.²⁴⁶

²⁴⁶ This conclusion underpins the reconstruction by Morgan, "Catherine," 158.

Before Milner White's work in the 1950s, the most systematic intervention came in the 1760s, when there was a major repair programme by Thomas Sanderson. In the course of this it is likely that some sort of design order was imposed on the panels, without arriving at the original sequence of the windows (with the single exception of most of CHs3). In the nineteenth century there were several small scale repairs and one exercise when it was planned to copy all the glass, of which only CH1 was completed. By the twentieth century, the glass was clearly in a very poor condition and, for the first time, the Minster was subjected to outside scrutiny over the way it was guarding its heritage. Such scrutiny was avoided during the reinsertion of the glass after World War II by Dean Eric Milner White, when he was able to indulge in wholesale change and modification without outside observation. From this it can be seen that the Green photographs of 1929-32 show the relationship between the medallions and the borders, almost all of which probably survived from the thirteenth century.

A final note concerns the nature of the glazing interventions. This chapter has been largely silent about the precise details of the plumber/glaziers' work, but there seems to have been an attempt, where possible, to replicate the colours of glass.²⁴⁷ In other words, glass seen as a specific colour by Torre seems to have been replaced by glass of a similar colour. From the perspective of this discussion, therefore, it means that it may be possible to rely on the colours to identify the panels, even if they are not original.²⁴⁸

These conclusions about the nature of earlier interventions, particularly in the ordering of the panels, lend support to the examination in Chapter 2 of other

²⁴⁷ As noted in Appendix C, *passim*.

²⁴⁸ See particularly the windows on the north of the chapter house, CHn2, CHn3 and CHn4.

visual and textual source material, and reinforce the conclusions about the original narrative structures.

CHAPTER 2: RECONSTRUCTIONS OF THE ORIGINAL WINDOWS

2.1 *Introduction*

In order to propose reconstructions of the original windows, a two-fold approach has been adopted. First, the possible locations for each panel are identified, based on the restoration histories from Chapter 1 and a series of visual criteria, some of which are window-specific; secondly, the content of each panel is examined and the scene identified in order to resolve any uncertainties. This is the first time either of these aspects of the chapter house windows has been attempted since Morgan's examination of CHn4. Previously, Milner White paid some attention to the possible meaning and original sequence of the panels in the course of his reinsertions after World War II, but there is no evidence he conducted historical research to arrive at his conclusions. The reconstructions are presented in Appendix B and Figures 26a-g: five of these are the result of the research in this thesis (CH1, n2, n3, s2 and s4), one confirms eighteen out of the twenty locations in an eighteenth-century reconstruction (CHs3) and one confirms Morgan's reconstruction of CHn4. These, including suggestions about the heraldic scheme are presented below, with supporting information in Appendix B and Figures 26a-g.

Although, as has been set out, similar repair techniques were applied across the scheme, some window-specific decisions were made which mean that each needs to be examined separately. From this it will be seen that robust reconstructions for five of the seven windows are possible, subject to minor alternative variations which will be indicated as appropriate. For CHn2, two less-than-perfect reconstructions are presented, and for CHn3, because of the number of interventions, conclusions have been based on common features

observed elsewhere. In order to present some of the evolving arguments, tables consisting of small grids have been adopted showing the four rows in the five lights of the narratives.

Key to the reconstructions is the fact that six of the designs adopted a pattern across the border/grisaille lights. As discussed above, originally the design was A-B-C-B-A or A-A-C-B-B/B-B-C-A-A, although in the 1760s this was standardised to the former sequence as far as possible. Once the border sequencing for each window is established, it is used to narrow down the range of the potential original locations for each panel. These can be further reduced in those windows where there is an alternating background colour to the medallions: the colours were originally distributed in alternating rows (the alternative possibility, that the pattern formed a chequerboard, was discounted in the course of the exercise). These windows are the copied CH1, CHn4, CHs3 and the current central and fifth lights in CHs4. Less noticeable visual clues, in the strip features in Peter in CHs2 (also existing, but less helpful, in the Virgin Mary window in Chn2) and an original yellow upper inner rim in two rows of CHn3, have been used to confirm reconstructions which have been devised by other means.

The investigation proceeded with an analysis of the glass in the panels to establish what are likely to have been the original features and which of the grisaille-light sequence had been adopted. Conclusions were then mapped against the historical descriptions of the panels and the examination of their likely positions. This showed that that, with very few exceptions, the original borders of their panels were retained throughout their history until Milner White's intervention in CH1 and CHn2, meaning they can be determined from

the Green photographs of 1929-32. This develops an original suggestion by Morgan about CHn4.

In order to identify the contents of panels whose identification is uncertain, textual affiliates for the saints' cults and scholarship relevant to the late thirteenth century are examined. These are considered alongside a series of visual comparators, most of which are monumental narrative cycles from great churches, mainly in France, dating from the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, but manuscript illumination is also explored. Together, these provide information to assist with sequencing, focus and emphasis within the narratives and in the identification of those panels whose content is unclear, although spatial constraints mean that the work presented here does not constitute a full assessment of the cult of each saint.

The windows appear to have been painted by three separate workshops, as illustrated in Appendix D, while specific comments about the style of individual panels can be found in the panel descriptions in Appendix C. Most of this categorisation is based on the painting style of the heads, although Workshop 3 (Peter in CHs2, Paul in CHs3 and the John the Baptist light in CHs4) seems to have been less experienced in handling the shape and the positioning of the medallions within the borders of the lights.

Workshop 1 (Katherine in CHn4, the Edmund and Becket lights in CHs4 and, from the evidence of the surviving panel showing the Ascension, the Passion and Resurrection window) adopted dramatic hairstyles, with prominently curly hair swept backwards, sometimes with a quiff. Where there is a headdress (such as a coif), the curls of the hair can be seen as a roll on the forehead. Heads are shown in profile and three-quarter view, where they are

usually concave. The workshop is more adept than Workshop 3 in the use of medallions and their positioning between the borders.

Workshop 2 appears to have been responsible for the Virgin Mary window in CHn2, and, from what has survived, William in CHn3. It may also have created the Margaret and Nicholas lights in CHs4. Distinctive features are that the hair is flat or in tight curls, and is marked in close parallel lines, with a heavier hairline between the face and the hair. Foreheads are prominent and the brow is often furrowed. Facial features are marked with heavier lines than Workshop 1 and are smaller than Workshop 3.

Peter (CHs2), Paul (CHs3) and John the Baptist (the fourth light of CHs4) were painted by Workshop 3. The heads and facial features are large and the hair is often composed of tight curls. Beards are bushier than those of Workshop 2, but not as ragged as those of Workshop 1. There is more of a sense of drama in the way the figures have been drawn and several almost have a look of emotion on their faces.

It appears that most of the windows, regardless of which workshop created them, follow a roughly chronologically sequential pattern, starting in 2a and finishing in 8e (or vertically in rows 2 to 8 in CHs4). However, the full significance of the different workshops will become evident in Chapter 3, when design features which cross over from one window to another are considered.

As part of completing the reconstructions for each window, the heraldic scheme has been examined. Most of the eight shields for each window are identifiable (see Appendix B and Figure 4b for their locations). There are, however, eleven losses, in CHn4 (E1 upper and lower, D1 upper and lower and D2 upper and lower), CHs2 (D2 lower and A1), CHs4 (A1) and CH1 (A1 and A3). The six in CHn4 had disappeared by 1690-91 when Torre saw the date

“1658” there,¹ but there are earlier descriptions by Dugdale and Johnston which mean they can be identified.² The remaining five gaps, however, were lost before there were any descriptions so no suggestions can be made. Only those identifications which are unclear are discussed here in association with their window, with a summary at the end of the Chapter.

Before the problematic windows are examined, a brief résumé is presented of the reconstructions of those that are more straightforward, namely CHs3, CHn4 and CHs4.

2.2 Three straightforward windows: CHs3, CHn4 and CHs4

2.2.1 CHs3: Narrative of Paul

CHs3 is the only window which was replaced into its almost correct original sequence in the eighteenth century (Figure 26c). The borders originally followed the current A-B-C-B-A sequence, detectable because of recognisable adjacent narrative panels (notably the Lystra scenes in CHs3:18-20 and those of Philippi in CHs3:26-30). Half of the medallions had red and half blue backgrounds. As shown in Appendix D,³ the window was created by Workshop 3. Textual⁴ and visual affiliates, including glass⁵ and manuscript illumination,⁶ have confirmed

¹ YMA, L1/7, Torre, 123.

² William Dugdale's Yorkshire Arms, 1641, London, College of Arms; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Top Yorks C 14 (Henry Johnston, 1669-70).

³ Volume 2, 1095-1098.

⁴ Acts 9, 14, 16, 27 and 28; Gal. 1:18; 1 Cor. 2:11; Acts of Paul, Montague Rhodes James, *The Apocryphal New Testament, being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles and Apocalypses* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), 294-296.

⁵ Visual affiliates for Paul include lost frescoes in S. Paolo, John White, "Cavallini and the Lost Frescoes in S. Paolo," *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 19 (1956): 84-95; Stephan Waetzoldt, *Die Kopien des 17. Jahrhunderts nach Mosaiken und Wandmalereien in Rom* (Wien: Schroll-Verlag, 1964) and Luba Eleen, "The Frescoes from the Life of St Paul in S Paolo fuori le mura in Rome," *Revue d'art canadienne: Canadian Art Review*, XII/2 (1985): 251-259. For images in windows, see *Online Archive*; "French sites," the cathedrals of Chartres Bay 4; Le Mans, Bays 68 and 103 (left and right lancet); Metz, Bay 14; Rouen, Bay 14; Sens, Bay 2. Paul is generally to be found included in those events of Peter's life at which he was also present. For these images, see *ibid.*, the cathedrals of Auxerre, Bay 7; Bourges, Bay 9; Tours, Bay 203; the churches of St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 1; and, St-Père, Chartres, Bay 221. There are relatively

the identification of sixteen panels (Paul given letters by the High Priest in CHs3:6, his conversion on the road to Damascus in CHs3:7, his baptism in CHs3:9, preaching in Damascus in CHs3:10, his escape in CHs3:16, the Lystra scenes in CHs3:18,19 and 20, the Philippi scenes in CHs3:26-30, the Malta scenes in CHs3:38 and 39 and the martyrdom in CHs3:40),⁷ of which CHs3:6, 26 and 30 have been clarified or re-identified in this study.

Of the remaining four unclear panels, CHs3:8 is much disturbed, but the presence of an original red gate and its C border suggests that it showed Paul, now blind, being led through the gates of Damascus.⁸ CHs3:36, with its A border, was followed by CHs3:37 with the the death and healing of either Eutychus or Patroclus.⁹ Both of these concern a youth listening to Paul preaching from an upper floor and falling. Both died and were revived by Paul. CHs3:37 shows a bird over the shoulder of a youth, which may represent Patroclus restored to life rather than Eutychus, because it is unclear from the sources whether Paul was present for the revival of Eutychus,¹⁰ despite the fact that Eutychus fits the chronology better. The implication is that CHs3:37 was in 8b, leaving the meeting between Paul and Peter in Jerusalem in CHs3:17 in 4b. Here the right-hand figure can be identified as Peter, by his prominent key. It is

few windows which are devoted solely to Paul, which makes the inclusion of CHs3 all the more intriguing.

⁶ For Paul, these include manuscripts, such as in the Vivian Bible, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. Lt. 1: fol. 386v, Herbert Kessler, *The Illustrated Bibles from Tours* (Princeton: Ann Arbor, UMI, 1977), 111, and the Bible of S. Paolo fuori le mura f.1m: fol. 310v, Rome, *ibid.*, 111.

Images can also be found in the initial letters in the Epistles, notably those in Troyes, MS 2391, Luba Eleen, *The Illustration of the Pauline Epistles in French and English Bibles of the 12th and 13th Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 79; Oxford, Bodl. Auct. D.4.8, *ibid.*, 78; Avranches, MSS 2 and 3, *ibid.*, 80-81; Rome, Vt. Urb. lat.7, *ibid.*, 81-82; and Paris, Mazarine 15, *ibid.*, 81-82.

⁷ Volume 2, 895, 919, 965, 971, 925-35 (Lystra), 941-61 (Philippi), 977-81 (Malta) and 985 (Martyrdom).

⁸ *Ibid.*, 895.

⁹ The textual source for Eutychus is Acts 20:9-12. For Patroclus, the source is Acts of Paul, II, James, *Apocryphal*, 294 and *Acta Petri, Acta Pauli, Acta Petri et Pauli, Acta Pauli et Theclae, Acta Thaddaej*, ed. Richard Adelbert Lipsius (Lipsiae: apud Hermannum Mendelssohn, 1891), 106-107. Volume 2, 971.

¹⁰ Acts 20:9.

concluded from the theme of the window that one of the others is Paul, making the scene a rare representation, with its political implications for the future direction of the Church, rather than their later encounter in Rome.¹¹

2.2.2 CHn4: Narrative of Katherine of Alexandria

CHn4 shows scenes from the life of Katherine of Alexandria and was created by Workshop 1 (Figure 26d and Appendix D). The subject matter was lost for most of the window's post-Reformation history: only by the time of John W. Knowles's notes had some of it been deciphered.¹²

In order to interpret the window, comparisons were made with other painted glass representations of Katherine's life from the twelfth to the early fourteenth centuries.¹³ It has also been necessary to look at how she was presented in the context of the evolution of her cult,¹⁴ together with

¹¹ Acts 9:27; Gal. 1:18.

¹² Knowles, "Manuscript Notes," fols.153r-155r.

¹³ For images of the key windows for Katherine, see *Online Archive*; "French sites," the cathedrals of Angers, Bay 125; Auxerre, Bay 26; Chartres, Bay 16; Dol (amalgamated east window); and Rouen, Bay 51; the Abbey Church of St- Père, Chartres, Bay 226. Formerly there was one in the Abbey Church at Fécamp, Bay 3 but at the time of visiting, this had been removed for conservation. *Online Archive*, "Other sites," Freiburg Munster, n39. It is noticeable that there are far fewer dating from the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries compared with the following centuries: this may be a reflection of survivals or it may indicate her increasing popularity in glass after the period in question.

¹⁴ Sherry L. Reames, "St Katherine and the Late Medieval Clergy: Evidence from English Breviaries," in *St Katherine of Alexandria: Texts and Contexts in Western Medieval Europe*, eds. Jacqueline Jenkins and Katherine J. Lewis (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 201-221; Saara Nevanlinna and Irma Taavitsainen. *St Katherine of Alexandria: The Late Middle English Prose Legend in Southwell Minster MS 7* (Cambridge: D.S.Brewer, 1993), 5-9; Katherine J. Lewis, *The Cult of St Katherine of Alexandria in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), xiii-xv; Christine Walsh, *The Cult of St Katherine of Alexandria in Early Medieval Europe*, (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2007),4. Within a hundred years, versions of her life were produced in the west in the vernacular as well as Latin. *Seinte Katerine*, included in the Katherine Group of lives of the saints and forming part of the *Ancrene Wisse*, dated from the late twelfth or early thirteenth centuries and was based on the *Vulgate*, Lewis, *Katherine*, 59; Anon, *Ancrene Wisse and Associated Works*, in *Anchoritic Spirituality*, ed. Anne Savage and Nicholas Watson (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), 259-286; as was the *Vie de Sainte Catherine* by Clemence of Barking, Jocelyn Wogan-Browne and Glyn S.Burgess, *Virgin Lives and Holy Deaths* (London: J.S.Dent, 1996); and Clemence of Barking, *The Life of St Catherine*, ed. William Macbain (Oxford: Basil Blackwell for the Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1964); Later in the thirteenth century, these were followed by the *Stanzaic Life*, Anon, *Stanzaic Life of St Katherine*. 13th century, in *Middle English Text Series*, University of Rochester: Robbins Library Digital Projects, ed. Sherry L.Reames. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, 2003,

contemporary literature and hagiography. The reconstruction generally confirms that by Morgan who devised the original sequencing of the panels from the grisaille surrounding each medallion.¹⁵ The only debateable points are her queried identification of CHn4:10 in 2e (where she argues the scene shows Katherine before Maxentius as opposed to the current suggestion of the start of the conspiracy against her),¹⁶ a possible slight variation for CHn4:40 in 8e (with an emphasis on her soul being assumed rather than her body),¹⁷ and a clarification of the reason for Maxentius's inclusion in his departure from the city in CHn4:30 in 6e.¹⁸

The heraldic scheme in CHn4 is the most damaged in the chapter house. Six shields were lost, probably in the course of the Civil War, judging from the date of "1658" which was recorded by Torre (probably reflecting an intervention by Edmund Gyles). From earlier records,¹⁹ these have been identified as England and Castile/Leon (E1, upper and lower), England and Clifford (D1 upper and lower), Edmund of Cornwall and de Vere (D2, upper and lower). The Castile/Leon shield is significant because it is not certain whether it was used during Eleanor's lifetime, or whether, given that she died in 1290, it was included as a post-mortem tribute.²⁰ In this, it represents a rare relevant death in the late 1280s and early 90s. If the former, it provides another date of relevance for the heraldic design, but if it were in her honour after her death, which seems

<http://www.lib.rochester.edu/camelot/teams/32sr.htm>; Jacobus Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, trans. William Granger Ryan, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 334-341; Karen Anne Winstead, *Virgin Martyrs: Legends of Sainthood in Medieval England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997), 66-70. It has been calculated that Voragine based his account on about one hundred different versions of Katherine's life, demonstrating the extent of her popularity, Lewis, *Katherine*, 10.

¹⁵ Morgan, "Catherine," 146-78.

¹⁶ Volume 2, 693.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 769.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 745. See further Chapters 3 and 4.

¹⁹ William Dugdale's *Yorkshire Arms*, 1641, London, College of Arms; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Top Yorks C 14 (Henry Johnston, 1669-70). These descriptions will be used below.

²⁰ On 6 July 1291, Romeyn was clearly proud to notify Edward I that 47,528 masses for Eleanor had been said in the Province, *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 34.

equally plausible, the insertion may have indicated royal involvement or a contribution by her nephew, James of Spain, canon at the Minster from 1287.²¹

2.2.3 CHs4: Narratives of the Five Saints

The lights of the Five Saints window each included a distinctive border and contained a canopy and four distinct medallions (Figure 26g). The locations given by Torre suggest that the original sequence across the window was probably Margaret, Nicholas, Thomas Becket, John the Baptist and Edmund.²² It is doubtful that the lights were changed before 1690-91 because the glass in these panels is still in a good condition and may not have needed repairs (with the exception a lost original in the fifth light in CHs4:30 which needed a replacement). Because the Nicholas and Edmund panels have an alternating red and blue background and the Becket canopies alternate between white and yellow, the original locations for the relevant panels can be narrowed down to one of two. For Margaret and John the Baptist, there are no visual clues, so the locations have to be suggested from the identifications of the scenes. Because of the quality of the glass, this is a relatively straightforward exercise. Stylistic analysis shows that all three workshops were involved, with Workshop 1 responsible for Thomas Becket and Edmund, probably Workshop 2 for Margaret and Nicholas, and Workshop 3 for John the Baptist (see Appendix D).²³

These identifications have been verified from literary²⁴ and visual

²¹ His own arms were different in that in the second and third quarters were “*argent, a cross flory purpura*,” Margaret Bent, *Magister Jacobus de Ispania, Author of the ‘Speculum Musicae’* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2015), 90.

²² YMA L1/7, Torre, 130.

²³ Volume 2, 1094-1098.

²⁴ For the long history of Margaret’s cult, see Anon, *Seinte Marherete, þe Meiden ant Martyr*, ed. Frances Mack (London: Published for the Early English University Press, 1934), ix, and the

comparators.²⁵ Slight variations from Brown's most recent scholarly descriptions are Becket perhaps leaving or, more probably, embarking to return to England from his exile in CHs4:26,²⁶ Nicholas gifting money to the three impoverished daughters in CHs4:8,²⁷ and the evil host murdering the three young clerics in CHs4:28.²⁸

discussion of vernacular versions in Mary Clayton and Hugh Magennis, *The Old English lives of St Margaret* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 3-215. For Nicholas see Wace, *The hagiographical works: the Conception Nostre Dame and the Lives of St Margaret and St Nicholas*, eds. Jean Blacker, Glyn S. Burgess and Amy Victoria Ogden (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2013). For John the Baptist, see Matt. 11 and 14 and Mark 6. For Edmund, see Francis Hervey, ed., *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi: the Garland of Saint Edmund King and Martyr* (London: J. Murray, 1907), 97-107. For his brief mention in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, see Anthony S.G. Edwards, *The Life of St Edmund King and Martyr* (London: British Library, 2004), 6. See also Abbo's *Passio Sancti Eadmundi*, Dorothy Whitelock, "Fact and fiction in the legend of St. Edmund," in *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology, for 1969: Saint Edmund commemorative issue, 869-1969*, eds. Christopher Evelyn Blunt et al. (Ipswich: W.E. Harrison, 1970), 218-19; and Anthony Bale, ed., *St Edmund King and Martyr: Changing Images of a Medieval Saint* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2009), 2. For Thomas Becket, see *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury (canonized by Pope Alexander III, AD 1173)*, eds. John Craigie Robertson and J.B. Sheppard, 7 vols. (London: Longman & Co., 1875-85).

²⁵ For Margaret, see *Online Archive*; "French sites," the cathedrals of Auxerre, Bay 15; Chartres, Bay 16; Clermont Ferrand, Bay 3 and Dol (amalgamated east window), and the churches at Fécamp, Bay 3 (temporarily removed) and St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 9; *The Book of the Passion of St Margaret the Virgin*, Riccardiana Library, Florence, *World Digital Library: Illuminated Manuscripts of Europe, Illuminated Manuscripts of Europe*, <http://www.wdl/en/item/10648/view/1/15>; the Queen Mary Psalter, London, British Library, Royal MS. 2 B. VII, <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=6467&CollID=16&NStart=20207>; the Salvin Hours (London, British Library, Additional MS 48985, <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/illmanus/other/011add000048985u00046v00.html>, fol. 124v; the Huth Psalter, fol. 13 (London, British Library, BL Additional MS 38116, <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/illmanus/other/011add000038116u00013000.html>); the Carrow Psalter, fol. 17v (Baltimore Walters Art Gallery, MS W. 34, <http://art.thewalters.org/detail/2767> and the Grandisson Psalter, fol. 24v (British Library, BL Additional MS

21926, <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/onlineex/illmanus/other/011add000021926u00024v00.html>). For Nicholas, see the *Online Archive*; "French sites," the cathedrals of Auxerre, Bay 18; Chartres, Bay 39; Le Mans, Bay 106; Rouen, Bay 51; Sées, Bays 13 and 15; Tours, Bay 209 and Troyes, Bay 205; the churches at Civray (left-hand light); St-Dié, Bay 2 and St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 2; "Other sites," Freiburg, s42; "English sites," Lincoln Cathedral, s29, and North Moreton, Oxon, s2. For Thomas Becket, see *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedrals at Angers, Bay 108; Chartres, Bay 18; Coutances, Bay 217 and Sens, Bay 23 and "English sites," Canterbury Cathedral, Trinity Chapel, n2-5, n7, s2, s4, s6-7. For John the Baptist, images can be seen in *Online Archive*; "French sites," the cathedrals at Bourges, Bay 20, and Amiens, Bay 40, Sainte-Chapelle, Bay G, left-hand light; the Abbey Church at St-Père, Chartres, Bay 225 and the Church at St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 5. For Edmund, no entire narratives in glass have been identified. See also Cynthia Hahn, "Peregrinato et Natio: the Illustrated Life of Edmund, King and Martyr," *Gesta*, 30, No.2 (1991): 119-39.

²⁶ Volume 2, 1045.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 1003.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 1055; Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 293.

The most problematic panel is the twelfth-century medallion inserted into 6e,²⁹ which has been in this location since before James Torre's description in 1690-91.³⁰ The original would have shown Edmund's execution, given that the death of every other martyr in the chapter house is portrayed. Had an accident occurred before the Reformation, it is likely that a replacement panel would have been created, given the probability that the glazing scheme was understood by contemporaries and the skills of the glazier were available, so it is more plausible that something occurred between the Reformation and 1690-91.

The inclusion of the arms of France (all of which are in CHs4) at the expense of any of England is difficult to explain: Edward's subsequent marriage to Margaret of France is too late to have been a consideration (unless there was an unlikely alteration to the inserted scheme in 1299-1300). However, in the late 1280s, after a period of hostility between the two countries and on the succession of Philip IV in France in 1285, Edward attempted a rapprochement through a suggested marriage between the French court and his son, negotiations which also involved Edward's paying homage to Philip IV in 1286 for his Gascon lands.³¹ This heralded a peace until 1294, when relations again soured because Philip IV confiscated Aquitaine,³² and Edward I took the unprecedented step of retaliating by taking the possessions of French residents in England.³³ The temporary thaw in relations with France from the late 1280s may thus explain the inclusion of the arms of France in CHs4, as well as the

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ YMA L1/7, Torre, 130.

³¹ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 53.

³² Romeyn recorded that he, the dean and the archdeacons were summoned to Westminster to discuss the best way of retrieving Gascony from the French king, *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 142.

³³ Mark William Ormrod and Bart Roger Denise Lambert, "A matter of trust: the royal regulation of England's French residents during wartime, 1294-1377," *Historical Research*, 89 (2016): 212, at White Rose Research, <http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/100182>.

way the arms of England and those of relevant earls are shown on a background of fleurs-de-lys.³⁴ The precise intended message conveyed by the use of this background is difficult to ascertain,³⁵ but it suggests that the heraldic design was being finalised after 1286 and underlines that Edward I had a specific interest in France at this time.³⁶

2.3 Four Problematic Windows: CH1, CHs2, CHn2 and CHn3

2.3.1 CH1: The Passion and Resurrection window

Consideration now turns to the more problematic reconstructions. CH1, showing the Passion and Resurrection, was in the most prestigious position, at the east, above the row of seats occupied by Minster dignitaries.³⁷ It would have been the focus for all the other windows and, if the glazing scheme had been designed as a single entity, could be expected to have set the theme for all the glass. As discussed in Chapter 1, it experienced the greatest destruction of any of the windows, existing only (bar the Ascension in CH1:36) as a copy. Given Browne's concern with reproducing what he found, it is suggested that he oversaw the replacement of the panels in the positions they had occupied after the Sanderson repairs of the 1760s, probably adjusting the background colours of Christ's Arrest in CH1:17 and him in Judgement in CH1:27 to fit the colour schemes of the rows where he found them.³⁸ At the time of the copy the borders were in the sequence A-B-C-B-A, although, from the way some of the panels

³⁴ The varying sized fleurs-de-lys may be connected with the different workshops involved: Workshop 2 (in CHn2 and CHn3) shows Old France, while Workshop 3 has the later semi fleurs-de-lys in CHs2 and CHs3. The tracery in CH1 and CHn4 is too disturbed to see any pattern by Workshop 1.

³⁵ Philip Lankester, pers. comm., 12 July 2016.

³⁶ The second half of the thirteenth century saw heraldry used "as an effective way to proclaim [...] pride in family and alliances," Ann Payne, "Medieval Heraldry," in *Age of Chivalry*, eds. Alexander and Binski, 56.

³⁷ This section is based on part of Moxon, "How 'lost'," 39-45.

³⁸ Volume 2, 399 and 419.

have been moved around, it is argued that the original ordering was A-A-C-B-B. Figure 24a shows the pre-Milner White border sequence and Figure 26a the reconstruction.

There is evidence that the copies of the contents of the narrative medallions were accurate, enabling them to be used to discuss the original scheme.³⁹ A comparison of the original of the panel showing the Ascension, surviving in 2c, and its copy, now in N19:4a, confirms Browne's claim that the work was done from tracings of the originals and hence followed the leadlines, and this is corroborated by Knowles who said Browne did the tracings himself.⁴⁰ There seems to have been an effort made to copy the colours (with the deliberate exceptions of the background and medallion colours of CH1:17 and 27): some of the drapery had probably already been lost so Barnett would have been freer to select his own colour scheme. However, with the exception of a rather harsh orange for the tunic of the central figure in CH1:36 replacing the original more subtle yellow and some differences in the use of white glass, the colours show an attempt to be authentic compared with the descriptions of the originals as described by Torre.⁴¹ Little original painting has survived, but one of the heads shows a pronounced forelock and, as many of the copied figures have the same feature (as have several figures in CHn4), this may have been similar to the painting of other original figures, suggesting that Barnett copied the painting style associated with Workshop 1.

The source material for the window was obviously predominantly biblical.⁴² Visual associations can be made with depictions of scenes in

³⁹ O'Connor and Haselock, "Stained Glass," 339, confirm, in general terms, the accuracy of the copies.

⁴⁰ Volume 2, 435; Knowles, "Historical Notes," fol.77.

⁴¹ Volume 2, 307.

⁴² Matt. 26, 2.

comparable cycles.⁴³ Here the copied iconography contains great similarities to visual affiliates in terms of details of individual scenes, which further reinforces the impression that they accurately reflected the original. Such iconographic inconsistencies that do exist probably reflect the condition of the lead lines at the time of the copies and suggest that Browne's concern with accuracy extended to copying features which were clearly not original.

Nineteen scenes in the window are straightforward to identify. Only CH1:6 is problematic.⁴⁴ It is currently described as the Temptation of Christ in the Wilderness.⁴⁵ However, this would be a very rare panel in the context of the Passion and, given that the copies were made from tracings of the originals, it suggests that the two figures on the ground were not originally beasts but could have been human beings who had acquired beast-like glass in the course of repair work before the copies were made. The leadlines indicate that they are not in a menacing pose, but more closely resemble figures in the process of supplicating or waking. In this case, it may originally have represented Christ's sojourn in the Garden of Gethsemane with the sleeping Apostles.⁴⁶ Based on

7 and 28; Mark 11, 14, 15 and 16; Luke 19, 22, 23 and 24; John 18, 19 and 20; Acts 1 and 2; 1 Peter 3.

⁴³ For scenes from the Passion and Resurrection, see *Online Archive*; "French sites," the cathedrals of Angers, Bay 100; Bourges, Bays 3 and 6; Chartres, Bays 37 and 51; Clermont Ferrand, s2; Laon, Bay 0; Le Mans, Bays 0 and 107; Poitiers, Bay 0; Rouen, Bay 10; Sens, Bay 100; Tours, Bays 0, 2 and 200; and the Abbey Church of St-Père in Chartres, Bay 217; the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris, Bay 0; the Church of St-Pierre of St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 0 and the Church of St-Urbain of Troyes, various bays. Among the numerous manuscripts sources for the Passion and Resurrection, comparisons have been made with the Grandisson Psalter; the Queen Mary Psalter; the Ramsey Psalter, New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M.302, http://www.ramseyabbey.co.uk/ramsey_abbey_psalter%20large.html; the Gough Psalter; Cambridge, Trinity, O.4.15; the Peterborough Psalter, Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, MS KBR Ms.9961-62, <http://manuscriptminiatures.com/4937/14872>; the Taymouth Hours, London, British Library, Yates Thompson MS 13, <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=8148&ColIID=58&NStart=13>; and the Barlow Psalter, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 22, [http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/view/search?q=="MS.%20Barlow%2022.%20Illuminations%20from%20%E2%80%98The%20Barlow%20Psalter%E2%80%99%2C%20East%20Anglia%2C%2014th%20century%2C%20\(before%201341\)".](http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/view/search?q==)

⁴⁴ Volume 2, 375.

⁴⁵ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 290.

⁴⁶ Matt. 26:39-46; Mark 14:35-41; Luke 22:41-46; John 18:1. The scene is represented in glass in the cathedrals at Bourges, Bay 6:6b; Laon, Bay 0: 4a and 4b and Tours, Bay 0, although it is

the hypothesis that there was usually a chronological sequencing, this identification would affect the original order of the panels in 2a and 2b: if CH1:6 shows the Agony in the Garden, it would follow the Entry into Jerusalem, and be followed by Judas plotting with the High Priests, Christ healing Malchus's ear and his Arrest. Thus it would have been in 2b, suggesting that the first two lights probably originally shared the same A border design, in an A-A-C-B-B border sequence. As such, it would represent another example of panels being switched to their second light-type.

To establish an original sequence, it has been necessary to base conclusions on the content of the medallions, their alternating background colours and the borders of the copied panels. The locations of the panels, as described by Torre,⁴⁷ generally fit the suggested border design and hence were probably retained in their original light-type until 1690-91 in accordance with the history of the other windows. These borders were as follows:

Border A: CH1:6, 10, 16, 20, 26, 30, 36 and 40.

Border B: CH1:7, 9, 17, 19, 27, 29, 37 and 39.

Border C: CH1:8, 18, 28 and 38.

The implication is that a switch between the second A light and the second B light was made by 1845. The changes would have been made by Thomas Sanderson to create an A-B-C-B-A design, as with CHn4, and this, in turn, may have confused the narrative such that it was not recognised and re-ordered as happened with the other predominantly biblical window, CHs3.

The suggested reconstruction (Figure 26a) creates a situation in which related scenes are grouped together on the same row, namely the preliminaries

one of the less common of the Passion scenes, *Online Archive*; "French sites". It features in the Grandisson Psalter, the Gough Psalter, fol. 36, the Queen Mary Psalter, fol. 242 and the Taymouth Hours, fol. 118v.

⁴⁷ YMA L1/7, Torre, 126.

to the Passion in row 2, the Passion and Christ's death with its aftermath in row 4, the Resurrection and its witnesses in row 6 and events linking the Ascension to the end of the world in row 8. The difficulty is that there are six scenes rather than the required five which relate to the torture and death of Christ: his Arrest (CH1:17),⁴⁸ his Flagellation (CH1:16),⁴⁹ Via Crucis (CH1:20),⁵⁰ Crucifixion (CH1:18),⁵¹ Deposition (CH1:37)⁵² and Entombment (CH1:19).⁵³ All currently have a blue background. Following the suggested narrative chronology, it is possible that the Arrest of Christ in CH1:17 might originally have had a red background colour and been in row 2. This means that at least one other panel would have been changed from blue to red to compensate. The likeliest candidate would have been CH1:27, showing Christ in Judgement, itself more appropriate for a position in row 8 (8e). It is possible that the two panels were switched to the incorrect row, probably in the 1690s, and what became an incorrect colour scheme was corrected, incorrectly, probably in the 1760s or, more likely, 1845.

The reconstruction, currently identified as a Passion window, contains an abbreviated version of the Passion and includes several panels showing the Virgin Mary (see Chapters 3 and 4), concluding with Christ in Judgement. As fewer than half of the panels are related to the Passion, this title does not adequately reflect the contents of the window so the suggestion is that a more appropriate title is to combine the two as the Passion and Resurrection.

In the heraldic scheme, no suggestions can be made for A1 and A3. One uncertainty has concerned D2, lower, where historical descriptions have

⁴⁸ Volume 2, 399.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 396.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 411.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 403.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 441.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 407.

suggested either Arundel or Bulmer. Richard of Arundel's father died in 1272-73, when Richard was five years old,⁵⁴ implying he would not have reached his majority until the late 1280s.⁵⁵ However, an alternative identification of his potential shield in CH1 (this time with billets) has been that of the baron, Bulmer, and, given the clarity of the billets on the Dugdale drawing,⁵⁶ the very small allusion to them in that of Johnston,⁵⁷ and its identification as such by Torre,⁵⁸ it can be concluded that the Bulmer family is the one represented rather than the Arundels.

2.3.2 CHs2: Narrative of Peter

As a result of Milner White's intervention, the narrative panels currently ascend in a zig-zag design, starting with 2e to 2a, 4a to 4e, 6e to 6a and 8a to 8e, making it the only window whose narrative currently starts in the bottom right-hand corner. In this window, he retained the original borders of the panels and tried to fit the narrative to the border design.

Despite the survival of much of the original glass, painted by Workshop 3 (see Appendix D),⁵⁹ this has been one of the more difficult windows for which to determine an original narrative, made more problematic by the fact that there is no alternation of background colour to the medallions (Figure 26e). The reason for the difficulty is that, as is ultimately suggested, the window does not strictly

⁵⁴ T.F.Tout, "Fitzalan, Richard (I), first earl of Arundel (1267-1302)," rev. Nigel Saul, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb>.

⁵⁵ The identification as "Arundel" first appears in the nineteenth century (see Appendix B, Volume 2, 317). The date of majority in the thirteenth century is uncertain and may have varied for different life situations, but T.E.James, "The Age of Majority," *The American Journal of Legal History*, 4 (1960): 26, suggests that, at least for knight's service, it settled at the age of 21 from Magna Carta until this was confirmed in *Statutum de Militibus* in 1307. In 1287, when Fitzalan would have been about 20, he was described as "Richard Fitzalan", but by January 1292 he was styled as "earl of Arundel," Tout, "Fitzalan". The indications are that he may have reached an age of responsibility in about 1288.

⁵⁶ Dugdale, fol. 91v.

⁵⁷ Johnston, fol. 52.

⁵⁸ YMA L1/7, Torre, 126.

⁵⁹ Volume 2, 1095-1098.

follow a chronological narrative sequence throughout. It has thus been necessary to examine clues in the glass, in texts⁶⁰ and in visual comparators⁶¹ to suggest the original panel sequence. Indicative of the problems is the fact there has only ever been general agreement about the identification of nine of the twenty panels (Christ's selection of Peter in CHs2:6,⁶² Peter and Andrew led away in CHs2:9,⁶³ the call of Peter and Andrew in CHs2:10,⁶⁴ the healing of the cripple at the Gate in CHs2:18 and 19,⁶⁵ Simon Magus falling in CHs2:26,⁶⁶ the Angel releasing Peter from prison in CHs2:29,⁶⁷ the baptism of Cornelius in CHs2:37⁶⁸ and Peter's martyrdom in CHs2:40).⁶⁹ For ten of the eleven remaining there have been at least two, and for CHs2:8,⁷⁰ four identifications. The methodology employed here has involved establishing related groups of panels to fit the spaces available.

Milner White took no account of the visual clues in the glazing of the small gaps between the inner edges of the inner rectangle in the panels and the outer edge of the medallions (a feature which also exists in CHn2). These gaps contain what have been described in this study as "strip features", showing fleurs-de-lys of varying colours set against different background colours,

⁶⁰ For Peter, the specific sources identified for medallion scenes are from Matt. 4, 14, 16; Acts 3, 5, 10, 12; Acts of Peter, James, *Apocryphal*, 300-336; Acts of Peter and Paul, *ibid.*, 470-471; Voragine, *Golden Legend*, Vol. 1, 340-50 for his Feast Day and, *ibid.* Vol. 2, 34-39 for the Feast of St Peter in Chains.

⁶¹ *Online Archive*; "French sites," the cathedrals of Angers, Bay 107; Auxerre, Bay 7; Bourges, Bay 9; Dijon, Bays 21 and 23; Le Mans, Bays 101, 108 and 111; some panels from a St Peter window in Rouen, Bay 14; and Tours, Bays 7 and 203, and the Churches at Semur, Bay 4; St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 1 and the Abbey Church of St-Père of Chartres, Bay 221. See also C.K.Carr, "Aspects of the Iconography of Saint Peter in the Medieval Art of Western Europe to the Early Thirteenth Century," PhD Dissertation, Cape Western Reserve University, 1978, 151-72.

⁶² Volume 2, 773.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 791.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 797.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 813 and 817.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 829.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 845.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 863.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 879.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 785.

creating a total of five different combinations of colours divided into two groups, strip features I and II (see Appendix B.5).⁷¹ The former has four sub-groups all consisting of a combination of yellow and green; there is only one group of the latter, using yellow and blue. In Milner White's organisation of the panels, the resulting pattern makes no sense of these strip features, in contrast with the current suggestion which results in a type of symmetry across the window. This is too tenuous to have been relied on in creating the suggested layout, but it is used in the later stages of the argument and serves to corroborate its overall plausibility.

2.3.2.1. Reconstruction

The borders to the panels in the Peter window were not changed by Milner White and are as follows:

Border A: CHs2: 6, 10, 16, 20, 26, 30, 36 and 40

Border B: CHs2: 7, 9, 17, 19, 27, 29, 37 and 39

Border C: CHs2:8, 18, 28 and 38.

Working on the hypothesis that the narrative moved in a broadly chronological way from left to right and upwards in keeping with all the other windows, the relationships between the twelve most easily identifiable panels (Christ leading Peter and Andrew away in CHs2:9, the call of Peter and Andrew in CHs2:10, Christ asking Peter to walk on water in CHs2:16,⁷² the cripple healed at the Gate in CHs2:18 and 19, Simon Magus falling in CHs2:26 and flying in CHs2:27,⁷³ the angel leading Peter into the City in CHs2:28⁷⁴ and releasing him from prison in CHs2:29, Peter and Paul before Nero or Agrippa in

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 351.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 525.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 557.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 561.

CHs2:38,⁷⁵ his arrest in CHs2:39 and his martyrdom in CHs2:40) were initially examined, and the likely original locations for ten indicated in greyscale (2a, 2b, 2e, 6c, 6d, 6e, 8b, 8c, 8d and 8e), as in Table 2.1. An implication of the positioning of CHs2:38 in 6c, showing Peter and Paul before Nero and Simon Magus as a prequel to the Simon Magus flying and falling sequence, is that the unplaced paired panels of CHs2:29 and 28, showing the angel liberating Peter and leading him into the city were originally in 8b and 8c (locations in row 4 are discounted because of the discussion below, especially concerning CHs2:8). Because there are two possible positions for the cripple at the Gate asking Peter for help in CHs2:18 and his cure in CHs2:19, these have been omitted from the grid at this stage.

The sequence of light-types across the window was A-B-C-B-A, detectable from the pairing of panels CHs2:29 and 28 (relating to the angel freeing Peter from prison and leading him into the city) and CHs2:10 and 9 (Christ calling Peter and Andrew and then leading them away).

Row 8	(8a)	29	28	39	40
Row 6	(6a)	(6b)	38	27	26
Row 4	(4a)	(4b)	(4c)	(4d)	(4e)
Row 2	10	9	(2c)	(2d)	16

Table 2.1: The locations of the most easily identifiable panels in CHs2

As to the less certain panels, the capped figure in CHs2:8 denotes an early scene of confrontation with a religious rather than a secular leader, namely Peter and John before the High Priest, one of the episodes that Carr suggests was in Old St Peter's.⁷⁶ As an early encounter with a religious figure from the central light, it is likely to have been located in either 2c or 4c, leaving

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 869.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*; Acts 5:17.

the unplaced paired panels of the healing of the cripple at the Gate in CHs2:18 and 19 in either 4c and 4d or 2c and 2d. CHs2:37, showing the Baptism of Cornelius, could have been in location 4b or 6b,⁷⁷ and it is argued that CHs2:36 should be re-identified as the Vision of Cornelius,⁷⁸ another scene which Carr believes was in the major cycle in Old St Peter's.⁷⁹ As paired panels, the most appropriate locations for CHs2:36 and the baptism of Cornelius in CHs2:37 would therefore be 4a/b or 6a/b, the latter being more likely in the light of further consideration of row 4.

CHs2:6, with its A border, would have been located in the available spaces of 4a, 4e or 8a. The scene is based on Matthew 16:18, where Peter is told that Christ will build his Church on the rock of Peter.⁸⁰ Not only were these verses the source of papal authority and apostolic succession, they were also used in later conflicts between the papacy and secular authorities and were the basis of Innocent III's claim in the early thirteenth century that Christ had left "Petro non solum universam Ecclesiam sed totum reliquit saeculum gubernandum".⁸¹ Because the related scenes of Peter's release from prison and being led to the City in CHs2:28 and 29 had originally also been elevated to the highest row, despite their relatively early occurrence in Peter's life, location 8a would be plausible for CHs2:6, suggesting further that this, alone of the windows, represents a variation from a simple chronological account (see Table 2.2).⁸²

⁷⁷ Volume 2, 863; Acts 10:47 and 48.

⁷⁸ Milner White, "Return," 1962, 31, is the only previous commentator to offer this identification.

⁷⁹ Carr, *Iconography*, 172.

⁸⁰ Volume 2, 773; Matt. 16:18.

⁸¹ Carr, *Iconography*, 60. "He left to Peter not only the universal church but also all the world to be ruled," John Gough, pers. comm., 29 October 2017.

⁸² See Chapter 3.

Row 8	6	29	28	39	40
Row 6	36	37	38	26	27
Row 4	(4a)	(4b)	(4c)	(4d)	(4e)
Row 2	10	9	(2c)	(2d)	16

Table 2.2: The locations of the less certain panels in CHs2

The final stage in working out the original narrative structure involved identifying the locations of the healing of the cripple in CHs2:18 and 19, as well as the sequence of the fourth row (see Table 2.3). Available candidates are the as-yet-unplaced CHs2:18 and 19, together with Peter healing with his shadow in CHs2:7,⁸³ Ananias as Sapphira scenes in CHs2:17 and 30⁸⁴ and a preaching scene in CHs2:20.⁸⁵

Of the first five panels which have been identified with a reasonable degree of probability in the chronological sequence of Peter's life, all share a common strip feature of SF II (Christ leading Peter and Andrew away in CHs2:9, the call of Peter and Andrew in CHs2:10, Christ asking Peter to walk on water in CHs2:16 and the healing of the cripple at the Gate in CHs2:18 and 19). Other panels in this series are the preaching scene in CHs2:20 and CHs2:30, making a total of seven SF II panels. Of these, Browne described CH2:30 as Peter raising Tabatha.⁸⁶ However, what was seen as Tabatha's head was itself intruded on an earlier occasion, as the style of painting does not fit the majority of the Workshop 3 figures (in particular, the eyes of the head are smaller and less expressive than those normally associated with the group as described in Appendix D).⁸⁷ Milner White moved this intruded head from lower down the panel and created a bed for the figure to lie on. The dove, which may have shown her soul returning to her body, is actually nimbed, suggesting that it

⁸³ Volume 2, 501.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 529 and 573.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 545.

⁸⁶ Browne, *Representation*, 65; Acts 9:40.

⁸⁷ Volume 2, 817-20.

refers instead to the Holy Ghost. Consequently, removing the female head and bed from the equation, a second possible identification is that this panel shows Peter punishing Ananias and Sapphira.⁸⁸ Of the thirteenth-century glazing schemes, this subject has been identified in Auxerre and Dijon. In the latter, the drama of the scene is emphasised,⁸⁹ a feature that also appears in the York panel. The structure at the bottom may show an open box, in the centre of the floor. Since Milner White, the scene of Peter with Ananias and Sapphira has been associated with CHs2:17,⁹⁰ in which Peter holds a box or a bag which he grasps protectively. If the correct association of this scene is with CHs2:30, then CHs2:17 may show either the good Christians providing Peter with all their sale proceeds or the immediate precursor to CHs2:30, with Ananias and Sapphira pretending to hand over their entire funds before Peter realises he has been duped.⁹¹ The result is that Peter and John before the High Priest (CHs2:8) was in 4c, followed by two scenes associated with Ananias and Sapphira in CHs2:17 in 4d and CHs2:30 in 4e, leaving 2c and 2d for the as-yet-unplaced scenes of the healing of the cripple in CHs2:18 and 19.

CHs2:7 has historically been given several attributions,⁹² but it is suggested that Peter is shown healing with his shadow. Given its B border, it was probably originally in 4b. Following the logic that SF II denotes an early stage in Peter's career and, given the A border, it is likely that CHs2:20 was in 4a. At this stage, it can only be confirmed as a general preaching/healing scene, but that such scenes were used in Petrine narratives could be seen from

⁸⁸ Acts 5:1-10.

⁸⁹ *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedral at Auxerre, Bay 7:4a. See also Virginia Raguin, *Stained Glass in Thirteenth-Century Burgundy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 161; the church of Notre Dame in Dijon, Bay 23:2, *ibid.*, 164.

⁹⁰ Milner White, "Return," 1962, 31.

⁹¹ Acts 5:2.

⁹² Volume 2, 779; all of these indicate the difficulty in interpreting the panel: Browne described it as "Peter and companions addressing a multitude"; Browne, *Representation*, 64; Knowles appeared to settle on it as "Peter heals Ananias", Knowles, "Manuscript Notes," fol.180v; and Milner White as "Woman with the Issue of Blood", Milner White, "Return," 1962, 30.

the early eighth-century mosaic in Pope John's Oratory in Old St Peter's, where he is shown specifically in almost identical images as preaching in Jerusalem, Antioch and Rome.⁹³

The resulting narrative sequence is broadly chronological, but with anomalies which are considered further in Chapter 3. There is no apparent basis for Milner White's belief that the panels were in a different order from the other main windows.

Row 8	6	29	28	39	40
Row 6	36	37	38	26	27
Row 4	20	7	8	17	30
Row 2	10	9	18	19	16

Table 2.3: Suggested original locations of the panels in CHs2

There is no evidence for the shield that was originally in A1. The original shield in D2 (lower) is unclear: as England with bordure it has been identified with John of Eltham, the second son of Edward II. If this is the case then it must post-date the rest of the glazing scheme. On the other hand, Davies surmised that it was originally Lancaster,⁹⁴ in which case it would have been the fourth such representation in the chapter house. The most significant shield in the tracery, however, is that of Amaury de Montfort in CHs2: D1 (lower), which is discussed below.

⁹³ Grimaldi's drawing of the Pope John's Oratory mosaic makes it clear that original iconography showed general as well as specific preaching scenes, Anne Van Dijk, "Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, and Constantinople: The Peter Cycle in the Oratory of Pope John VII, 705-707," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 55 (2002): 307 and 315.

⁹⁴ Robert Davies, *The Heraldry of the Chapter House of York Minster* (London: J.G. and R.C. Nichols, 1870), 395

2.3.3 CHn2: Narrative of the Virgin

CHn2 is the only window where Milner White changed the grisaille and border surrounds for eight panels in order to create the boustrophedon sequence that he felt was original. He divided the panels into two subjects, the first showing scenes of the nativity and infancy of Christ, followed by those of the death and Assumption of the Virgin Mary.⁹⁵ It has been necessary to revert to the 1930s photographs (Figure 24b) to establish what may have been the original borders.

These show the following:

Border A: CHn2:6, 10, 26, 27, 30, 36, 37 and 38

Border B: CHn2:7, 8, 17, 19, 20, 28, 29 and 39

Border C: CHn2:9, 16, 18 and 40.

The A-B-C-B-A sequence across the window can be confirmed from the association of CHn2:6, 8, 9 and 20, showing the Annunciation, Visitation, Nativity and the Annunciation to the shepherds (in 2a, 2b, 2c and 2d),⁹⁶ together with the Magi group of them following the star, appearing before Herod and making their gifts to the Virgin and Child in CHn2:10, 17, 16 and 19 (in 4a, 4b, 4c and 4d).⁹⁷ A third natural sequence is formed in 6d, 6e and 8a by CHn2:39, 38 and 37, showing the Apostles at the Virgin's deathbed, the death of the Virgin and the Apostles carrying the Virgin's bier, following the Presentation in the Temple or the Purification (CHn2:18) located in 6c.⁹⁸ CHn2:40, showing Christ carrying the Virgin's soul is a C panel so poses fewer problems and could have occupied the vacant 8c.⁹⁹ As an A border, 6a is a likely location for the

⁹⁵ Milner White, "Return," 1958, 39-41.

⁹⁶ Volume 2, 457, 473, 477 and 511.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 483, 493, 487 and 505.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 565, 559, 551 and 499.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 571.

Flight into Egypt in CHn2:27.¹⁰⁰ The Apostles witnessing the Assumption in CHn2:29 could have been in either 8b or 8d.¹⁰¹ The likely locations for these panels are shown in Table 2.4, leaving sequencing difficulties for the uncertain CHn2:7, 26, 28 and 36 (showing the massacre of the Innocents, the Assumption of the soul of the Virgin and her Coronation).¹⁰²

Row 8	37	[29]	40	[29]	
Row 6	27		18	39	38
Row 4	10	17	16	19	30
Row 2	6	8	9	20	

Table 2.4: The suggested sequence for the more secure identifications and locations in CHn2

Further material examined included textual accounts for the story of the early life of Christ and the Virgin's death.¹⁰³ The biblical sources for the early life of Christ pose relatively few problems in panel identification (the Annunciation, the Visitation and the Nativity in CHn2:6, 8 and 9, the Magi sequence in CHn2:10, 16, 17 and 19.in CHn2:26-27). CHn2:30, originally showing the Angel warning the Magi not to return to Herod,¹⁰⁴ has been much altered, but its original identification is clear from the historical descriptions and visual affiliates, and it would have followed the Magi sequence, in 4e. Other material included manuscript illuminations¹⁰⁵ and painted glass windows of the late twelfth, thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, mainly in France.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 523.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 533.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 465, 517, 523 and 545.

¹⁰³ Matt. 2; Luke, 1 and 2; Pseudo-Melito, *Transitu*, in James, *Apocryphal*, 214, the version of her Dormition attributed to St John and elaborated by John, Archbishop of Thessalonica, *ibid.*, 208; Joseph of Arimathea's *Narrative*, *ibid.*, 216-18; Voragine, *Golden Legend*, Vol. 2, 80-81.

¹⁰⁴ Volume 2, 539.

¹⁰⁵ The Barlow Psalter; the Queen Mary Psalter; the Hunterian Psalter, Glasgow, Glasgow University Library. Sp.Coll. MS Hunter U.3.2, <https://special.lib.gla.ac.uk/exhibns/month/may2007.html>; *Canticles, Hymns and Passion of Christ*. Cambridge, St John's College MS K.21, http://www.joh.cam.ac.uk/library/special_collections/manuscripts/medieval_manuscripts/medman/A/K21/K21f54r.htm; some images are in the de Lisle Hours, New York, Pierpont Morgan, MS

For the second part of the window, which is drawn mainly from Apocryphal sources, there are fewer comparators. Here, there are two main difficulties: the first emerges from the uncertain identification of CHn2:7 and the second involves the question of the original border/grisaille surrounds for CHn2:26 and 28, and hence the original locations of all three panels. Both problems are concerned with the original panel in 6b. Research has narrowed down the options to two alternatives: Option 1 (in Table 2.5) and Option 2 (in Table 2.6), shown in Figures 26bi and ii, one of which is less unsatisfactory than the other, but neither of which is ideal.

The uncertain CHn2:7 was in a B light, in 6b or 8b. Option 1 attempts to locate it in 6b, before the scene of the Presentation/Purification (originally in 6c). Only two events can be associated with this, namely the fall of idols,¹⁰⁷ or the Holy Family welcomed back into Jerusalem.¹⁰⁸ Apart from the rarity of these two scenes in contemporary depictions, the positioning of CHn2:7 in the available 6b location creates a difficulty for either CHn2:27 (the Flight into Egypt) or CHn2:26 (Herod observing the massacre of the Innocents). It is likely that the latter two were adjacent, but, for Option 1 they both have an A border, meaning one could have been in 6a but the other would have to have been in the unlikely 2e. The alternative in Option 2 is that CHn2:7 shows a scene from the death of

G.50, http://corsair.themorgan.org/cgi-bin/Pwebrecon.cgi?DB=Local&Search_Arg=%22ms+g.50%22+ica&Search_Code=GKEY^&CNT=50&HIST=1.

¹⁰⁶ Of the windows examined, St-Urbain of Troyes has images of the Infancy, Assumption and Passion in a single band running across the odd numbered bays (assuming the nineteenth-century copies reflect the original). The cathedrals of Angers, Bay 100 shows the Life of Christ, including the Infancy; Laon, Bay 2; Le Mans, Bay 3 (heavily restored in the nineteenth century); Le Mans, Bay 103 and the church at St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 7 concentrate on the Infancy alone. The twelfth-century window in the Cathedral at Chartres, Bay 50, shows the Infancy with the Passion, and Bay 28b combines the Infancy with a Life of the Virgin. Windows showing solely the Death and Assumption are Chartres, Bay 42; Le Mans, Bay 104 (first light), and a nineteenth-century reconstructed window in Bay 8 in St-Julien-du-Sault. Finally, windows which, like CHn2, depict a combination of the Infancy and the Assumption are to be found in St-Père of Chartres, Bay 218 (which also shows the early life of the Virgin); Le Mans Bay 105 and St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 6. See *Online Archive*; "French sites".

¹⁰⁷ Pseudo-Matthew, *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*, XXIV, in James, *Apocryphal*, 75-76.

¹⁰⁸ No textual affiliate identified.

the Virgin, either as part of a Dormition-type of sequence or as the Jewish interference with the Virgin's funeral, where the Jew is either alerted to the passing of her funeral procession through Jerusalem or is charged with healing the blind in Jerusalem after his own conversion.¹⁰⁹ This last is most plausible for the overall original design and fits the chronological position in 8b after the attack on her bier in CHn2:37 in 8a. In conjunction with the discussion of CHn2:26 and 28 below, it also permits a more logical sequencing of the Flight and the Massacre in 6a and 6b respectively.

The second, related, issue concerns the original borders of the two panels, CHn2:26 and 28. In 1690-91, Torre described CHn2:26 and 28 (Assumption of the Virgin) respectively in B and A light-type positions.¹¹⁰ By the date of the Green photographs, the borders of CHn2:26 and CHn2:28 had been reversed: CHn2:26 was shown with an A border and CHn2:28 in a B border. The issue is whether they were in the correct light for their borders when Torre saw them, and were subsequently erroneously placed in the wrong light, the borders then being changed to fit the "new" light (Option 2); or they were in the wrong light in Torre, an error which was subsequently corrected when the panels were moved back to their "correct" light to fit their border (Option 1). The former is a more convoluted narrative: the suggestion means the panels could have been moved into the wrong borders in the 1690s and the error corrected in the 1760s, not by switching them across the lights but by changing the borders. However, this possible change could be made more easily in CHn2 (as in Peter in CHs2) than in the other windows, given the presence of the iron rectangle within the panel which contains the medallion, whereas most of the other windows show a complicated medallion shape set directly into the grisaille.

¹⁰⁹ Pseudo-Melito, *Transitu*, in James, *Apocryphal*, 215.

¹¹⁰ YMA L1/7, Torre, 125-27.

Table 2.5: The suggested sequence for Option 1 (CHn2:26 with an original A and CHn2:28 with an original B border)

37	29	40	[28?]	[36]
26/27	7	18	39	38
10	17	16	19	30
6	8	9	20	? not 26/27

Table 2.6: The suggested sequence for Option 2 (CHn2:26 with an original B and CHn2:28 with an original A border)

37	7	40	29	28
27	26	18	39	38
10	17	16	19	30
6	8	9	20	36

Option 1, the more straightforward account, makes a reconstruction of the original sequence difficult to the point of being impossible. The problem is that it would mean both Herod observing the Massacre of the Innocents in CHn2:26 and the Flight into Egypt in CHn2:27 were originally A lights: there is only one feasible original A location available, namely 6a, leaving a very unlikely 2e as the alternative, between the Annunciation to the shepherds (in 2d) and the Magi sequence (in 4a-4e). Option 1 would also represent the only occasion among those windows which had a straightforward history (as opposed to the damaged CHn3 and CHs3) where panels were in the “wrong” lights by the time of Torre. In the preferred Option 2, CHn2:26 was originally in 6b, as a B light panel, CHn2:28 in 8e as an A light, meaning CHn2:27 would have remained in 6a.

Accepting Option 2 as the less unsatisfactory, the original borders were thus grouped as follows:

Border A: CHn2:6, 10, 26, 27, 30, 36, 37 and 38.

Border B: CHn2:7, 8, 17, 19, 20, 26, 29 and 39.

Border C: CHn2:9, 16, 18 and 40.

Original locations can therefore be identified for eighteen panels for Option 2 (assuming now that the Apostles witnessing the Assumption in CHn2:29 would have been in 8d), leaving gaps for 2e and 8e.

An enigma, however, still concerns location 2e, where the only A-bordered panels now available are the Assumption of the soul of the Virgin in CHn2:28 and her Coronation in CHn2:36. As the former shows the movement of Mary's soul, it logically follows in the narrative in row 8 and could be placed in 8e, leaving her Coronation in CHn2:36 for 2e. This low position is an unusual location for a Coronation, which is normally shown as the culmination of a Virgin cycle, and the final arguments in support can only be examined in the context of the overall iconography of the chapter house glazing which assumes that the windows were designed as part of an entire scheme rather than on an individual basis.¹¹¹ This Coronation was not the only one in the chapter house: it also featured in the adjacent CH1 and is the only image to be repeated in the windows of the entire building. Its importance in CH1 can be detected from its original location, at the centre of row 8. There is also some, minimal, support for this unusual location for the Coronation in CHn2:36 in 2e from the distribution of strip features (see Appendix B.2),¹¹² which occur in this window as in CHs2 (Peter in Appendix B.5).¹¹³ Here they are much damaged, but there may have been three unique strip features (I, II, and III) in the Annunciation, Coronation and Christ carrying the Virgin's soul in panels CHn2:6, 36 and 40. Under Option 2 these form a triangle across the window, appearing as they do in 2a, 2e and 8c respectively. Because the strip features are fitted in between the outside edge of the medallion and the inner rectangle it is extremely unlikely that they

¹¹¹ See further below, Chapters 3 and 4.

¹¹² Volume 2, 325.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 353.

would have been switched, so it is concluded they are original. However, unlike in CHs2, there is no meaningful pattern in the strip features across the other panels.

In this context, the identification of the overall theme of the window, currently described as the Early Life of Christ and the Death of the Virgin, is reassessed in this thesis because of the alternative interpretation of several of the earlier scenes which, cumulatively, give is a Marian focus.¹¹⁴ In the thirteenth century, in addition to the Assumption, the Annunciation and the Presentation in the Temple were treated as Marian as opposed to Christological Feasts. The Eastern Church continued to place the emphasis of the Presentation on Simeon's involvement with the Christ in the Temple, and so it was treated as part of the life of Christ, but, from the end of the seventh century onwards, and certainly by the end of the thirteenth century, in the Western Church,¹¹⁵ it had become the Marian celebration of the Feast of the Purification (CHn2:18),¹¹⁶ and appears as such in the Use of York.¹¹⁷ The design of the Annunciation scene (CHn2:6), with Gabriel holding a large palm leaf, unusually (and possibly uniquely), alludes to the announcement of Mary's death as well as the news of her impending motherhood.¹¹⁸ The upshot is that the entire window can be re-identified as depicting an integrated Life and Death of the Virgin.

¹¹⁴ This brings back into the thirteenth century Schiller's observation that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the birth and childhood of Christ were often seen as Mariological, (Gertrud Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, trans. Janet Seligman from *Ikonographie Christlichen Kunst*, 1966 (London: Lund Humphries, 1971), Vol. 1, 33.

¹¹⁵ Margot Fassler, *The Virgin of Chartres* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2010), 111 and 118.

¹¹⁶ Mary Clayton, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990), 28-29.

¹¹⁷ The summons for the Council of the Province of York, 1292, was done with reference to "the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin Mary", Frederick Maurice Powicke and C.P. Cheney, eds. *Councils and Synods, with other documents relating to the English Church, 1205-1313* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), Vol. 2, 1114.

¹¹⁸ Pseudo-Melito, *Transitu*, in James, *Apocryphal*, 210; the version attributed to St John and elaborated by John, Archbishop of Thessalonica in *ibid.*, 201. There is a similar image of a palm-like shape in S3 in the choir, but here is it described only as "Gabriel hands the Virgin Mary a palm branch as a sign of her impending death", (Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 285).

2.3.4 CHn3: Narrative of William of York

Working towards the original iconography of the William window is particularly challenging (Figure 26c). At least four panels had already been lost at the time of Torre's description; gaps had either been left as such (presumably with some non-narrative infills) or filled with intruded panels, only some of which can be tracked through the history of the window. The intrusion of the five panels into what should have been the grisaille of the bottom row may have disoriented later antiquarians because some of the accounts do not seem to match the likely ordering of the rows.¹¹⁹ From the little remaining evidence, it appears the window may have been painted by Workshop 2 (see Appendix D).¹²⁰

Problems of identification are not new. Only with O'Connor and Haselock, in 1977, was even the topic of the window finally identified as St William.¹²¹ The textual source material is limited,¹²² but the main features of William's life are clear. Several years after his death in 1154, the healing miracles on which his canonisation was based emanated from the use of the oil from his tomb in the nave of the Minster. Those benefiting included the lame,¹²³ while sight was restored to five blind people, one of whom was probably the first subject of a healing miracle in the *Vita*, that of the blind girl from Leeds.¹²⁴ New eyes were given to the victim of a duel (unnamed, but clearly subsequently identified as Ralph of the Ralph and Besing miracle, in which the two fought a judicial duel, as a result of which Ralph lost both his eyes until his prayers at

¹¹⁹ For example, Knowles, "Historical Notes," fol.63r.

¹²⁰ Volume 2, 1095-1099.

¹²¹ O'Connor and Haselock, "Stained Glass," 339-340.

¹²² The source material for the Life of William is restricted to the Bull of Canonisation, issued by Pope Honorius III on 18 March 1226, *The Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops*, ed. James Raine, Vol. 3 (London: Longmans, 1886), 129 with a translation in Browne, *Historians*, Vol. 1, 52-3; and the more detailed *Vita*, which Norton has dated to about 1225, *ibid*, Vol. 2, 270-91, while the later *Miracula* can be found in *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 531-43. See also Christopher Norton, *St William of York* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2006).

¹²³ *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 129.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, 281 and *ibid.*, Vol. 3, 531.

William's shrine-like tomb were successful),¹²⁵ and, finally, three dead males were revived.¹²⁶ All these miracles featured in the *Vita*, which was written in advance of William's canonisation in 1226 and used to create the Liturgy for his Feast on 8 June.¹²⁷ At least four additional generalised sets of healing miracles were added for the *Vita*.¹²⁸ The final source, the *Miracula*, was compiled from a now lost fourteenth- or fifteenth-century table.¹²⁹

No surviving visual evidence for a William narrative pre-dates CHn3,¹³⁰ so a somewhat unsatisfactory procedure has involved an examination of later imagery.¹³¹ Because of William's lack of popularity outside York, there are no other major narratives of his life beyond the immense n7 created in the north choir aisle in the early fifteenth century.¹³² From the evidence in CHn3, the borders were distributed in an A-B-C-B-A design (the possibility of an A-A-C-B-B pattern has been discounted because of the survival of two adjacent panels,

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*; Norton, *William*, 169-80. The miracle concerned a judicial duel between two protagonists, one of whom was blinded in the process and whose sight was restored at William's tomb.

¹²⁶ *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 2, 288-91. The term, "mortuos", would equally cover boys as well as men.

¹²⁷ The texts of the Use of York date from the fifteenth century, but it is presumed that much if not all the text was created during the thirteenth century: *Missale ad usum insignis ecclesiae Eboracensis*, ed., William G. Henderson, Surtees Society, 59 and 60 (Durham: Andrews, 1874), 42-50; *Manuale et Processionale ad usum insignis ecclesiae Eboracensis*, ed. William G. Henderson, Surtees Society, 63 (Durham: Andrews, 1875), 196; *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiae Eboracensis*, ed. Stephen W. Lawley, Surtees Society, 75 (Durham: Andrews, 1883), cols. 294-306; *ibid.*, cols. 293-308.

¹²⁸ *Missale*, 43.

¹²⁹ Norton, *William*, 150.

¹³⁰ There may have been an example in the lost glass of a window in the chapel dedicated to William in the south transept.

¹³¹ Later narrative cycles, in a truncated form, exist in the Minster. These include an early fourteenth-century panel showing the Ouse Bridge miracle intruded into s34. In n24, also an early fourteenth-century window, in rows 5 and 6, there are three scenes recounting the Ouse Bridge miracle. In the 1410-23 Parker window (n9), there are three scenes of his life (in 1c there is a "wounded soldier at the shrine of St William", his enthronement in 2c and his crossing Ouse Bridge in 3c). The main cycle, however, is in the ca.1415 n7 in the north choir aisle, which includes scenes of his life, death, canonisation and the subsequent evolution of the cult (French, *St William*, 1-120; *International Colloquium*, 112-13). The most common image from all the narratives show William in a scene riding towards the east, behind a cross-bearer, across Ouse Bridge, blessing those behind him.

¹³² Thomas French, *York Minster: the St William Window* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 1-23. The current, post-conservation locations of the panels can be found at Corpus Vitrearum: 27th *International Colloquium, York 7-11 July 2014: Word and Image* (Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi: University of York and York Museums Trust, 2014), 112-13.

CHn3:16 and 9, with respectively an A and a B border, showing episodes in the Ralph and Besing miracle).¹³³

The following panels have survived to a greater or lesser extent:

Border A: CHn3:6, 10, 16, 20, 26, 30 and 36, of which CHn3:10, 20 and 30 are particularly unclear. In addition, a further A panel is missing, which would have been numbered 40 in the current exercise.

Border B: CHn3:9, 17, 19, 37 and 39, meaning that three B panels have not survived (which would have been numbered 7, 27 and 29), and most of the original contents of CHn3:17 have been destroyed.

Border C: CHn3:18, 28 and 38. CHn3:8 appears not to have survived, but the panel currently there may have been *in situ* in the 1690s,¹³⁴ and may reflect something of the original appearance.

The single visual feature that plausibly relates to the original sequence is a third, yellow rim which lies inside the white and red outer rims of the medallions and which probably only existed at the tops of some of the panels. Either it or a lead line/glass intrusion indicating its original presence appears in CHn3:19, 26, 28, 37, 38 and 39.¹³⁵ Part of a similar line is visible in the Green photograph possibly of the woman on the cart cured in CHn3:20.¹³⁶ According to the sequence suggested in Appendix B, these would have been located in the fourth and the eighth rows.¹³⁷

The exception to the normal pattern of historical treatment of the panels is that CHn3:17 (with an original B border) was probably in an A border light in the 1690s,¹³⁸ which may be explained by the wholesale disruption the window

¹³³ *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 537.

¹³⁴ YMA L1/7, Torre, 125.

¹³⁵ Volume 2, 613, 623, 631, 651, 657 and 663.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 619.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 333-38.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 601; YMA L1/7, Torre, 125.

had obviously experienced. This was rectified, probably in the 1760s, when there was a general attempt to reorganise panels such that they created a symmetrical pattern across the windows, concentrating on the most dominant visual features. However, probably in the same exercise, CHn3:6 (with an A border) was moved to a B light.¹³⁹ This is difficult to explain except that it enabled an intruded canopy to be moved to 2a, creating a more prominent symmetry with a similar intrusion in 2e.

2.3.4.1. Reconstruction

From Browne's description of CHn3:6, it is likely that this formed the first scene of the narrative, showing William's re-entry into York after his second consecration as archbishop. CHn3:8 either indicated William's enthronement or replaced one that did.¹⁴⁰ In its current appearance, it resembles scenes of his enthronement to be found elsewhere, such as n7:10b and n9:2c and 4c-7c. This leaves positions 2b, 2d and 2e in row 2 still to be identified. Given the probable importance of corner position 2e (see Chapter 3) and the need for an A border, one possibility is the scene showing the first awareness of William's sanctity (CHn3:36), when his tomb was opened to reveal his incorrupt corpse and vestments following a fire.¹⁴¹ For 2b, a possibility is CHn3:17, a B panel, the only surviving feature of which, the tops of three towers of a significant building, may have indicated William's arrival at the Minster (a scene which is represented in n7 in 9d).¹⁴² A likely subject for 2d would have been his death,

¹³⁹ Volume 2, 577.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 585.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 645; *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 2, 279-80; *Missale*, 46. Norton, *William*, 149. Norton dated the fire to the mid-1150s, *ibid.*, 150, but, as he has pointed out, there are no indications that William was being revered as a saint until the later 1170s.

¹⁴² Volume 2, 601.

depicted in a panel which was lost before Torre's description in 1690-91. Two deathbed scenes are in n7:10c and 10d.

Suggestions for row 4 take into account the presence of the yellow internal rim identified above. The first recorded healing miracle was that of the blind girl from Leeds, cured by a man in shining raiment at William's shrine-like tomb.¹⁴³ Before Milner White's attentions, CHn3:26 featured a small person apparently standing on the shrine.¹⁴⁴ Another early miracle was the healing the dropsical woman from Harewood.¹⁴⁵ It appears in n7:11d and 11e, showing the invalid being brought to the tomb/shrine in a cart and subsequently cured.¹⁴⁶ In CHn3:19, with a B border, there is a representation, albeit much disturbed, of the cart which might have brought the invalid to York.¹⁴⁷ CHn3:20, again much disturbed, may have shown her at the tomb and, thereafter, walking away from it, although this is speculatively based on the little that is currently visible and the fact that it has an A border.¹⁴⁸ Whatever scene was shown in 4e, it is likely that it showed a miracle and, probably, the successful outcome of the condition in 4d.

The Bull of Canonisation cited a group of miracles which combined the healing of "several" people.¹⁴⁹ In this connection, CHn3:28 appears to show several individual figures, probably indicating a collective healing of several

¹⁴³ This incident may have been referred to among the five blind people in *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 129 and in *Breviarium*, 75, col. 303. It is specified in *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 2, 281 and in Vol. 3, 531. It is notable that the panel showing what is probably the same scene in n7:11c shows an Archbishop, almost certainly William, healing the girl in person, Corpus, *International Colloquium*, 112. The "shrine-like tomb" is intriguing because it is contrasted with the opening of William's (lower) tomb in CHn3:36 and may have been intended to represent the higher structure built over his tomb to indicate his sanctity.

¹⁴⁴ Volume 2, 623; YMA L/1/7, Torre, 124; YMA Green Photographic Collection.

¹⁴⁵ *Missale*, 43; *Breviarium*, 75, cols. 303; *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 2, 282-3; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, 532.

¹⁴⁶ French, *St William*, 68-69.

¹⁴⁷ Volume 2, 613.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 619.

¹⁴⁹ "Plures," *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 129.

people at the tomb.¹⁵⁰ The current appearance of CHn3:18, showing the healing of Ralph's blindness,¹⁵¹ has a similar structure to CHn3:28, meaning they can almost be interchangeable, particularly in the relationship between the shrine-like tomb and the position of the supplicants (the significance of their similarity is discussed in Chapter 3). This leaves an original gap for a lost panel in 4b, which may have been a single miracle. Of the early miracles which appear in the texts, in the liturgy for William's Feast, and in n7, a possible topic might have been the healing of a mad person, the curing of a leper, or the curing of an invalid with mortar from the tomb.

It is likely that the sixth row opened with Ralph and Besing fighting (in CHn3:16),¹⁵² followed with Besing prevailing in CHn3:9,¹⁵³ and Ralph kneeling at the tomb and being healed in CHn3:18, one of the most important early miracles in William's cult.¹⁵⁴ This would leave two panels, either two separate miracles or one double sequence, for 6d and 6e (CHn3:29 and 40 in the current numbering system, neither of which has survived). For a double miracle, it is plausible to consider the woman who fell ill after eating a frog, together with her subsequent recovery. This is also allocated two panels in n7 and is described in the main texts.¹⁵⁵

The top row can be seen as the culmination of the process of canonisation, including the most significant elements in the evolution of a saint's cult. Three of the panels, CHn3:37, 38, and 39 include indications of the yellow rim which also featured in row 4 (the 1929-32 photograph of CHn3:30 may also

¹⁵⁰ Volume 2, 631.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 607.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 597.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 591..

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 607; *Breviarium*, 75, col. 303; *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 129; *Missale*, 46-47; *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 2, 289-90; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, 539.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, 284; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, 535. In n7 the miracle is spread over 17a and 17b, *Corpus, International Colloquium*, 112.

indicate an inner rim).¹⁵⁶ Torre saw the panel in 8a as showing a man blowing a trumpet,¹⁵⁷ a panel which is lost from view until the current CHn3:10 emerges with Milner White's insertion.¹⁵⁸ It might fit the iconography if there had been a trumpeting angel in this key 8a position, heralding William's canonisation,¹⁵⁹ but there is insufficient evidence to do anything more than hypothesise on the basis of Torre's description and the coincidence of its current appearance. CHn3:37 and 38 are both boat scenes. CHn3:37 in 8b may contain an image of William rescuing sailors at sea.¹⁶⁰ However, the boat seems remarkably stable compared with the other sailing disasters illustrated in the chapter house.¹⁶¹ There is no sign of a mast and propulsion seems to be by oar, so, alternatively, CHn3:38 in 8c may well contain a reference to the drowned fisherboy being resuscitated by William. This would imply that the panel preceding it may have been an earlier scene in the same story,¹⁶² such as the boy falling into the water.

CHn3:39 may show two stages of another resuscitation miracle.¹⁶³ We appear to have a figure bending over a large structure to the left-hand side, which could represent a well, while on the right are two figures, one clearly an adult, holding what has been seen as a crucifix over the smaller one who may have been a child.¹⁶⁴ Both adult figures have been historically described, though not universally, as female.¹⁶⁵ The suggestion is that the scene shows both the child falling down a well, to the consternation of its mother, with the sequel, in

¹⁵⁶ Volume 2, 651, 657, 663 and 639.

¹⁵⁷ YMA L1/7, Torre, 124.

¹⁵⁸ Volume 2, 595.

¹⁵⁹ It might fit the celebratory tone of the texts, such as *Breviarium*, 75, col. 304 and *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 2, 278.

¹⁶⁰ Volume 2, 651; *Missale*, 43 and n7:16e, *Corpus*, *International Colloquium*, 112.

¹⁶¹ As in CHs3:38 and CHs4:28.

¹⁶² *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 129; *ibid.*, Vol. 2, 291.

¹⁶³ Volume 2, 663.

¹⁶⁴ Knowles, "Historical Notes," fol.65r.

¹⁶⁵ YMA L1/7, Torre, 124; Knowles, "Manuscript Notes," fol.159r; in Knowles's London text, he described the left-hand figure as male, Knowles, "Historical Notes," fol.65r.

which he is rescued and revived.¹⁶⁶ This seems more plausible than the alternative identification of the large shape as the shrine as it does not fit the latter's lead line. If these identifications for CHn3:37, 38 and 39 are correct, they would demonstrate two of the most miraculous of William's activities, namely bringing the dead back to life. In this they would partially reflect the Bull of Canonisation, with its reference to "tres mortuos".¹⁶⁷

The remaining panel is CHn3:30,¹⁶⁸ described by Torre as showing three standing figures, one of whom was nimbed (apparently the only figure in the window convincingly to indicate a saint).¹⁶⁹ Bearing in mind the fact that William's relics were translated to the east end in 1284, a scene depicting this might have been expected. However, it is unexpected that none of the other scenes associated with the translation event is included. In n7, for example, scenes included were (18b) King Edward and Queen Eleanor invited to attend the translation, (18c) Edward falling down a hill, (18d) the King giving thanks to St William, (18e) the royal party riding to York, (20a) the relics removed from the coffin, (20b) the translation of the relics, (20c) the service of the translation, (20d) a stone falling on a sleeper during the service and the sleeper explaining the miracle(20e).¹⁷⁰ Even though it is the case that the size of n7 means it has scope for more scenes than CHn3, it seems surprising that none of the others is included as a means of enhancing the royal status of the event, especially if this were to have been the culmination of the cycle.

However, the panel may, alternatively, have depicted William being admitted to the ranks of saints through his canonisation, particularly bearing in mind Torre's description which does not indicate the carrying of a large object.

¹⁶⁶ *Breviarium*, 75, col. 303; *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 2, 290-1.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, 129.

¹⁶⁸ Volume 2, 639.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*; YMA L1/7, Torre, 124.

¹⁷⁰ Corpus, *International Colloquium*, 112.

Its current appearance owes much to Milner White: in the pre-restoration image it showed two main standing characters, at least one of which was, unusually for CHn3, nimbed.¹⁷¹

The significance of this discussion is that if the window were created in the late 1280s, as appears likely, it would postdate the 1284 translation. It would therefore be expected that the final scene showed something from the translation. A panel representing the canonisation would, however, draw attention to Gray's contribution to the creation of the cult, in that it would place considerable importance on the strenuous efforts he made to achieve this,¹⁷² especially after the set-back in 1224.¹⁷³ It is plausible to suggest that his subsequent success acquired a special status among the canons in the institutional memory of the Minster, even if William's sanctity had already been popularly acclaimed. On balance, from what remains of previous descriptions and the 1929-32 photograph,¹⁷⁴ it appears more likely that the canonisation rather than the translation is represented, in which case the emphasis would be more on Gray's achievement than the more recent translation, paid for by Bek at his consecration as bishop of Durham.

2.4 Comments on the heraldic scheme

The location and the identification of the shields in the heraldic display indicate the following. Of the royal arms, a total of fifteen represented the arms of England,¹⁷⁵ three showed France¹⁷⁶ and one was of Castile/Leon.¹⁷⁷ The

¹⁷¹ YMA Green Photographic Collection.

¹⁷² Sayers, *Papal Government*, 180.

¹⁷³ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 51. Norton, *William of York*, 198-99.

¹⁷⁴ Volume 2, 639.

¹⁷⁵ In CH1 (E1 upper and D1 upper), CHn2 (E1 upper, D1 upper and D2 upper), CHn3 (E1 upper and D2 upper), CHn4 (E1 upper and D1 upper), CHs2 (E1 upper, D1 upper and D2 upper) and CHs3 (E1 upper, D1 upper and D2 upper).

distribution of the arms of England is not systematic, although they tend to be the upper of any pair in D1 or D2 in each window, and are always, with the exception of those of France in CHs4, in the uppermost position in E1 (CHs4 is the only window where the arms of England were omitted).

Of the royal earls, the arms of Lancaster were included on three occasions,¹⁷⁸ and Cornwall once.¹⁷⁹ The non-royal earls were also a stable group during this period; between 1270 and 1295 there were no significant family changes that would affect the use or dating of heraldic devices, meaning that they cannot be used to date the tracery design more precisely. They included William de Beauchamp of Warwick (once),¹⁸⁰ Roger de Bigod of Norfolk (once),¹⁸¹ Gilbert de Clare of Gloucester (three times),¹⁸² John de Dreux of Richmond (once),¹⁸³ Henry de Lacy of Lincoln (once),¹⁸⁴ John de Warenne of Surrey (twice),¹⁸⁵ and Robert de Vere of Oxford (once).¹⁸⁶ In addition, there is the shield of Amaury de Montfort, with his ambiguous status given his discredited parentage.¹⁸⁷ This means that all the English earls were represented in the glass, with the exceptions of Richard of Arundel, Humphrey de Bohun (Hereford) and William de Valence (Pembroke).

Of the barons the following were represented: Blanchminster (once),¹⁸⁸ Bulmer (once),¹⁸⁹ Fitzalan of Bedale (twice),¹⁹⁰ Balliol (once),¹⁹¹ Ros (twice),¹⁹²

¹⁷⁶ CHs4 (E1 upper, D1 upper and D2 upper).

¹⁷⁷ CHn4 (E1 lower).

¹⁷⁸ CH1 (D2 upper), CHn2 (E1 lower) and CHs2 (E1 lower).

¹⁷⁹ CHn4 (D2 upper).

¹⁸⁰ CH1 (D1 lower).

¹⁸¹ CH1 (E1 lower).

¹⁸² CHn2 (A1), CHn3 (E1 lower and D1 lower).

¹⁸³ CHn3 (D2 lower).

¹⁸⁴ CHs3 (E1 lower).

¹⁸⁵ CHn2 (D1 lower) and CHn3 (A1).

¹⁸⁶ CHn4 (D2 lower).

¹⁸⁷ CHs2 (D1 lower).

¹⁸⁸ CHs4 (A3).

¹⁸⁹ CH1 (D2 lower).

¹⁹⁰ CHn4 (A1) and CHs2 (D1 lower).3 (D1 lower).

¹⁹¹ CHs3 (D1 lower).

Neville (once),¹⁹³ Clifford (twice),¹⁹⁴ Greystoke (twice),¹⁹⁵ de Meinill (once),¹⁹⁶ Percy Ancient (once),¹⁹⁷ Percy of Kildale (once),¹⁹⁸ Tattershall (once)¹⁹⁹ and Vescy (once).²⁰⁰ Amongst these, there is a clear emphasis on the northern Province.²⁰¹

The significance of the heraldic scheme is unclear. The shields attributed to each individual among both the earls and barons are not evenly distributed (and not all included), suggesting that the scheme was not an in-house design to reflect the power or structure of Edward I's court;²⁰² more likely it demonstrated different levels of financial contributions. Whether these were paid for by individual canons, the result of a collective offering from Chapter or paid for by the relevant families themselves (or, indeed, a combination) is unclear. If the last, it indicates that Clare and Edmund of Lancaster jointly were the most generous among the earls. Any reflection of financial contributions by the families might also explain the irregular inclusion of the shield of Edward I: while the uppermost position, in E1, may have been intended for royal arms, the remainder may have been used as infills when further contributions were not forthcoming.

Individual personal issues may have played a role: Clare may have been acting to protect the position of his brother, Bogo de Clare, the notorious pluralist who held Masham, the treasurership and its two associated prebends

¹⁹² CHn2 (D2 lower) and CHs2 (A3).

¹⁹³ CHn2 (A3).

¹⁹⁴ CHn3 (D1 lower) and CHn4 (D1 lower).

¹⁹⁵ CHn4 (A3) and CHs3 (D2 lower).

¹⁹⁶ CHn3 (A3).

¹⁹⁷ CHs4 (D2 lower).

¹⁹⁸ CHs3 (A1).

¹⁹⁹ CHs4 (E1 lower).

²⁰⁰ CHs3 (A3).

²⁰¹ See details in Appendix B.

²⁰² Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 124, discusses a similar non-hierarchical display of shields in the nave of the Minster.

at Wilton and Newthorpe.²⁰³ Alternatively, Bogo may have made the contribution himself to ensure the Clares were included. At this stage, the Ros involvement may have been influenced by or related to Peter de Ros's installation as canon and precentor in August 1289.²⁰⁴ Any contribution by the Percies may have been associated with their relative, William, who held Thockrington until at least 1294.²⁰⁵ As argued in Chapter 1, it is more likely that Amaury paid his own contribution than that any member of Chapter paid for his inclusion.

The way the shields were selected and paid for may be uncertain: on balance it seems that they may reflect contributions by the families rather than a scheme designed and funded by Chapter or its members, possibly as a result of a campaign by Romeyn to get the Chapter House completed. The inclusion of Amaury de Montfort's shield supports this conclusion, given that, by the late 1280s, there are no surviving identifiable members of Chapter who might have funded his inclusion. However, the scheme lends support for Brown's selection of the early 1290s as a significant period in the heraldry design. As such it would fall within the appropriate time-bracket for the completion of the project. It would be reasonable to assume that the remainder of the glass also dates from this period, while the heraldry was being designed and created, after the construction of the roof.

2.5 Conclusion

The reconstructions presented in this Chapter confirm the plausibility of the some of the conclusions set out in Chapter 1, namely that the panels were

²⁰³ Henry Summerson, "Clare, Bogo de (1248-1294)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn. Jan. 2008, <http://www.oxforddb.com>.

²⁰⁴ *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 377; Le Neve, *Fasti*, 56.

²⁰⁵ CPR, 1292-1301, 123.

generally retained in their original light or light-type until Milner White's intervention after World War II. The exceptions are four panels in CHs3, the window which suffered stonework problems to the two left-hand mullions after the Restoration when there may have been a hasty repair and reinsertion, one panel in CHn3 and the heraldry in the tracery of CHn4, which also had clearly suffered some sort of damage, probably during hostilities in the Civil War, requiring panels from elsewhere to be inserted. The Green photographs show the original borders and the Barnett copies of CH1 probably retained the existing border designs until Milner White's intervention. The only exception to the principle that panels retained their borders until Milner White is a probable switch between CHn2:26 and 28.

Comparing the reconstructions of all the windows with the current locations, it can be seen that only forty-seven panels are now in their original position, of which thirty have remained there throughout. The remaining seventeen of the forty-seven have, either by accident or design, been moved away from and then back into their original position. Five panels have been completely lost, in addition to the nineteen now existing only as copies, and eighty-eight are still in the wrong place of which twenty are the Barnett copies in the nave.

Visual clues in the windows, with the exception of the strip features of seventeen panels in CHn2, were introduced to create deliberate patterns across the narratives. The reason the features in CHn2 were different in that the strip features do not indicate a pattern for either whichever option is unknown. It is possible that this was an early window to be completed, and symmetrical standardisation had still to be adopted.

The original narratives themselves all started in position 2a and culminated in 8e, with the exception of the abbreviated versions in CHs4 where the starting point in each light was row 2 and the culmination in row 8. Generally, a broad chronological sequence can be identified, although in CHs2 other themes were superimposed upon the chronology. The significance of the reconstructions will be considered in Chapter 3. As a result of this exercise, for thirty-one of the panels, a new or clarified identification has been presented, and for another three an alternative has been included.

The glazing appears to have been created by three workshops, each taking responsibility for two entire windows and one or two lights in CHs4 (see Appendix D). Two of these (Workshops 1 and 2) may have subsequently moved to the vestibule. Workshop 3 does not seem to have been used further.

The main outcome is that the original narrative structure has been suggested for all of the outstanding windows and that created in CHs3 has been confirmed. This has enabled comparisons to be made across the designs and coincidences and anomalies to be explored in Chapters 3 and 4.

CHAPTER 3: A UNIFIED GLAZING SCHEME

3.1 *Introduction*

At first sight, the chapter house windows share a similar appearance in terms of their tracery, their band design, the positioning of their narratives and their heraldic schemes. What is less clear is the extent to which the project was unified thematically, with motifs cutting across the three different workshops responsible for their creation, and reflecting the priorities of those for whom the building was commissioned. Ultimately, it will be suggested that such features seem to have been rooted in prevailing theology and liturgy, not unexpected for an educated group of ecclesiastics, but they indicate a sophisticated level of engagement with intellectual concerns.

3.2 *Theological influences*

This section investigates the extent to which the designs share similar features and, if so, possible explanations. Common coincidences and anomalies in the way the narratives have been structured are investigated, highlighted by a comparison with roughly contemporary visual representations of the same or similar subject-matter surviving elsewhere in England and on the Continent and with relevant textual accounts. Inevitably, owing to the vagaries of survival, this approach cannot be conclusive but it can open up possibilities regarding apparent commonalities in the windows.

The argument here consists of two main stages: first, it appears that there were similar patterns in the narrative sequences across the main windows based on the organisation of the panels, involving the extension of some sequences and the omission of other scenes which might have been expected

in the thirteenth century. These manipulations created common foci across the relevant windows. Second, these conclusions are explained by examining contemporary ideas, suggesting the main concerns of those commissioning the designs. Patterns of association across the windows are presented in Table 3.1, showing the way central and corner panels are linked in each window.

3.2.1 Narrative structures: central positions (4c and 6c)

Across the main reconstructed windows, and including the Margaret light of CHs4, one of the striking similarities is that a visual and/or thematic emphasis seems to have been presented in the original centrally positioned panels, 4c and 6c (4a and 6a in CHs4) (Figures 26a-g). Within the context of the individual life, each pairing is related: in CH1, for example, panels 18 and 28 share a visual and thematic connection between Christ's Crucifixion and Resurrection,¹ while in CHn3, the two central locations contain the main miracles which gave rise to William's canonisation, the five unspecified miracles healing the crippled and the dumb (CHn3:28, in 4c)² and what was probably the gift of new eyes to Ralph (CHn3:18 in 6c).³ Both the latter scenes have a similar structure in that the shrine-like tomb is set on the right-hand side, with the supplicants to the left, facing towards the Passion and Resurrection window in CH1. An ultimate conclusion will be that an early design for CHs4 was for Margaret to have been the sole subject for CHs4 and for Margaret emerging from the dragon in CHs4:17 and 27 to have been the two central panels (to be further explored in Chapter 4).⁴ If this were the case these central panels would have presented resonances of the Resurrection of Christ and either Christ or the Virgin standing

¹ Volume 2, 403 and 423.

² *Ibid.*, 631.

³ *Ibid.*, 607.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1025 and 1051.

on the beasts.⁵ The result of any modification is that, now, two of the only four Margaret panels show a similar scene of Margaret emerging from the dragon, triumphing over it. In CHs2, the two central scenes are those of Peter facing figures of authority in Jerusalem (the High Priest in CHs2:8 in 4c) and in Rome (Nero and Simon Magus in CHs2:38 in 6c).⁶ In both, Peter faces towards the right, placing the support of Christ's Passion in CH1 symbolically behind him, unlike the other pairings where the relevant saint faces east towards the Passion and Resurrection window in CH1. It is also noticeable that the confrontation in CHs2:8 (in 4c) is unconnected to the surrounding scenes.

Table 3.1: Panels associated visually and/or thematically in each window

Associated panels indicated in shades of green:

 Denoting the association between the central panels, 4c and 6c

 Denoting the association between the corner panels, 2e and 8a

 Denoting the association between the corner panels, 2a and 8e

CH1:Passion and Resurrection

36	40	38	[39]	[27]
[26]	[10]	28	9	29
[16]	20	18	37	19
[30]	6	8	7	[17]

CHn2:....Life of the Virgin Mary
Option 2: 26/28 Borders B/A

37	7	40	29	28
27	26	18	39	38
10	17	16	19	30
6	8	9	20	36

CHn3:....Life of St William of York

[10?]	37	38	39	[30?]
16	9	18		
26		28	19	[20?]
6	[17?]	[8]		36

CHn4... Life of St Katherine

39	37	38	36	40
29	27	28	26	30
19	17	18	16	20
9	7	8	6	10

⁵ See Chapter 4.

⁶ Volume 2, 785 and 869.

CHs2... Life of St Peter

6	29	28	39	40
36	37	38	27	26
20	7	8	17	30
10	9	18	19	16

CHs3...Life of St Paul.

6	37	38	39	40
26	27	28	29	30
16	17	18	19	20
6	7	8	9	10

CHs4...The Five Saints

37	38	36	39	40
27	28	26	29	[30?]
17	18	16	19	20
7	8	6	9	10

Despite the biblical accounts of Paul before the authorities,⁷ and in contrast to the way Peter's life is depicted, such encounters are omitted from CHs3. There is, notably, no scene of a final confrontation with Nero before Paul's martyrdom: his final years are treated very peremptorily. Instead, in CHs3, the central positions are used for the only main incidents where Paul was physically assaulted by the authorities (in Lystra and Philippi, in CHs3:18 and 28),⁸ until his execution. In both panels, Paul stands centrally, slightly contrapposto, facing east and flanked by his assailants. The location of CHs3:18 in 4c is particularly unusual in that the narrative has been adjusted to enable it to be placed centrally: it is the first of three rare if not unique representations of Paul's stoning in Lystra and its aftermath (CHs3:18-20).⁹ It follows his unrelated escape from Damascus (CHs3:16) and his meeting with Peter in Jerusalem (CHs3:17). What is even more unexpected is that the sequence starts with Paul being punished for his miracle, while the miracle of the lame man, the catalyst for the Lystra stoning, is excluded. In itself this runs counter to the general practice in the chapter house glazing, where the

⁷ Acts 23:33 and 25:23.

⁸ Volume 2, 925 and 953.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 925-35. Only one depiction of the stoning has been located and none of the following incidents, in the twelfth-century bible in Troyes, MS 2391, fol. 225v, Eleen, *Pauline Epistles*, 79.

emphasis is on the miracles conducted by the various saints. A secondary effect is that, in showing only the aftermath, the sequence draws attention to the fact that, canonically, it was the Jews who took advantage of the furore caused by the miracle and instigated Paul's stoning, while the original miracle was the healing of a non-Jew.¹⁰ Much is made of the Jewish features of one of the men throwing stones in CHs3:18 and of the man observing Paul being taken from the City in CHs3:19.¹¹ It is thus notable that only the aftermath of the miracle, the aggression by the Jews, is shown while the catalyst, the healing of a pagan worshipper, is omitted, demonstrating a sub-theme of anti-Semitism which can be identified across the chapter house glazing and is further considered below.

CHn2 shows a similar association between the central panels, although the thematic association is less immediately obvious. The central axis in CHn2 (for both options) contains the Adoration of the Magi (CHn2:16 in 4c) and the Purification (CHn2:18 in 6c).¹² Of particular interest here is the choice of the Adoration of the Magi for the central position in row 4, adjacent to its focus (the Virgin and Child) in 4d (CHn2:19) which itself might have been expected to be located centrally.¹³ The significance of CHn2:19 is visually emphasised, with the Virgin and Child seated under a large wooden structure (possibly a throne), the outline of which breaks through the edge of the medallion and encroaches into the grisaille above. Nevertheless, despite this mark of importance, it is CHn2:16 which is in the central C light. Compared with other Magi scenes, the figures in

¹⁰ Acts 14:18.

¹¹ Robert Mills, "Monsters and Margins: Representing Differences," in *History of British Art*, ed. David Bindman, Vol. 1 in *History of British Art 600-1600*, ed. Tim Ayers (London: Tate, 2008), 218-19; Elisabeth Revel-Neher, Marcel Dubois and David Maizel, *The Image of the Jew in Byzantine Art* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1992), 101-4. Revel-Neher discusses the facial caricaturisation of Jews in French and English manuscripts of the thirteenth century. Lateran IV had decreed that Jews should wear different clothing from Christians, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume 1: Nicaea I to Lateran V*, ed. Norman P. Tanner (Bologna: Sheed and Ward, 1990), 265.

¹² Volume 2, 487 and 499.

¹³ *Ibid*, 505.

CHn2:16 are also shown in an almost exaggerated act of sacrifice and offering made towards the Virgin and Child.¹⁴

This reflects a similar gesture in CHn2:18 in 6c above. The design of the Purification image is the only representation so far encountered which shows Simeon on the same side of the altar as Mary and Joseph.¹⁵ He holds Christ above the altar to the right, with Mary and Joseph behind him, in a gesture apparently making an offering of or to Christ, and thus creating a focus to the right-hand side. The three figures facing to the east thus mirror the Magi in the panel below. Theologically, this was the occasion when Simeon warned Mary of the pain she was to experience and hence her future personal sacrifice, while the Magi's gifts, especially of myrrh, were associated with the portent of Christ's death. The visual impression of the design of both central panels is of fingers or arrows pointing towards the east, in the direction of the original Passion and Resurrection window in CH1, depicting the ultimate sacrifice.

At first sight, CHn4 does not fall into this pattern: the scene of Maxentius meeting the philosophers (CHn4:18) does not visually mirror that of the Katherine's scourging in CHn4:28.¹⁶ However, despite the absence of any visual link between the two, there is a strong thematic connection, built around the fact that Katherine was venerated for the way she, particularly, lived her life in *imitatio Christi*. An immediate visual resonance is created by the close similarity of the structure of the scene of Katherine's scourging in CHn4:28 with Christ's Flagellation (CH1:16),¹⁷ which was in CH1:4a in the east window. Both show the victim facing forwards, tied to a central stake and stripped to the waist,

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 487.

¹⁵ *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedrals of Chartres, Bay 50:4b and 28b:6c; Laon, Bay 2:5a and 5b; Le Mans, 3:6a and 105:5c; Tours, Bays 1:5b and 202:5c; Troyes, Bay 0:7c; the churches of St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 6:4a and 7:5; St-Père, Chartres, Bay 218:5a-c; St-Urbain, Troyes 7:4b (reconstructed); St-Quentin, Bay 1:6b.

¹⁶ Volume 2, 707 and 733.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 395.

with two scourgers on either side.¹⁸ Only one other representation showing Katherine in this Christ-like pose has been identified, in the Cathedral at Auxerre.¹⁹

York's iconography reflects a close similarity between the lives of Christ and Katherine in the textual sources. In the early thirteenth-century *Wooing of our Lord*, female saints were encouraged to ask of Christ, "What can I suffer for you for all that you have suffered for me?" and to come to the conclusion that "my body will hang with your body, nailed on the cross, fastened within four walls".²⁰ Reames's work on the Liturgy for the Feast of St Katherine in the Use of York has shown differences between the emphases in Katherine's cult in her respective audiences.²¹ The liturgy in York, for example, was similar to that of other institutions dominated by a male, clerical audience in that the most indispensable elements in Katherine's life for this audience were her Christological faith in God and her "heroic endurance".²² In contrast with other depictions which stress her learning,²³ in York, her hands seem to be joined in prayer or raised in argument or remonstrance. Of the twelve panels in which she appears, six omit a book (the Angel appearing to Katherine in CHn4:6, the

¹⁸ There is another scourging scene in the chapter house, in St Paul's window, also in 6c, but it is noticeably unlike the Christ/Katherine image: Paul is not tied to a central pillar, he is shown in three-quarter view and is fully clothed.

¹⁹ *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedral at Auxerre, Bay 26:3a. Depictions which do not resemble Christ can be found at *Online Archive*, "French sites," for example, in the cathedrals of Angers, Bay 125:4a and 4b; Chartres, Bay 16:7a; in the Abbey Church at Fécamp, one was recorded in Bay 3:5a before its recent removal.

²⁰ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 256. "Hwat mai þole for þe foral þ tu þoledes for me [...] Mi bodi henge wið þi bodi neiled o rode sperred querfaste wiðinne fowr wales," Anon, *þe Wohunge of ure Lauerd*, ed. W. Meredith Thompson (London: published for the Early English Text Society by Oxford University Press, 1958), 36.

²¹ Reames, "St Katherine," 207.

²² *Ibid.*, 216.

²³ *Online Archive*, "French sites," in Dol Cathedral, where only five original panels survive, Katherine holds a book up to the philosophers, Bay 0:H2, as a symbol of her Christian knowledge and learning, and is also holding one when she is visited by the Empress and Porphyrius, Bay 0:H4. She appears in the same way in Bay 125:1b and 3a in the cathedral at Angers; and in the cathedral at Chartres she appears in Bay 16:4a, 4b, 7a and 9a. In the church of St-Père, Chartres, she holds a book both when she initially disputes with Maxentius, Bay 226:1a-c, and when she is in prison, visited by the Empress, Bay 226:4b.

dispute with the philosophers in CHn4:20, Katherine being scourged in CHn4:28, her martyrdom in CHn4:36, being visited by Christ in CHn4:37 and her being saved from the wheels in CHn4:38).²⁴ The book was also probably absent from a further three (Katherine protesting to Maxentius in CHn4:7, her being led from prison in CHn4:16 and returned there in CHn4:26),²⁵ while in the remaining three it is impossible to tell (Katherine escorted to prison in CHn4:8, before Maxentius in CHn4:27 and visited by the Empress in CHn4:39).²⁶ Overall, from what survives she is shown less as an intellectual than as someone motivated by belief. CHn4, therefore, places more stress on Katherine's faith than her erudition.

CHn4:18 in 4c also continues the *imitatio Christi* theme using different iconography.²⁷ It contains a scene where Maxentius, supported by his evil adviser, variously called Chryasadem in the *Vulgate*,²⁸ an unnamed prefect in *Legenda Aurea*,²⁹ and Cursates in the *Stanzaic Life*,³⁰ finally meets the philosophers. At first, Christological undertones were not made visible. However, in the course of the thirteenth century, there was an iconographic trend to display at least the leader of the pagan philosophers as though they were Jewish, thus creating a scene in which the Roman authorities allied with a group led by a "Jew" to defeat a Christ-like Katherine as a figure of faith.³¹ Because of the loss of key glass in York, the full extent to which the adversaries were shown as "Jewish" is unclear, but there are some indications of such

²⁴ Volume 2, 671, 715, 733, 749, 755 and 759.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 677, 699 and 721.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 683, 727 and 763.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 707.

²⁸ Walsh, *Cult*, 7.

²⁹ Voragine, *Golden Legend*, Vol. 2, 337.

³⁰ Anon, *Stanzaic Life of Katherine*, verses 490-6.

³¹ *Online Archive*, "French sites," in the cathedrals at Angers, Bay 125 (one Jewish hat at rear), Auxerre, Bay 26 (one possible Jewish hat), Dol, Bay 0 (Jewish hats in H2 and H3); Rouen, Bay 51 (Jewish hat in 2d); and the church of St-Père, Chartres, Bay 226. See also Freiburg Münster, n39, *ibid.*, "Other sites," 2b and 2c.

presentations in what may be the original lead lines of the pointed hat of the Jew.³² The leading philosopher was certainly presented as Jewish in the slightly later Katherine window in n23 in the nave (Figure 27a).

This Christological aspect is emphasised by the inclusion of an unprecedented number of scenes demonstrating the build-up of an intensifying conspiracy compared with other Katherine narratives. If CHn4:10 shows the first stage of the plan devised by Maxentius and his allies to summon the philosophers to argue the case against Katherine,³³ the narrative continues, apparently awkwardly, in the first three panels of row 4: CHn4:19 (4a) clearly shows the messenger being dispatched to locate the philosophers;³⁴ in CHn4:17 (4b) he presents them with the summons;³⁵ while in CHn4:18 (4c), they are brought before Maxentius.³⁶ This means that there are as many as four medallions devoted to the hostile role of individuals represented as Jews (Figure 27c), conspiring with the secular, pagan Emperor, far exceeding the number devoted to the conspiracy elsewhere. (Examples of uncanonically depicted Jewish headgear are provided in Figures 27b, 27d and 27e).

As with CHn2:16 (the Adoration of the Magi)³⁷ in the window showing the life of the Virgin, it seems unusual for the meeting of Maxentius and the philosophers to be located centrally (CHn4:18 in 4c),³⁸ while the actual encounter with Katherine, in the dispute itself, was placed at the extreme right (CHn4:20 in 4e),³⁹ and the conversion, martyrdom and salvation of the

³² *Online Archive*, "French sites," in St-Père of Chartres, Bay 226:left-hand lancet; the Cathedral at Dol, the east window: H2 and H3, and 3h; and "Other sites," Freiburg Münster, n39:2b and 2c.

³³ Volume 2, 693.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 711.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 703.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 707.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 559.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 707.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 715. Unlike in *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedral at Angers, Bay 125:1a and 1b; the cathedral at Chartres, Bay 16:5a and 5b; the church of St-Père, Chartres, Bay 226:2a-c.

philosophers are also condensed into a single scene, in CHn4:29 (6a) at the extreme left on the row above.⁴⁰ The positioning of the coming together of Katherine's conspiratorial enemies in the central light, in advance of the debate, is consequently given a more prominent position and a greater emphasis than the debate itself, further enhancing the resonances with Christ's predicament. Given the Christ-like allusions of her scourging in CHn4:28 in 6c,⁴¹ both the central scenes in the Katherine window present and so emphasise the Christological basis of her cult. The window then falls into the same pattern as CH1, CHs2, CHs3, CHn2 and CHn3, in that in this case the two central positions show a key aspect of the ways her Life reflects that of Christ.⁴²

To conclude the examination of the central panels, the windows have different central foci but still have been designed to resonate with each other: in CH1, the juxtaposition stresses Christ's role in Redemption through the Crucifixion and Resurrection; by confronting figures of authority in CHs2, Peter presents himself as an authority figure; Paul is subjected to intense physical torture in CHs3; Katherine, more than the other saints, lived her life in *imitatio Christi* in CHn4; while the Virgin replicates God's and Christ's sacrifice in CHn2; William demonstrates his miraculous powers of healing in CHn3; and Margaret's emergence from the dragon resonates with several theological elements, including the Resurrection, in CHs4. There was, thus, an arguable link between the panels in 4c and 6c in the main windows (and between 4a and 6a in CHs4). They all stress a theme in the life of Christ, while also indicating the individual contribution made by the saints to the Church. In this, the designs

⁴⁰ Volume 2, 739.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 733.

⁴² Madeline H. Caviness, *Visualizing Women in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 104. She also discusses the ways that female martyrs, specifically Margaret, became increasingly "Christlike", especially after they had demonstrated their bravery in facing torture, *ibid.*, 87.

show a possibly late thirteenth-century evolution of Kemp's analysis of narrative structures from the twelfth, namely the central lights showing a summary of the pictorial narrative, and the "outer panels [being] scenic attributes of the central scene".⁴³

3.2.2 Narrative structures: corner positions (2e and 8a)

Attention now turns to other possible relationships between panels in the windows to show that the narratives have, to varying extents, been adjusted to create a connection between the corner panels in 2e and 8a. In order to achieve this, it will be shown that the methods used to achieve these emphases include the unexpected position, omission or inclusion of specific scenes in order to adjust the precise location of individual episodes. The pattern here is less obvious than that involving the central panels in that there seem to be two main types (and none in CHs4 where the corner discussion is irrelevant as the five narratives are confined to a single light each).

The clearest examples are in CHs2 and CHs3. In CHs2, after the uncommon call of Peter in CHs2:2a,⁴⁴ the two other significant occasions in which Christ appeared to Peter were placed, out of chronological sequence, in 2e and 8a. CHs2:16,⁴⁵ in 2e, showing Christ encouraging Peter to walk on water, is placed after Peter's chronologically later miracle where he healed the lame man outside the Golden Gate (CHs2:18 and 19 in 2c and 2d).⁴⁶ CHs2:6, depicting Christ's selection of Peter as his "rock" in Judaea was in 8a, after

⁴³ Wolfgang Kemp, *The Narratives of Gothic Stained Glass*, trans. Caroline Dobson Saltzwedel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 23. Deremble and Manhes had showed the variety of ways used at Chartres to present narratives, Colette Manhes and Jean-Paul Deremble, *Les Vitraux narratifs de la Cathédral de Chartres*, (Paris: Léopard d'or, 1993), 62-64.

⁴⁴ Volume 2, 519. Three possible representations, in the cathedrals of Le Mans (Bay 111:1a) and Tours (Bays 2:8b and 203:1b) more plausibly show Christ's invitation to Peter to walk on water, *Online Archive*, "French sites".

⁴⁵ Volume 2, 773.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 813 and 817.

Peter's encounter with Simon Magus in Rome in the row below.⁴⁷ The result is that Christ appeared to Peter in the two opposite corner panels, suggesting an emphasis of the window was on Peter's selection by Christ.

A similar arrangement prevails in CHs3, where, despite the relative size of the cycle, there is an intriguing truncation of Paul's conversion sequence in row 2. The expected scenes after the conversion on the road to Damascus include those involving Ananias,⁴⁸ such as Ananias dreaming, curing Paul of his blindness, and/or feeding Paul. In CHs3, these are all omitted, leaving only the Baptism panel (CHs3:9), showing Ananias.⁴⁹ The resulting gap created in 2e is filled with a general preaching scene in Damascus creating a situation where two related scenes are on different rows: namely Paul preaching in Damascus in CHs3:10 in 2e and his escape in CHs3:16 in 4a.⁵⁰ It is clear that the selection of the preaching scene for 2e was significant enough for these consequences to have been acceptable, especially given that there is no specific episode in the events in Damascus associated with it: all that are included in the Use of York are generalised references to the fact that he preached to the Jews in the Synagogue.⁵¹ The opposite diagonal in the window is CHs3:36 in 8a,⁵² which shows Paul's preaching and being overheard, possibly by Patroclus, meaning that the miracle has been moved out of its chronological narrative position, as it is shown before Paul's arrival in Rome. Again, the impact is that an adjustment has been made to include preaching episodes in corner positions.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 773.

⁴⁸ Acts 9:10-18.

⁴⁹ Volume 2, 901.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 907 and 913..

⁵¹ *Breviarium*, 75, cols. 164 and 166. In a similar scene in the tracery of Bay 14 in Metz Cathedral, Paul is clearly preaching to Jews, and it is possible that the outline of one of the headdresses in CHs3:10 shows a Jewish Type-2 hat.

⁵² Volume 2, 965.

The fact that two panels have been devoted to the preaching scene in 8a (with the healing of Patroclus in 8b)⁵³ makes the way the martyrdom itself is presented even more unexpected. There is nothing of Paul's arrival in Rome, his meeting with Paul, nor his trial. These are subsumed in a single scene of the beheading in CHs3:40.⁵⁴ As can be seen from the *Legenda Aurea*, Paul was considered a greater preacher than Peter and, in the Use of York, considerable emphasis was placed on this aspect of his role.⁵⁵ The conclusion, therefore, is that the conversion and martyrdom sequences were truncated in York and the narrative was adjusted to permit the preaching emphasis to be included in the corner positions of 2e and 8a.

The arguments in relation to the William window are more tenuous because of its condition. The first sign of his sanctity, the survival of his corpse and vestments from a fire, was in 2e (CHn3:36).⁵⁶ The identification of 8a, however, relies solely on Torre's description: "Stands a man in gold and silver habitt with a Trumpet at his Mouth".⁵⁷ This suggests the presence of an angel, whose wings were lost or not visible. Were this to be the case, it is possible to argue for a relationship between the two panels, the first earthly sign of his sanctity in 2e, with the first sign of heavenly acknowledgement in 8a.

The Katherine (CHn4) and Virgin (CHn2) windows operate differently from those of Peter and Paul: here the arguments relate ultimately to the relationship of Christians with Jews in late thirteenth-century Europe, which was

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 965 and 971.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 985.

⁵⁵ The Feast of the Conversion, *Missale*, 13-15; the Feast of Peter and Paul, *Missale*, 59, 60); the *Sanctorale* for the Feast of the Conversion, *Breviarium*, 75, cols.160, 164, 166; and the *Sanctorale* for the Feast of Peter and Paul, *Breviarium*,75, cols. 347, 348, 356 and 357. The difficulties for the Church in accounting for the relationship between Peter and Paul date back to the early Church, see J.M. Huskinson, *Concordia Apostolorum: Christian Propaganda at Rome in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries: A Study in Early Christian Iconography and Iconology*, *British Archaeological Reports, International Series*, 148 (1982), 77-96.

⁵⁶ Volume 2, 645.

⁵⁷ YMA L1/7, Torre, 124.

articulated through attitudes to the Virgin Mary. As a result, they are less robust because of the difficulties of identifying the intended contemporary meaning.

In CHn2, the unexpectedly placed panel is, as noted, the Coronation of the Virgin, in 2e, according to the favoured Option 2 (CHn2:36).⁵⁸ The previous scene was one of the Annunciation to the shepherds (CHn2:20),⁵⁹ followed by the Magi scenes, with them following the star, appearing before Herod, presenting their gifts to the Christchild and being warned by the angel in their sleep not to return to Herod (CHn2:10, 17, 16, 19 and 30 in 4a to 4e).⁶⁰ The implication is that the Coronation was deliberately selected for the corner position. The significance of the Coronation has been discussed by Heslop in connection with the lost paintings in the chapter house at Worcester Cathedral, where he demonstrates that “the Coronation of the Virgin becomes a revelation to Synagogue”,⁶¹ as symbolic of the wilfully blind faith of the Jews. Its association with “the Church Triumphant” and the figure of Ecclesia has also been analysed in the context of the façade at Wells Cathedral by Malone.⁶² Figures of Synagogue and Ecclesia were painted in that part of the York chapter house ceiling which faced CHn2.⁶³ However, for the purposes of this discussion, it is the juxtaposition with CHn2:37 (originally in 8a),⁶⁴ showing the Jew attacking the Virgin’s bier, which is important.

One version of the funeral of the Virgin presents as a simple illustration of the Apostles carrying Mary’s bier, with no Semitic allusions. However,

⁵⁸ Volume 2, 545.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 619.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 483, 493, 487, 505, 539.

⁶¹ T.A. (Sandy) Heslop, “The English Origins of the Coronation of the Virgin,” *The Burlington Magazine*, 147, No. 1233 (2005): 794.

⁶² Carolyn Marino Malone, *Façade as Spectacle: Ritual and Ideology at Wells Cathedral* (Leiden, Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, NV, 2004), 44-52.

⁶³ Norton, “Medieval paintings,” 43.

⁶⁴ Volume 2, 551.

CHn2:37 shows a more anti-Semitic version.⁶⁵ Underneath the bier are the remains of two small figures, one probably with his hands elevated. There are several explanations of this in the apocryphal sources: most of these refer to a single person, variously named but always a Jew, who was attracted to the funeral procession by the chanting of the Apostles led by Peter, and whose hands stuck to the bier when he touched it.⁶⁶ Visual versions include a solitary Jew behind,⁶⁷ or under the bier,⁶⁸ always touching it, and a before-and-after image, with the same Jew first stuck and then released as a result of Peter's intercession.⁶⁹ The only text which might explain the presence of two separate figures is that of St John the Divine,⁷⁰ in which an angel appears and severs the Jew's hands. The presence of the Jew, in whatever variation, tells a story of Jewish attack on the Virgin and Divine intervention, a narrative that is repeated in the lower border of the Pilgrimage Window (n25 in the north nave aisle of the Minster) as an ape parody (Figure 28).⁷¹ It is uncertain which of the two-figure versions is represented in CHn37, although as the other scenes in the glazing seem to be based on Pseudo-Melito (who does not refer to the presence of an angel),⁷² it probably illustrated the Jew attached to and released from the bier. Whichever was originally included, it is clear that an anti-Semitic line was being adopted, drawing attention to the hostility of the Jews to the Virgin, and it was

⁶⁵ Voragine, *Golden Legend*, Vol. 2, 80-81.

⁶⁶ Pseudo-Melito, *Transitu*, in James, *Apocryphal*, 214; Joseph of Arimathea's *Narrative* in *ibid.* 217 and the version by St John the Divine in *ibid.*, 208.

⁶⁷ As shown in the *York Psalter*, T.S.R.Boase, *The York Psalter in the Library of The Hunterian Museum, Glasgow*, (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1962), pl. 5.

⁶⁸ *Online Archive*; "French sites," the cathedrals at Chartres (Bay 42:4b); Le Mans (Bay 104:1a; Angers (Bay 123:2); Amiens (Bay 21:6a) and the church of St-Urbain of Troyes, 8:4a. It also features in eighth-century Saxon carvings at Wirksworth Church, Derbyshire, Jane Hawkes, "The Wirksworth Slab: an iconography of humilitas," *Peritia*, 9 (1995), 252-253 and 265-267.

⁶⁹ *Online Archive*; "English sites," Stanton St John, s4.

⁷⁰ The version of her Dormition attributed to St John and elaborated by John, Archbishop of Thessalonica in James, *Apocryphal*, 208.

⁷¹ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 288; Paul Hardwick, "The monkeys' funeral in the Pilgrimage window, York Minster," *Art History*, 23 (2000): 294. Here, in n25, it shows the single-figure version.

⁷² James, *Apocryphal*, 214.

decided to place this in the significant corner location in 8a. It was possibly connected to the adjacent scene of the converted Jew healing the blind in CHn2:7 already discussed (Option 2).⁷³

The relationship between these two corner panels, of the Coronation and the Funeral in 2e and 8a, needs to be examined in the context of Christian attitudes to Jews in the thirteenth century, the main focus for which was the perceived attack by the Jews on the virtue of the Virgin Mary:⁷⁴ the greater the power of her cult, the more the Jews were vilified because of their doubts about the virgin birth. According to Shoemaker, the emphasis placed on the presumed interference of the Virgin's funeral can be explained by the "role played by the Virgin and her cult in the exclusion of Jews from Christian society during the western Middle Ages".⁷⁵ As a "miraculous body", Fradenburg shows that it was the Virgin Mary who was "set up in opposition to the Jews",⁷⁶ and was associated with Ecclesia, the young Christian Church, in opposition to the blind Synagogue of the old faith.⁷⁷ In other words, Mary became the pre-eminent symbol of the confrontations, and her virginity was central to the way this antagonism was articulated. This, in turn, was used to justify the Crown in exacting punishment of the Jews in the name of divine order, resulting in the 1290 expulsion from England.⁷⁸ A possible theme linking the Coronation in CHn2:36 and the attack on the funeral cortège in CHn2:37 (2e and 8a

⁷³ Volume 2, 465. See Chapter 2.

⁷⁴ See Chapter 4.

⁷⁵ Stephen J. Shoemaker, "'Let Us Go and Burn Her Body': The Image of the Jews in the Early Dormition Tradition," *Church History*, 68 (1999): 775-76.

⁷⁶ Louise O. Fradenburg, "Criticism, anti-Semitism, and the Prioress's Tale," *Exemplaria*, 1 (1989): 88.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 89. Synagogue was included in the chapter house ceiling, Norton, "Medieval paintings," 43.

⁷⁸ Shoemaker, "Image of the Jews," 823.

respectively),⁷⁹ therefore, is the Virgin's role as the champion of the Church against Jewish antagonism.

As discussed above, in CHn4:10 (in 2e)⁸⁰ showing the development of a conspiracy against Katherine is highly unusual, though the possible allusions to a "Jewish" role among her aggressors fit with contemporary depictions. As well as linking with Christological elements, it can also be related to the juxtaposition of virginity and the Jews.

In addition to the hooked nose caricature associated with Jews, it can be seen in the use made of different types of headgear throughout the chapter house, categorised here as involving four different "Types" (Figure 27b-e). The first three Types are variations of standard pointed hats, while Type-4 is apparently used to denote either a "soft Jewishness" or a general sense of "otherness". Generally it is clear that this type of hat denotes a scholar, as Ayers, for example has shown at Merton College.⁸¹ This raises an unanswerable question as to why the hat is used differently in York, but nowhere in the chapter house glazing does this type of headgear denote a Christian learned figure. This Semitic element to denote a questionable or hostile figure developed in the course of the thirteenth century in glazing schemes elsewhere in Europe. Pointed caps can be seen in Angers Cathedral, Bay 125:1 (one green example in the rear), in the early fourteenth-century representations in St-Père, Chartres, Bay 226:2a-c; in Dol, H2; Rouen, Bay 51:4c and Freiburg, n39:2b.⁸² Rare exceptions are the thirteenth-century

⁷⁹ Volume 2, 545 and 551.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 693.

⁸¹ Ayers, *Merton College*, Part 2, Pls. 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25.

⁸² *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedrals at Angers, Dol and Rouen, and the church at St-Père, Chartres, and "Other sites," Germany, Freiburg.

window in Chartres, Bay 16:5a and 5b where the headgear has points but it is not clear if they are Jewish style hats,⁸³ and in Auxerre, Bay 26:1a-c.

In 8a (CHn4:39),⁸⁴ with Katherine's veneration by the Emperor's wife and the general of his army in this Type-4 hat, Katherine's triumph over some of the most powerful figures in the earthly world is seen as complete. It is plausible that this constitutes a modified version of the 2e/8a pattern emanating from the unambiguous relationship between virginity and the Jews. Certainly, the positioning of CHn4:39 in 8a was enabled by the inclusion of one panel showing Maxentius leaving the City (CHn4:30 in 6e),⁸⁵ a scene which has not been found elsewhere, and, by excluding, on row 8, one of the most common confrontation scenes between Maxentius and Katherine, that preceding her trial by wheel. Consequently, it seems that the narrative has been adjusted to enable the Empress and Porphyrius scene to be placed in 8a, where Katherine's faith is acknowledged by the representatives of her opponents, juxtaposed with the start of the conspiracy against her in 2e (CHn4:10).⁸⁶

It is thus possible to conclude that there was a deliberate relationship between the corner panels in 2e and 8a for CHs2 and CHs3. Such a link can be suggested for CHn2, CHn3 and CHn4 but with less certainty because of the degree of interpretation required, although the ideas resonate with mid- and late thirteenth-century notions.

3.2.3 Narrative structures: corner positions (2a/b and 8e)

In the light of the previous discussion, it is necessary to consider the alternative pairings of 2a/b and 8e, showing the beginnings and endings of the narratives,

⁸³ *Ibid.*, "French sites," the cathedrals at Chartres and Auxerre.

⁸⁴ Volume 2, 763.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 745.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 693.

to assess their significance and whether a similar pattern can be detected. As Wolfgang Kemp argued, more research into these aspects of stained glass narratives is needed,⁸⁷ so, given that, with the exception of the five abbreviated narratives in CHs4, the contemporary narratives in the chapter house start in 2a and terminate in 8e, the scheme provides an opportunity for just such an investigation.

In CH1:2a there is a crucial scene in Christ's earthly life, when he chose to enter Jerusalem (CH1:30),⁸⁸ thereby setting in motion the events that would lead to the culmination of the cycle of salvation with Christ in Judgement (CH1:27) in 8e.⁸⁹ This approach is mirrored in the other relevant windows. There seems to have been a decision to position what was deemed to be the *sine qua non* at the opening of each narrative, where the subject acted in such a way that their fate was to be certain, with the culmination in 8e, at the end of a top row in which there were indications of Divine approval.⁹⁰ Peter chose to follow Christ in CHs2:10 (2a) in a rare scene of his initial call,⁹¹ leading inevitably to his crucifixion in CHs2:40 (8e),⁹² while Paul accepted his commission from the High Priest in CHs3:6 (2a) in an equally rare glazing scene.⁹³ This was the prerequisite of his conversion and hence his martyrdom in CHs3:40 (8e), itself notable in York because it does not show him blindfolded and therefore does not allude to the post-mortem miracles involving Plautilla

⁸⁷ Kemp, *Narratives*, 30.

⁸⁸ Volume 2, 431.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 419.

⁹⁰ For Peter, this was in CHs2:6 in 8a; for Paul, Patroclus revived in CHs3:37 in 8b; for Margaret, her martyrdom in CHs4:37 in 8b; for Katherine, her torture by the wheels and the movement of her corpse in CHn4:38 and 40 in 8c and 8e respectively; for William, probably the canonisation in CHn3:30 in 8e, and for the Virgin, Christ collecting her soul in CHn2:40 and the Assumption of her soul in 28 in 8c and 8e respectively (Option 2).

⁹¹ Volume 2, 797.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 883..

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 985.

and Nero.⁹⁴ Of the female saints, in CHn2:2a the start of the Virgin's main narrative is presented, with her acceptance of her role in God's scheme at the Annunciation (CHn2:6),⁹⁵ and its culmination in 8e (CHn2:28 in Option 2), with her soul carried to heaven.⁹⁶

The situation which gave rise to Katherine's refusal to obey the emperor was shown in 2a (CHn4:9),⁹⁷ followed by her protest in 2b (CHn4:7),⁹⁸ with the culmination of this decision being the elevation of her soul in 8e (CHn4:40),⁹⁹ rather than her post-mortem corporal transfer to Mount Sinai. In the Margaret light of CHs4, the narrative, in an abbreviated form, follows a similar pattern. In 2b (CHs4:7) she chooses to resist Olybrius,¹⁰⁰ while in 8b (CHs4:37) she is martyred.¹⁰¹

Of the remaining lights in CHs4, the Nicholas scenes are a collection of miracles from his life: there is no sense of the launch, structure or culmination that would have been expected had it mirrored the other windows, and the two central panels show one of the evil landlord scenes (CHs4:28)¹⁰² and an unrelated one of Nicholas saving sailors in a storm (CHs4:18).¹⁰³ The start of the narrative (CHs4:8) is nothing more than a separate miracle, showing Nicholas providing dowry funds for the three impoverished daughters.¹⁰⁴ John the Baptist opens with a scene of the angel appearing to him in prison. This has not been found elsewhere but cannot be taken as a sign of his consenting to his

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 985.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 457.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 525. See the discussion under "Liturgical Influences" below.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 687.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 677.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 769.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 997.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 1073.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 1055.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 1031.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 1003.

fate (CHs4:9),¹⁰⁵ despite its visual significance as identifying John with the Virgin through the Annunciation-type imagery. It is followed by episodes from the Salome sequence including his martyrdom (CHs4:29)¹⁰⁶ in 6d, not at the termination of the narrative. As with Nicholas, there is no visual or thematic linking of the central scenes in Salome dancing for Herod in CHs4:19 and his martyrdom in CHs4:29,¹⁰⁷ beyond their chronological closeness. Thomas Becket appears to conform to the requirement for initial consent to his fate, in his consecration in CHs4:6, and its culmination in CHs4:36 with his martyrdom,¹⁰⁸ but his confrontation with Henry II in CHs4:16 is not visually or thematically associated with the other central panel showing, probably, his return to England in CHs4:26.¹⁰⁹ Edmund suffers from the loss of the original panel in 6e (CHs4:30),¹¹⁰ but it would have shown his martyrdom, not, as expected, in the final scene in 8e (CHs4:40),¹¹¹ where there is the discovery of the saint's head. In this absence it is difficult to come to firm conclusions, but it may be that the central positions, containing a visual resemblance to Christ's Flagellation, in 4e (CHs4:20),¹¹² and what would have been his beheading (CHs4:6e), echo a Christological theme. It is possible to argue that his sortie from the castle marks the theological start of the route to his sanctification in 2e (CHs4:10).¹¹³ However, the discovery of his head in CHs4:40¹¹⁴ does not conform to the pattern elsewhere for the final scene, nor is there any indication of divine approval. Hence, only the Becket sequence possibly shows a parallel

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 1009.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 1061.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 1037 and 1061.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 991 and 1069.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 1019 and 1045.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1065.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 1091.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 1041.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 1013.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1091.

beginning and end of the narrative, but, unlike Margaret and the saints of the other windows, there is no (or no surviving) evidence of divine approval.

The William narrative is inevitably slightly different because the emphasis in his cult is on his post-mortem miracles. However, 2a contained the Ouse Bridge miracle (CHn3:6),¹¹⁵ where symbolically William chose to return to York. In Chapter 2 it was argued that CHn3:30 probably represented a scene of his canonisation rather than his translation, and hence the religious culmination to his cult.

As Norton explains, the Bull of Canonisation “announces that William has been inscribed in the catalogue of the saints”,¹¹⁶ and would have marked the fact that his sainthood was among the series of English episcopal saints acknowledged by ever-tightening papal rules.¹¹⁷ Even if, outside York, his success “was greeted by an almost universal lack of interest”,¹¹⁸ within parts of the Northern Province, and especially in the Minster, there would have been an enormous sense of achievement attributed to William’s champion, Walter de Gray. If it showed a culmination connected with his canonisation, it would reflect the celebratory note which has been suggested for the trumpeting angel in CHn3:10 in 8a,¹¹⁹ and echo the papal pronouncement that “there is no doubt that he is now greatly honoured by the Lord in his Church triumphant”.¹²⁰

The central issue is the relative significance attached to the canonisation and the translation in the minds of those influencing the glazing scheme, conclusions about which are relevant to the issue of patronage. Whichever was

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 577.

¹¹⁶ Norton, *William*, 199.

¹¹⁷ André Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 51 and 168.

¹¹⁸ Norton, *William*, 202.

¹¹⁹ *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 2, 278; *ibid.*, Vol. 3, 128 and 129.

¹²⁰ Browne, *History*, Vol. 1, 53. “[...] cum non esset dubium upsum in triumphanti a Domino multipliciter honorari,” *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 128.

in 8e, there is no doubt that, like the other windows, it represented a culmination of his narrative. On balance, it appears more likely to have shown the canonisation than the translation.

This structural emphasis on 2a and 8e in the relevant windows is, therefore, constant, despite the fact that, by the end of the thirteenth century, many saints had acquired an earlier history which was commonly depicted elsewhere and was increasingly important in their cults. Certainly, by the fifteenth century, the childhoods of William and Cuthbert were to be depicted in n7 and s7 in the choir.¹²¹ The Virgin's life could be traced through her youth in the Temple back to her own immaculate conception, particularly topical because of contemporary interest in her status: Katherine and Margaret both demonstrated an early devotion, Katherine in particular through an earlier mystic marriage with Christ; Paul was traditionally associated with the persecution of Christians, including presiding over the stoning of Stephen; as well as his childhood, William had a pre-history associated with his first tenure as Archbishop and the plots resulting in his dismissal; Thomas Becket's pre-consecration narrative was well-established. Without exception, these accounts of earlier events have been omitted from the chapter house windows. Just as the culmination for each narrative was carefully selected, so, too, was the starting point.

3.2.4 Possible theological underpinning

These choices may well have reflected personal preferences on the part of the patrons, but a key question for this discussion is the extent to which a common explanation can be identified. While much attention has been paid in recent

¹²¹ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 282-84.

scholarship to the relation between text and image, it is possible that latterly links between theology and image have been somewhat ignored. There are notable exceptions, of course. Paul Binski described the way Paul's writings on pillars underpin the architecture of the Trinity Chapel in Canterbury Cathedral, in connection with which, if the chapter house at York is viewed from the point of view of the masonry in between the windows, the effect is created of pillars supporting the ceiling (Figure 29). Binski has also drawn parallels between Paul's description of Christ as the "cornerstone", and the *Agnus Dei* keystone in the eastern crossing vault at Canterbury Cathedral,¹²² raising further parallels with the central boss in the chapter house (Figure 14a).¹²³ Here such theological comparisons will be extended to explain some of the anomalies and coincidences in the glazing scheme.

One possible explanation relates to the imperative to live in *imitatio Christi*. The specific Christological reputation of Katherine has already been examined, but that it was central to the cult of saints and their hagiographies has been investigated by Norton in the context of the miracles of William at York,¹²⁴ and by Koopmans in connection with Thomas Becket.¹²⁵ It was fundamental to the Franciscan concept of a holy existence, emanating from the Pauline notion that involved "the wilful renunciation of this world as a prerequisite for any true *imitatio Christi*",¹²⁶ and thus had traditionally focused on the *vita passiva* of virgins and monastic orders rather than on the *vita activa* of the secular Church.¹²⁷ Thomas Aquinas, however, wrote that "religious

¹²² "Angulari lapide", Eph. 2:20, *Latin Vulgate Bible*.

¹²³ Binski, *Becket's Crown*, 10-11.

¹²⁴ Norton, *William*, 179-89 and 191.

¹²⁵ Rachel Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate: Miracle Stories and Miracle Collecting in High Medieval England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), *passim*.

¹²⁶ 1 Thess. 1:6. See Kenneth Baxter Wolf, *The Poverty of Riches: St Francis of Assisi Reconsidered* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 42.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 48-53.

perfection consists especially in the imitation of Christ” as a general encouragement to live a holy life,¹²⁸ a concept which also had its roots in Paul’s epistles.¹²⁹

While this suggestion clearly accounts for the emphases that have been identified within the narratives, it is possible that further, more esoteric, theological explanations can illuminate the varying emphases across the different windows.

Visually, through the binding effect of the band windows encircling the building, the chapter house windows can be seen as demonstrating the unity of the Church, reinforcing Paul’s conviction that the Christian community was “one body in Christ”.¹³⁰ The idea had received momentum through the decisions of Papal Councils, such as Lateran IV,¹³¹ and has been described by Dunn as “the dominant theological image in Pauline ecclesiology”.¹³² Paul maintained that, as Christ was the head of the body of the Church, so, too, were the Church’s members its actual body,¹³³ those of the past as well as the present.¹³⁴ Saints were in community with each other, sharing the same blessings,¹³⁵ and all partaking in the same corporate life.¹³⁶ Gregory of Tours had earlier re-phrased this to emphasise that one should talk of a singular “life” of the saints, in order to stress that a religious existence was one part of a collective whole.¹³⁷ This

¹²⁸ “[...] perfectio religionis maxime consistit in imitatio Christi” in *Summa Theologiae*, 47, ed. and trans. Jordan Aumann (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1970), 118 and 119.

¹²⁹ Eph. 5:1.

¹³⁰ “Unum corpus sumus in Christo,” Rom. 12:5, *Latin Vulgate Bible*.

¹³¹ *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, no.7, 237; no. 14, 242, no. 31, 249.

¹³² James D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 548.

¹³³ “Singuli autem alter alterius membra,” Rom. 12:15, *Latin Vulgate Bible*.

¹³⁴ “Non ei qui ex lege est solum sed et ei qui ex fide est Abrahae qui est pater omnium nostrum,” Eph. 4:16, *Latin Vulgate Bible*.

¹³⁵ “Etenim in uno Spiritu omnes nos in unum corpus baptizati sumus sive Iudaei sive gentiles sive servi sive liberi et omnes unum Spiritum potati sumus,” 1 Cor. 12:13, *Latin Vulgate Bible*.

¹³⁶ “Ex quo totum corpus compactum et conexum per omnem iuncturam,” Eph. 4:16, *Latin Vulgate Bible*.

¹³⁷ Saint Gregory, *Life of the Fathers*, trans. Edward James (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1985), 6 and 28. The singular form of the title demonstrates the importance of this theme, namely “*Vita Patrum*”. The implications of Gregory’s analysis are discussed in Cynthia

concept continued to be invoked, with Aquinas arguing that “the good of Christ is communicated to everyone, just as the moral value of the head is to all members [of the body]”.¹³⁸

However, a corollary to Paul’s emphasis on the unity of the Church was his sense of the importance of individual contributions, in what Whiteley has described as “mutual functional dependence”.¹³⁹ The theological source lies in Paul’s pronouncements on Church unity, as in his first Epistle to the Corinthians:

For as the body is one and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body: So also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free: and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink.

For the body also is not one member, but many.¹⁴⁰

The implications were explored further in his letter to the Romans:

For as in one body we have many members, but all the members have not the same office: So we, being many, are one body in Christ; and every one members one of another: And having different gifts, according to the grace that is given us, either prophecy, to be used according to the rule of faith; Or ministry, in ministering; or he that teacheth, in doctrine; He that

Hahn, *Portrayed on the Heart: Narrative Effect in Pictorial Lives of Saints from the Tenth through the Thirteenth Century* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001), 34-35. My attention was drawn to Gregory’s *Life* by Morgan, “Catherine,” 170.

¹³⁸ Thomas Aquinas, *Expositio in Symbolum Apostolorum*, Article 10, “Bonum ergo Christi communicatur omnibus Christianis, sicut virtus capitis omnibus membris.”

<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/Creed.htm#10>.

¹³⁹ Denys E.H.Whiteley, *The Theology of St Paul* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964), 191.

¹⁴⁰ 1 Cor. 12:12. “Sicut enim corpus unum est et membra habet multa omnia autem membra corporis cum sint multa unum corpus sunt ita et Christus. Etenim in uno Spiritu omnes nos in unum corpus baptizati sumus sive Iudaei sive gentiles sive servi sive liberi et omnes unum Spiritum potati sumus. Nam et corpus non est unum membrum sed multa,” *Latin Vulgate Bible*, <http://www.latinvulgate.com/lv/logreg.aspx>.

exhorteth, in exhorting; he that giveth, with simplicity; he that ruleth, with carefulness; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.¹⁴¹

In his epistle to the Ephesians, he stated that this variety of contribution demonstrated how Christ had given individual gifts to humans: “[...] he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors”,¹⁴² thereby indicating both unity and diversity among the members of the early Church.¹⁴³ It is arguable that this diversity of contribution, apparent in the variety of emphases in the chapter house narratives, may have been deliberately intended to resonate with a pretence of the unity of Chapter as well as the Church itself.

Finally, it is also possible to extend consideration of the coincidences and anomalies to a third theological thread, namely to the different ways of perceiving salvation or even sanctity in the medieval Church, particularly concerning the way the narratives commence and culminate. In particular, it is plausible that the structures may have been obvious to contemporary intellectuals as being linked to theories concerning God’s foreknowledge.

Ideas concerning predestination and divine foreknowledge had initially been raised by Paul,¹⁴⁴ subsequently developed by Augustine¹⁴⁵ and Thomas

¹⁴¹ Rom. 12: 4-8. “Sicut enim in uno corpore multa membra habemus, omnia autem membra non eundem actum habent: ita multi unum corpus sumus in Christo, singuli autem alter alterius membra. Habentes autem donationes secundum gratiam, quae data est nobis, differentes: sive prophetiam secundum rationem fidei, sive ministerium in ministrando, sive qui docet in doctrina, qui exhortatur in exhortando, qui tribuit in simplicitate, qui praeest in sollicitudine, qui miseretur in hilaritate,” *Latin Vulgate Bible*.

¹⁴² Eph. 4:11 “Et ipse dedit quosdam apostolos quosdam autem prophetas alios vero evangelistas alios autem pastores et doctores,” *Latin Vulgate Bible*.

¹⁴³ Dunn, *Theology*, 535.

¹⁴⁴ Rom. 8:29-30, 9:11 and 14-16 and 11:2; Eph. 1:3-6, described by Whiteley as “the [...] great passages upon which the Christian doctrine of Predestination has been founded,” Whiteley, *Paul*, 93.

¹⁴⁵ Augustine, *The Enchiridion on Faith, Hope and Love*, ed. Henry Paolucci (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1987), 36. Chapter 30: “men are not saved by good works, nor by the free determination of their own will, but by the Grace of God through Faith”, (“Non meritis, nec libero arbitrio reparari homines, sed gratia,” in Augustine, *Enchiridion*, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jacques Paul Migne, in *Library of Latin Texts, Series A*, Turnout: Brepolis’ Publishers Online, n.d., <http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/all/fulltext?ACTION=byid&warn=N&id=Z40005>

Aquinas.¹⁴⁶ By the end of the thirteenth century, it was well established that God was all-knowing and so could foresee the decisions made by human beings, whether sinners or saints. That the saved would be saved was foreknown by God and they were granted efficacious grace to ensure their triumph at the time of the Last Judgement and their everlasting glory.¹⁴⁷ To achieve this, it was pre-ordained that they would follow the example set by Christ, who, arguably, took a significant step towards his Passion and Resurrection when he entered Jerusalem. Sinners on the other hand, those who were not chosen, were merely granted sufficient grace to enable them to pursue the path of salvation: if they failed the fault was theirs, not God's. Hence "God is responsible for man's salvation; and man is responsible for his damnation".¹⁴⁸

The opening scene in every main narrative in the chapter house, therefore, shows the subject exercising God's gift of free will at a point of no return, thereby demonstrating their fulfilment of God's foreknowledge on a key occasion. This means that narratives of their early lives were irrelevant.

According to this argument, the last panel in each window confirmed the efficacy of final perseverance, thus echoing the words of the Bull of

3061&div=4&FILE=../session/1450201188_14229&DBOFFSET=33836926&ENTRIES=2) and Chapter 98: "predestination to eternal life is wholly of God's free grace," Augustine, *Enchiridion on Faith*, 112. "Deus etsi potest convertere quos voluerit, non tamen inique facit, cum alios convertit, alios non convertit. Originale vinculum damnationis," Augustine, *Enchiridion*.

¹⁴⁶ Summarised in the sentence, "God's knowledge is the cause of things," "Dicendum quod Scientia Dei est causa rerum," in Part I, Question 14, Article 8, Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Vol. 4, ed. and trans. Thomas Gornall (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1964), 30 and 31; see Aquinas's commentary on Paul and Pelagius in Part I, Question 23, Article 5, Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Vol. 15, ed. and trans. M.J.Charlesworth (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1970), 120-129. Thomas Aquinas explored this further in his examination of "whether prophecy only relates to future contingents", in *Summa Theologiae*, Part II-III, Question 171, Article 3, Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Vol. 45, ed. and trans. Roland Potter (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode: 1970),13-16.

¹⁴⁷ Phil. 1:6, Eph.1:5, Rom. 8:30, 9:11 and 17-18; 2 Thess. 2:12; Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Part I, Question 23, Article 5, Vol. 15, 120; summarised in Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Part I-II, Question 109, Article 8, where Aquinas wrote, "Man can avoid individual acts of sin, but not every act, except by grace" or "Ad primum ergo dicendum quod homo potest vitare singulos actus peccati, non tamen omnes, nisi per gratiam, ut dictum est," in Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Vol. 30 ed. and trans. Cornelius Ernst (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1972), 98-99; efficacious grace is discussed in *ibid.*, 224-27, Question 114, Article 9.

¹⁴⁸ John Salza, *The Mystery of Predestination according to Scripture, the Church and St. Thomas Aquinas* (Charlotte, North Carolina: Warren, 2010), 4.

Canonisation of St William of York, where Pope Honorius affirmed that the same “final perseverance” had been demonstrated in the canonisation process.¹⁴⁹

Doubtless, this aspect of the iconography would have reinforced Chapter members, seated in the stalls below the windows, in their belief (or hope) that they, too, demonstrated signs of being among God’s elect, and therefore were themselves predestined to die in a state of grace and triumph.¹⁵⁰ The narrative structures thus reinforce of the fulfilment of God’s original promise to redeem the world and the glory of the sacrifice of individual Christians in its achievement. The way they were sequenced would have provided a means for canons to broadcast this message to discerning non-Chapter members attending in the chapter house as well as reinforcing their own hope or expectation of a positive afterlife.

The reinforcement members of Chapter felt, being surrounded by saints whose sanctity hinted at their own possible destiny, would be particularly enhanced by the fact that one of these saints was one of their long-serving predecessors.¹⁵¹ William had been a Chapter member, serving as archdeacon of the East Riding and treasurer,¹⁵² before his double archiepiscopate (1143-47 and 1153-54),¹⁵³ in an association with the Minster which lasted almost forty-five years. It was during his second consecration feast that he fell ill and died on 8 June 1154.¹⁵⁴ Within twenty-three years, miracles were reported as occurring at his tomb, resulting in Gray’s campaign for his canonisation which was finally confirmed in 1226. Not only would William’s inclusion in the chapter house

¹⁴⁹ “Et sic finalis in bono perseverantia efficaciter suadetur,” *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 128.

¹⁵⁰ Professor Robert Swanson, pers. comm, 13 April 2013.

¹⁵¹ Norton, *William*, 27.

¹⁵² Norton has shown that the negotiations for this joint appointment probably took place in 1108-9, *ibid.*, 10-16.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 77.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 144-45.

serve as confirmation that the canons were collectively directly connected with the group of major saints whom William had joined but also suggest that they too were on course for individual salvation.

It is, therefore, plausible that the selection of scenes and their organisation may have been used, as Hahn suggests, as a means of conveying the significance of the narratives,¹⁵⁵ and, thereby, possibly inspiring an emotional and physical response.¹⁵⁶ In this they substantiate, in visual form, Hahn's conclusion from the texts that *Vitae* did not constitute biographies, but aimed to "reflect the grace of the saint, the holy coronation that the saint receives at death and his admission to the heavenly court".¹⁵⁷

3.2.5 Deliberate or coincidental?

Consideration now turns to the extent to which there may have been a deliberate decision to base so much of the design on the theology of Paul or whether it was a subconscious reflection of prevailing attitudes.

While it has been argued that "in churches [...] art does not relate directly to the written word on the page, but rather to the spoken word, ritual and spaces",¹⁵⁸ it would be wrong to assume automatically that a similar situation applied in the private spaces reserved for Chapter, especially given the theological momentum that had emerged during the thirteenth century and its increasing focus in a university context.¹⁵⁹ Admittedly most members of Chapter were non-resident and most probably never visited York, but the prevailing culture was of a high educational standard. This study of canons who were

¹⁵⁵ Hahn, *Portrayed*, 46-47.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 87.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 30.

¹⁵⁸ Ayers, *Merton College*, Part 1, xcvi.

¹⁵⁹ Gordon Leff, *Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (New York: Wiley, 1968), *passim*.

members of Chapter between 1250 and 1300 shows that some were Italian, including eleven members of the Orsini/Caetani, Colonna and Conti families; one was a Grandisono and hence was probably of the Savoyard family that was close to Edward I and related to his mother, and another was Spanish, James of Spain, a nephew of Eleanor of Castile. With the exception of the highly-educated James, it has not been possible to establish the respective educational levels of the others. The names of the remaining 146 are French, Anglo-Norman or Anglicised, of whom one hundred have been traced to the universities at Oxford or Cambridge. Of these, a minimum of thirteen were doctors in one or more of theology, canon or civil law;¹⁶⁰ William de Corner and Robert de Pickering were professors of both canon and civil Law at Oxford,¹⁶¹ while John Romeyn was professor of theology at Paris.¹⁶² The majority, and probably the overwhelming majority, therefore, was educated to at least the first university level. Hence, it is plausible that key members of the late thirteenth-century Chapter would have been well aware of Paul's specific contribution to Christian doctrine. What needs to be explored here, therefore, is whether he might have been deliberately honoured in the chapter house because of the role he had played in the evolution of the theology which appears to underpin its design.

Peter and Paul are traditionally associated, the connections between them inevitable because of their role in the foundation of the early Church.¹⁶³

¹⁶⁰ Adam de Belstede, Sewal de Boville, Thomas de Cantilupe, Thomas de Corbridge, William de Corner, John de Craucumbe, William de Greenfield, Roger Marmion, Roger de Pickering, William de Pickering, Robert de Ripplingham, John Romeyn the Younger and Thomas de Wakefelde

¹⁶¹ Court of Chancery, *Calendar of Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward I, 1272-81*, 1 (London: HMSO, 1893-91), 94; *Wickwane*, 175.

¹⁶² David M. Smith, "Romeyn, John. Archbishop of York," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/24042?docPos=2>.

¹⁶³ See for example the images in Sta. Cecilia, S. Clemente, SS Cosma e Damiano, S. Lorenzo fuori le mura, S. Lorenzo in Lucina, Sta. Maria Maggiore, Sta. Maria in Trastevere, Sta. Passera, S. Pellegrino in Naumachia, Sta. Prassede, S. Pudenziana and S. Teodoro (John

Peter, in turn, was the Minster's patron saint. This may explain Paul's inclusion and location in the Chapter House, however, in contemporary representations, Paul is usually allocated a small part of a life of Peter in window design.¹⁶⁴

Emphasis is often placed on their apocryphal meeting in Rome: in the tenth-century Monreale mosaics they rush to greet each other,¹⁶⁵ as they do in the thirteenth-century fresco at San Paolo *fuori le mura*, possibly based on the fourth-century original.¹⁶⁶ In glass, the episode features in Bay 14:7a in Rouen, in Bay 103:1e and 1g in Le Mans, and in Bay 221:1e in St-Père, Chartres.¹⁶⁷ Only occasionally, as in the cathedrals at Chartres, Le Mans and, possibly, Metz, is Paul shown in a window devoted to himself alone.¹⁶⁸

However, in the chapter house, there is little indication of a sense of Peter and Paul's joint enterprise beyond the fact that their windows are adjacent. There is only a single reference to each in the other's window, neither including the generally established scenes of their co-operation. CHs2:38 shows Paul with Peter at the initial dispute with Simon Magus, whereafter he disappears from Peter's chapter house story.¹⁶⁹ Nor is Paul shown at the final hearing when the martyrdoms were jointly ordered (Peter's appearance before

Osborne and Amanda Claridge, *The Paper Museum of Cassiano del Pozzo*, Part 2, Vol. 1 (London: Harvey Miller, 1998), 79 and 81, 83, 95, 121, 190, 207, 250, 269, 276, 306, 308 and 322); Ruth Wilkins Sullivan, "Saints Peter and Paul: Some ironic aspects of their imaging," *Art History*, 17 (1994): 68-73; Huskinson, *Concordia*, 5-77.

¹⁶⁴ *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedrals of Bourges, Bay 9:3b, Auxerre, Bay 7, Poitiers, Bay 2:1b and Tours, Bay 203:3b. Paul is allocated slightly more importance in the churches of St-Père, Chartres, Bay 221:1e, 2a-c, 2d-e and 6d-e and at St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 1:3d, 4c, 5d and 6d.

¹⁶⁵ Herbert Kessler, "The meeting of Peter and Paul in Rome: an emblematic narrative of spiritual brotherhood," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 41 (1987): 265.

¹⁶⁶ Waetzoldt, *Kopien*, fig. 407.

¹⁶⁷ *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedrals of Rouen and Le Mans, the Abbey Church in Chartres.

¹⁶⁸ *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedrals of Chartres, Bay 4; Rouen, Bay 14, shows Peter as a part of the life of Paul and Le Mans, Bay 103, has the Life of Paul associated with the Life of Christ. Metz Cathedral has the remains of what may have been a window devoted solely to Paul.

¹⁶⁹ Volume 2, 869.

Nero or Agrippa in CHs2:39).¹⁷⁰ On the other hand, CHs3:17 (the only occasion when Peter is shown in CHs3) presents the two meeting in Jerusalem, after Paul's escape from Damascus.¹⁷¹ That this scene of their encounter has been included rather than the more traditional one of their meeting in Rome is particularly intriguing, given that what is shown is the so-called Council of Jerusalem, when Paul and Peter disagreed about the relations between Jews and Gentiles in the direction the Church should take.¹⁷² By separating Peter and Paul, each Life becomes more distinct and the different emphases within their cult are highlighted. Certainly in the chapter house Paul is, unusually for the thirteenth century, presented as a major figure in his own right, rather than a visual adjunct to Peter.

An additional example of an emphasis on Paul can be seen in CHn2. Paul's association with the death of the Virgin Mary was tenuously based on an addition in a single text of Pseudo-Melito which described Paul's improbable inclusion among the Apostles who were carried to her deathbed.¹⁷³ Three panels appear to show a bald figure among the Apostles, namely CHn2:38 (her deathbed), CHn2:37 (the rear front figure carrying her bier) and CHn2:29 (a possible link panel where of the two main figures, one is looking upwards and a third possible bald figure is gazing downwards as though into her grave).¹⁷⁴ Unfortunately, the glass in the visual affiliates in Appendix C is too indistinct to detect a similar pattern elsewhere.

Further, if the sculptural context of the building is considered, Paul is singled out even more than Peter by sight lines. The lack of a central pillar

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 875.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 919.

¹⁷² Gal. 2 and, especially, Gal. 5. O'Reilly has commented on Bede's studied ambivalence about the divisive events at the Council of Jerusalem, Bede, *On the Temple*, translated by Seán Connolly (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995), xliii..

¹⁷³ James, *Apocryphal*, 211-2.

¹⁷⁴ Volume 2, 559, 551 and 533.

created a space within which the unusual form of the *Agnus Dei* boss (as mentioned in Chapter 1) could be inserted at the centre of the ceiling, becoming its main focal point, as the symbol of Christ's sacrifice and hence of salvation. The boss is manifestly of great significance: not only is it central in the dome of the ceiling (Figure 14a), but the structure of the stalls has been designed in such a way that it can always be seen between carved pendants by everyone seated in the canons' stalls around the perimeter.¹⁷⁵ The entrant to the chapter house would have processed along the vestibule, its own similarly presented *Agnus Dei* boss indicating the sweep of the corner towards the main chapter house doors (Figure 14b). Because the bosses were keyed into the ribs, the assumption is that they have not been moved in the intervening centuries,¹⁷⁶ in which case the rump of the chapter house Lamb is presented to the true east (as opposed to the chapter house east),¹⁷⁷ its head turned to face the Passion in the Passion and Resurrection window.¹⁷⁸

Nevertheless, given the horizontal orientation of the image on the boss, the Lamb could not be viewed equally well by the canons under all the windows. The most privileged location in this respect was from CHs3, because only from here can it be seen the right way up. That the view of the canons when sitting in the stalls was a factor when determining the decoration of the chapter house can be further presumed from the fact that almost all the twenty-four foliated faces at the end of the pendants of the stalls present themselves towards the

¹⁷⁵ I am grateful to Izzy Armstrong-Frost, then a fellow PhD student at the University of York, for this observation, pers. comm., 13 October 2012.

¹⁷⁶ I am grateful to John David, Master Mason at York Minster, pers. comm., 14 November 2013, for confirming this probability. There is no evidence that Willement was involved in any re-carving of the boss in 1845.

¹⁷⁷ As discussed in Chapter 4.

¹⁷⁸ Halfpenny, *Gothic ornaments*, Pl. 102 shows the central boss in a south/north orientation and has misrepresented the figure of the Lamb, not indicating his backward glance.

occupants.¹⁷⁹ It is therefore not impossible that the choice of Paul for the space in CHs3 may have been important because of the *Agnus Dei* sightlines, thereby establishing Paul's status among the chapter house saints,¹⁸⁰ and possibly, given the stress on Paul as a teacher, consciously reinforcing his role as the prime theologian of the Church.

What is suggested here, therefore, is that the organisation of the narratives in the windows not only reflects Church unity, the contribution of individuals to its mission and issues concerning Divine foreknowledge, but that these have been consciously included as emanating from the theology of Paul.

3.3 Liturgical influences

If theological concerns of Chapter can be detected in the way the narratives were structured, it is also possible to identify liturgical influences in the way individual scenes are presented. This can also be seen in other media, such as sculpture and architecture,¹⁸¹ and wall paintings elsewhere.¹⁸²

The emphasis on Paul as a teacher, and William as a miracle worker in the liturgy and in their respective windows has already been examined. Slocum

¹⁷⁹ Ten examples of the same types of faces, popularly known as "green men", can also be seen in the wall bosses bordering the route to the chapter house, along the vestibule walls. Were research to be conducted into this phenomenon, it would be valuable if associations with the Virgin Mary could be examined, given that elsewhere, in Exeter Cathedral for example, they are particularly linked to her cult. Thirty-four of the sixty-two such carvings in the Minster are to be found in the chapter house complex, John Anderson, *Minster Guide*, pers. comm., 23 November 2015. Norton has shown the significance of sight lines between the south entrance and the tomb of St William in the rebuilt nave in York Minster, lecture "The Cult of St William in York Minster" at the annual conference of the British Archaeological Association at York, 22 July 2017, while Michelle Sticht observed the sight lines between the later Greenfield window in s29 and the original location of the chapel of St Nicholas, pers. comm., 24 July 2017.

¹⁸⁰ There is some evidence from monasteries that there were distinctions of importance between different seats. If a monk had been punished and re-admitted to the chapter house, for example, he could be demoted to a "lesser seat", W.S.Gardner, "The Role of Central Planning in English Romanesque Chapter House Design," PhD Dissertation, Princeton University, 1976, 181. Karl Schuler, "Chapterhouse Decoration before 1250," *Arte Medievale*, 11 (1997): 93 describes monastic superiors as sitting at the east of chapter houses.

¹⁸¹ Malone, *Façade*, 131-189.

¹⁸² Matthew M. Reeve, *Thirteenth-Century Wall Painting of Salisbury Cathedral: Art, Liturgy and Reform* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2008), 79-104.

has shown that the York liturgy for Thomas Becket, unusually, emphasised the narratives of his life as opposed to the miracles after his death,¹⁸³ and this reflects what was shown in the central light of CHs4. It has already been argued that Katherine was presented as a figure of faith as opposed to one of learning, and Chapter 4 will consider the way she is presented as a virgin,¹⁸⁴ together with Margaret in the same role.¹⁸⁵ Inevitably, these attributes reflect the way the saints in question were venerated, and so it is not unexpected that, to varying degrees, the windows reflect the same emphases. However, there are two issues in which the influence of, or association with, the liturgy are more specifically marked. These concern central aspects of the doctrine of the Assumption of the Virgin and the construction of the narrative of St Peter.

3.3.1 *The Narrative of Peter*

One of the most problematic reconstructions to explain is that of Peter (CHs2) (Figure 26e). Episodes from the different sources for his life are distributed across the window, taking broad account of the obvious biblical sequencing in which the Gospels, in this case that of Matthew, revealed the first part of the chronology, followed by Acts of the Apostles providing information about Peter's activities after Christ's Resurrection and the Acts of Peter covering his final period in Rome. Within this framework, however, there are numerous anomalies, which are ultimately explained by the evolving influence of his liturgical role.

The liturgical influences are most visible in rows 6 and 8. The contents of the former showed Peter as a priest, the only saint in the chapter house in

¹⁸³ Kay Brainerd Slocum, *Liturgies in Honour of Thomas Becket* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 227.

¹⁸⁴ *Manuale*, 204 and 206; *Breviarium*, 75, cols. 719, 720, 721, 723, 726.

¹⁸⁵ *Breviarium*, cols. 75, 392, 393, 394.

ecclesiastical vestments, hence a mediator with the divine in that this was the only office which could enact transubstantiation,¹⁸⁶ and demonstrating a significant stage in the evolution of his liturgical status. This row combined two events: the first was the baptism of the centurion, Cornelius, the inclusion of which is notable because by the late thirteenth century it was extremely rare in Petrine narratives (see the discussion in Appendix C, CHs2:36 and 37).¹⁸⁷ The second sequence showed three scenes of Peter's dealings with Simon Magus in Rome, out of place in a strict chronological account when considered alongside row 8, which only had two panels set in Rome (Peter appearing before Nero or Agrippa in CHs2:39 in 8d and the martyrdom scenes in CHs2:40 in 8e).¹⁸⁸

However, the two sequences, Cornelius and Simon Magus, supply the terminology which dominates the Petrine liturgy. In particular, the language appears in the *Sanctorale* of the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul more so even than the martyrdom itself, the event which gave rise to the Feast,¹⁸⁹ even though they did not give rise to feast days in their own right. The importance of the Simon Magus sequence is seen not only in the textual versions of Peter's life, but also in its wide and extensive depiction in glazing schemes elsewhere. The liturgy for the procession on the Feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul gave more prominence to the angel's appearance to Cornelius than any other scene associated with Peter. The ritual exchange for the Feast, repeated on several occasions, is "Cornelius, a centurion, a religious man, and fearful of God, saw

¹⁸⁶ Included in the first Constitution of Lateran IV, "On the Christian Faith", *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 230.

¹⁸⁷ Volume 2, 857 and 863.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 875 and 879.

¹⁸⁹ *Breviarium*, cols. 349-353.

an angel of God, who told him, 'Cornelius, send for Simon, who is known as Peter; he shall tell thee what thou must do'".¹⁹⁰

The selection of panels for row 8 is the most unusual, given that CHs2:6 (a rare depiction of Christ's *in vita* description of Peter as the rock, based on Matthew 16, before his final Entry into Jerusalem) was in 8a,¹⁹¹ followed by Peter's escape from prison in Judaea and the angel conducting him back to the city before he left for Rome, from Acts 12 (CHs2:29 and 28 in 8b and 8c).¹⁹² The culmination of the row is the more expected (and chronologically accurate) trial in Rome in CHs2:39 and his martyrdom in CHs2:40 from the Acts of Peter XXXII (8d and 8e).¹⁹³ Like the panels in row 6, CHs2:6 (in 8a) does not give rise directly to a feast,¹⁹⁴ but its connection with the liturgy followed at York is evident in the constant refrain, "You are Peter, and upon this rock", which is the basis of the second part of the processional for the Feast of the Martyrdom of Peter and Paul, and is used frequently in the York Missal,¹⁹⁵ and also pervades the Processional for the Feast of St Peter's Chains (*Vincula Sancti Petri*). The liturgy here opens with reference to Christ's power of binding and freeing, but continues, "Peter said, 'You are Christ, the son of the living God'. In reply, the Lord said, 'I say unto you, you are Peter and upon this rock I shall build my church'".¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁰ *Manuale*, 197, "Cornelius centurio, vir religiosus ac times Deum vidit manifeste angelum Dei dicentem sibi: Corneli, mitte et accursi Simonem qui cognominatur Petrus; hic dicet tibi, Quid te oporteat facere".

¹⁹¹ Volume 2, 773.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 849 and 835.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 875 and 879.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 773.

¹⁹⁵ "Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram," *Manuale*, 197. See also *Missale*, 73 and further examples in Appendix C, CHs2:6 (Volume 2, 773).

¹⁹⁶ "Tu es, inquit Petrus, Christus Filius Dei vivi. Respondens Dominus ait, Et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam," *Missale*, 198. It also features in the Sanctorale for the Feasts of St Peter's Chair, St Peter in Chains and Sts Peter and Paul, *Breviarium*, cols. 201, 434 and 345 and 46 respectively.

The feasts themselves are marked in the following four panels. Of special significance is the fact that the right-hand figure in CHs2:28 is clearly the angel in Judaea leading Peter to the city,¹⁹⁷ which means that the image does not depict what would be the more canonically appropriate *Quo Vadis* episode when Christ met Peter and led him back to Rome to meet his fate.¹⁹⁸ Instead it shows the incidents which gave rise to the Feast of St Peter's Chains, which took place in Jerusalem. The emphasis is thus on the event as giving rise to a feast day rather than as an element in his Life. The final pair of panels, CHs2:39 and 40,¹⁹⁹ directly represented the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul (albeit without Paul), showing Peter's appearance before Nero or Agrippa and his martyrdom. The effect on the design of the window renders the emphasis of the final four panels along the top row as being on the significant liturgical themes which relate to Peter's main feasts, while the remainder in rows 6 and 8 stress their terminology.

It is not clear whether there is a similar treatment of Peter in glazing schemes elsewhere. Scenes giving rise to the two main feast days, of his martyrdom and him in chains, appear in numerous French cathedrals and churches,²⁰⁰ It is expected that the martyrdom would appear as a culmination in these windows, but it is notable that only St-Julien-du-Sault resembles York in that both the angel freeing Peter and leading him into the City are shown. It is generally difficult to ascertain the narrative constructions in the other cathedrals to determine if a similar emphasis is being placed on the liturgy as opposed to the chronology of Peter's life. The reasons for the distinctive treatment of the

¹⁹⁷ Volume 2, 839.

¹⁹⁸ Acts of Peter, XXXV. James, *Apocryphal*, 333.

¹⁹⁹ Volume 2, 875 and 879.

²⁰⁰ *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedrals at Angers, Bay 107; Auxerre, Bay 7; Bourges, Bay 9; Tours, Bay 203 and possibly Bay 7. See also the churches at St-Père, Chartres, Bay 221; Semur-en-Auxois, Bay 4 and St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 1.

Peter window in York, however, are straightforward. The Dean and Chapter doubtless saw themselves as the guardians of liturgical practices in York, above all identified with Peter, the patron saint of the Minster. They would have wished the Minster to be associated with the Church Triumphant and possibly the Papacy that Peter represented, through the way Peter was presented as powerful because of his personal selection by Christ. This may have been the way they wished to perceive themselves and be perceived by those distinguished laymen and other ecclesiastics who were admitted to the chapter house, and may reflect Chapter's possessiveness of the liturgy in their relations with the archbishop himself.

3.3.2 *The Assumption of the Virgin Mary*

Specific iconography relating to the Virgin is discussed further in Chapter 4; here, the aim is to consider the impact of the liturgy on the way her death is presented in CHn2. At the core of this argument is the medieval divergence between the liturgical and visual sources for the end of the Virgin's earthly life (Figure 26b).

Images of the Assumption of the Virgin usually illustrated her standing in a mandorla being elevated bodily to heaven,²⁰¹ an event which was omitted from the chapter house. At first sight, this appears to be the subject of CHn2:40,²⁰² which shows a central figure with a female head figure contained within a mandorla. However, the restoration history reveals that Torre saw the

²⁰¹ *Online Archive*, "French sites." These include the cathedrals at Angers, Bay 123:5; Chartres, Bays 42:7b and 127:3; Coutances, Bay 202:2; Le Mans, Bays 104:3a, 105:5d and 110:2b; St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 6; St-Urbain, Troyes, Bay 6:4b and Troyes Cathedral, Bay 201:3a. In England, the image can be seen at Beckley and North Moreton, s2, *Online Archive*, "English sites".

²⁰² Volume 2, 571..

central figure as a man,²⁰³ while Browne described him as Jesus.²⁰⁴ From the descriptions by Knowles it is apparent that, by the end of the nineteenth century, the face had been damaged and removed, but the cruciform halo was visible.²⁰⁵ The current female head was inserted by Milner White. This means the loss of the glass of the face is likely to have occurred in the Noton repairs of the 1850s,²⁰⁶ or those of Robinson in the 1880s.²⁰⁷ We are aware that Sydney Smirke saw Noton as nothing more than a jobbing glazier,²⁰⁸ and from the accounts submitted by Robinson, most of the work involved leading carried out by a solitary apprentice. On neither occasion is it likely that a cruciform halo was intruded into the panel in order to create a Christ-like figure, so it is probable that the halo had been present when Browne described the glass, contributing to his identification of it as Jesus.²⁰⁹ The lead line on the 1930s photograph appears to show the outline of a bearded male head, turning upwards to his left, and also shows a cruciform halo. Further, the shape in the arms contains remains of original white glass, indicating the soul of the Virgin. It is also noticeable that, in so far as the glass survives, there are no depictions of women in the chapter house with their feet visible. Here their lead outline is very clear.²¹⁰ The result is that, despite Milner White's best efforts, this panel did not originally show the Corporal Assumption of the Virgin.

²⁰³ YMA L1/7, Torre, 125.

²⁰⁴ Browne, *Representation*, 49.

²⁰⁵ Knowles, "Historical Notes," fol.166v; Knowles, "Manuscript Notes," fol.72r.

²⁰⁶ *Gazette*, 1855, 3; Knowles, "Manuscript Notes," fol.107v; YMA Hornby Scrapbook, 320; YMA E/4e Fabric Accounts, 1826-65: 287-99; YMA E3/220V Fabric Rolls, 1855/56 (account of William Noton). See Appendix A:11 (Volume 2, 17).

²⁰⁷ YMA E3/248V and E3/ Fabric Rolls, 1883 and 1886 (Two accounts of Joseph Robinson, relating to 1882 and 1885). See Appendix A:12 (Volume 2, 18).

²⁰⁸ YMA B.3.4.73 Bankers' Book (Letter slipped inside the book). See Appendix A:9 (Volume 2, 13-14).

²⁰⁹ Browne, *Representation*, 49.

²¹⁰ *Online Archive*, "French sites," the image of Christ holding a small figure can be seen in the cathedrals at Chartres, Bay 42:5b; at St-Quentin, Bay 2:6b; at Strasbourg, Bay 12: tracery and at Troyes, Bay 201:2b. See also St-Père, Chartres, Bay 218:5a-c. In the cathedral at Amiens, Bay 21:6a, Christ is shown, as in York, holding the Virgin Mary inside a mandorla.

The only alternative depiction of the Assumption is CHn2:28,²¹¹ but this shows a small shape being carried to heaven by angels. This was the normal way of representing a soul rather than a body and resonates with the removal of a similarly small shape, apparently representing Katherine's soul, in CHn4:40. Like the Virgin, contemporary representations normally show Katherine's body being moved to Sinai, but it would appear that both chapter house panels ignore these explanations. Thus, unlike any comparator that has been identified, the Virgin's Corporal Assumption has been omitted from the Chapter House glazing.

The main difficulty in the presentation of Mary's death and its aftermath concerned the way the liturgy for her Assumption had evolved. The lack of relics posed a dilemma for the early Church, solved in the East by an explanation that she fell asleep and was corporally assumed. These eastern traditions, as described in the Apocryphal Gospels, were incorporated without controversy into their liturgy for the Feast of the Assumption and were associated with the visual representation emphasising her dormition. However, the experience of the West was not as straightforward. Augustine, for example, generally (though not always) seems to have assumed that Mary died. He writes, in *De catechizandis rudibus*, that she was "born of a mother who, although she conceived without being touched by man [...] always remained thus untouched, in virginity conceiving, in virginity bringing forth, in virginity dying".²¹² In his *In Psalmum XXXIV Enarratio*, he states: "Mary who was of Adam died for sin,

²¹¹ Volume 2, 525.

²¹² Augustine, "On the Catechising of the Uninstructed," 22.40 in Philip Schaff, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, III, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1980), 307. "Natus enim de matre quae quamvis a viro intacta conceperit, semperque intacta permanserit, virgo concipiens, virgo pariens, virgo moriens," Augustine, *De catechizandis rudibus*, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jacques Paul Migne, in *Library of Latin Texts, Series A*. Turnout: Brepolis' Publishers Online, n.d., http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/all/fulltext?action=byid&warn=N&id=Z300053220&div=3&sequence=1&file=../session/1449406307_28965).

Adam died for sin, and the Flesh of the Lord which was of Mary died to put away sin".²¹³ Most early western commentators on the events of Mary's death and funeral were equally restrained. Gregory of Tours, for example, in *De Gloria Martyrum*, was notably terse on the subject.²¹⁴

When the Assumption was gradually adopted in the western Church calendar between the seventh and early eleventh centuries,²¹⁵ a difficulty emerged in identifying a reliable source for the liturgy. The solution was to draw mainly on the *Cantica Canticorum* attributed to Solomon, first proposed in the ninth-century sermon *Cogitis Me* by Paschasius Radbertus, but attributed in error by the medieval church to Jerome.²¹⁶ That the text he produced, based on the *Cantica Canticorum*, eventually formed the basis of the York Office can be seen from a comparison between *Cogitis Me* and the responsories and antiphons chanted at York. Indeed, the entire text of *Cogitis Me* appears to have been included verbatim, described as a reading of "St Jerome".²¹⁷ The difficulty Radbertus faced was that, when designing an appropriate liturgy, he could not ignore this most sensitive aspect of the Assumption narrative. He did not deny the fact of Corporal Assumption but he urged caution against accepting doubtful

²¹³ Schaff, *Nicene Fathers*, 83, "Etenim ut celerius dicani, Maria ex Adam mortua propter peccatum, Adam mortuus propter peccatum et caro Domini ex Maria mortua est propter delenda peccata". See also Augustine, *In Psalmum XXXIV Enarratio*, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jacques Paul Migne, in *Library of Latin Texts, Series A*. Turnout: Brepolis' Publishers Online, n.d., http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/all/fulltext?ALL=Y&action=byid&warn=N&id=Z400058328&div=4&file=../session/1449408035_3834&ENTRIES=1&CURDB=pld#Hit1.

²¹⁴ Translated in Saint Gregory, Bishop of Tours. *Glory of the Martyrs*, trans. Raymond van Dam (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press), 21-22.

²¹⁵ Clayton, *Cult*, 29. However, its adoption was left to local choice, Fassler, *Virgin*, 100-101. In this respect, the late tenth and early eleventh centuries constituted "crucial periods for the formation and the standardization of the Divine Office," Fassler, *Virgin*, 107.

²¹⁶ Rachel Fulton, "Quae est ista quae ascendit sicut aurora consurgens? the Song of Songs as the Historia for the Office of the Assumption," *Medieval Studies*, 60 (1998): 91-118. Clayton, *Cult*, 12 has claimed that it was Ambrose who first applied the *Cantica Canticorum* to the Virgin, as opposed to the Church itself. This can be seen in Chapters 5, 7, 8 and 9 of *On Virginity*, Ambrose. *De Virginibus*, in *Patrologia Latina*, edited by Jacques Paul Migne. In *Library of Latin Texts, Series A*. Turnhout: Brepolis' Publishers Online, 2014. <http://clt.brepolis.net.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/lita/pages/Results.aspx?qry=c321ba3b-e85c-4239-bc97-ae0d547057b3&per=0>.

²¹⁷ Margot Fassler, "Mary's Nativity, Fulbert of Chartres and the Stirps Jesse: Liturgical Innovation circa 1000 and Its Afterlife," *Speculum*, 75, No.2 (2000): 401 compared with *Breviarium*, cols. 476-503.

sources as providing certainties.²¹⁸ This was expressed in *Cogitis Me* as, “I have said, because many of our people are in doubt whether she was assumed with her body or left the body”,²¹⁹ a phrase which appeared, almost verbatim, in the York Office.²²⁰ The second reading in the Use of York was from Bede,²²¹ who was equally ambivalent about the fate of Mary’s corpse.²²²

This caution continued to prevail in some of the literature: the extent of the controversy can be seen in the fact that, in the early thirteenth century, Innocent IV was to announce the issue of the fate of the Virgin to be an “open question”, so that believers could make up their own mind.²²³ Honorius Augustodunensis had reflected this uncertainty, writing that “her body was revived afterwards and *is believed* to have been gathered up into the glory of heaven” [italics added].²²⁴ Bernard of Clairvaux, despite his similarly close sense of affinity with the Virgin Mary, had been “restrained” in his writings on the subject,²²⁵ as was Thomas Aquinas.²²⁶ The main theological obstacle that remained was the issue of Mary’s own conception: if she had a non-divine origin it was difficult to argue that she had escaped the manacle of sin created by the Fall. This issue, highly topical in the late thirteenth century, was not resolved until, in the early fourteenth century, Duns Scotus provided the most convincing

²¹⁸ Fulton, “Quae est,” 90.

²¹⁹ Matter, *Paschastii*, 112-13, “Haec idcirco dixerim, quia multi nostrorum dubitant, utrum assumpta fuerit simul cum corpore an abierit relictor corpore”.

²²⁰ *Breviarium*, col. 481.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, col. 482.

²²² Clayton, *Cult*, 17.

²²³ James H. Stubblebine, “Cimabue’s Frescoes of the Virgin at Assisi,” *Art Bulletin*, 49, no. 4 (1967): 332.

²²⁴ Honorius Augustodunensis, *The Seal of the Blessed Mary*, trans. Amelia Carr (Toronto: Peregrina Publishing, 1991), 87.

²²⁵ Rachel Fulton, “The Virgin Mary and the *Cantica Canticorum* in the High Middle Ages,” PhD Dissertation, Columbia University, 1994, 215.

²²⁶ Pius XII. *Munificentissimus Deus: Defining the Dogma of the Assumption*. Apostolic Constitution, 1950, http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_p-xii_apc_19501101_munificentissimus-deus.html (English version) and http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/la/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_p-xii_apc_19501101_munificentissimus-deus.html (Latin version).

argument to date of her Immaculate Conception,²²⁷ thereby removing the main theological objection to her Corporal Assumption. Only in 1950 was it finally declared to be Church doctrine.²²⁸

However, despite the official ambivalence of the Church, some later commentators had become more confident about the inevitability of her Corporal Assumption, reflecting the intensification of her cult as the virginal Mother of God. The more Mary was venerated for her sanctity and her virginity, the stronger became the case for her Corporal Assumption. At an uncertain date,²²⁹ for example, *De Assumptione Beatae Mariae Virginis*, by Pseudo-Augustine, argued that the body of the mother who bore Christ could not putrefy.²³⁰ In the *Sermones Dominicales et in Solemnitatibus* of St Anthony of Padua (d. 1231), he claimed “you have [...] a clear statement that the Blessed Virgin has been assumed in her body”.²³¹ By the end of the thirteenth century, under the influence of the writings of the strong protagonist, Bonaventure, Head of the Order of Friars Minor and almost archbishop of York in 1265, the balance was swinging even further towards accepting Corporal Assumption: for example, in *De assumptione B. Virginis Mariae*, Bonaventure wrote:

From this we can see that she is there bodily [...] her blessedness would not have been complete unless she were there as a person. The soul is not a person, but the soul, joined to the body, is a person. It is manifest

²²⁷ Brian K. Reynolds, *Gateway to Heaven: Marian Doctrine and Devotion, Image and Typology in the Patristic and Medieval Periods*, Vol. 1: *Doctrine and Devotion* (New York: New City Press, 2012), 329 and 367-369.

²²⁸ Pius XII. *Munificentissimus*.

²²⁹ Fulton, “Virgin Mary,” 195.

²³⁰ Jean-Claude Schmitt, “L’Exception corporelle: à propos de l’Assomption de Marie,” in *The Mind’s Eye: art and theological argument in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Anne-Marie Bouché (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 154.

²³¹ Pius XII. *Munificentissimus*, “per hoc aperte habes — ita ait — quod Beata Virgo in corpore [...] est assumpta”.

that she is there in soul and in body. Otherwise she would not possess her complete beatitude.²³²

Thus the confusing nature of the source material for narrative panels of the Assumption in the late thirteenth century is immediately apparent. Not only did conflicting accounts exist in the Apocryphal Gospels, but the liturgy itself was of no specific help and warned of the need for caution. The *Cantica Canticorum* could not function as a source for a visual narrative as it did not tell a story or provide material for specific scenes. Nor did it refer specifically to the Virgin Mary, as it comprised an allegorical examination of the quality and nature of love. While this had not prevented its being used in the liturgical texts,²³³ the visual image-makers had of necessity to turn to the Apocryphal Gospels, despite the sense of caution among some scholars in the West.²³⁴ A gap had thus developed between the Apocryphal Gospels, used for visual imagery, and the *Cantica Canticorum*, used for church services, as well as a divergence between the official theories of the eastern and western Churches.

Despite the fact that, by the end of the thirteenth century, the idea of the Corporal Assumption had triumphed in much of the literature and in all the visual representations that can be identified, it is especially unusual that the Chapter at York wanted the caution of their liturgy visualised in the way the window was designed. In its reticence about the Corporal Assumption,²³⁵ York

²³² *Ibid.* "Et hinc constare potest quod corporaliter ibi est [...]. Cum enim [...] beatitudo non esset consummata nisi personaliter ibi esset, et persona non sit anima, sed coniunctum, patet quod secundum coniunctum, id est corpus et animam, ibi est: alioquin consummatam non haberet fruitionem".

²³³ Fulton, "Virgin Mary," 130.

²³⁴ This is not to suggest that *Cantica Canticorum* was never used for visual imagery, Ernst Kitzinger, "A Virgin's Face: Antiquarianism in Twelfth-Century Art," *Art Bulletin*, LXII (1980): 8-11 has demonstrated through inscriptions that it was drawn on for the mosaics at Sta Maria in Trastevere.

²³⁵ In the context of the Wirksworth slab, Hawkes has described the scene showing the attacks by the Jew on the bier as "a suitably neutral scene" to indicate both the Dormition and the Assumption without engaging with what was "(doctrinally) contentious", Hawkes, "Wirksworth," 266.

is unique among the visual narratives of the end of the Virgin's life that have been examined. This must have reflected the intellectual concerns of Chapter, and possibly can be focused further on the views of the patron. This reflection of the uncertainty of the liturgy lends credence to the probability that the chapter house design expressed the concerns of a highly educated group of canons.

3.4 Conclusion

In the way the narratives were constructed and scenes depicted, it is thus arguable that the glazing scheme was part of a unified design, which cut across the different workshops involved. It reflected the specific liturgical interests of the York Chapter and, in turn, the aspirations to unity on the part of the Church, the main thrust of the Decrees of Lateran IV.²³⁶ It is also plausible that a perceived unity of the active Chapter, while also recognising individual contribution, could have been presented as a microcosm of the idealised wider Church, although, as discussed in Chapter 1, this picture of unity may have been a misrepresentation of the actual situation.

A sub-theme that has emerged in the course of this discussion is the degree to which the chapter house glazing reflected contemporary involvement with the prevailing anti-Semitism of the late thirteenth century, demonstrated in the mandate issued by John le Romeyn on 21 April 1287 to preach against the Jews throughout the Province.²³⁷ This is manifest in the way that certain scenes and episodes have been selected which portray the Jews adversely, such as the partial rendering of the Lystra sequence in CHs3. However, the main indication comes from the use of Jewish headgear and, to a lesser extent,

²³⁶ *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, no. 7, 237; no. 14, 242; no. 31, 249.

²³⁷ *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 22.

physical features such as the shape of their noses. The most striking aspect of the different types of hats or caps adopted (see Appendix C) is the way that they are employed to indicate evil figures in the windows who were not always canonically Jewish. Four different types of caps or hats have been identified (Figure 27).²³⁸ Types-1 to 3 are clearly used for evil, hostile characters, whether Jewish or pagan. Type-4 is generally, and correctly, associated with doctors or scholars elsewhere,²³⁹ but may alternatively have denoted modified Jewish caps,²⁴⁰ not associated with scholarly activity. The argument here is that this type was used to denote a modified type of Jewish cap, possibly indicating a less obdurate Jewish or hostile character, as they tend not to be worn by the main protagonists in any scene. In situations where they are uncanonically used, they show at least a sense of otherness, if not specifically the evil associated with Jews. The chapter house glass contains no examples of Type-4 caps being used for Christians or Christian scholars. More research needs to be conducted into their specific significance, but the general anti-Semitic tone is a corollary of the stress on Church unity: as the Church bound itself closer together so it excluded and demonised outsiders. This trend, too, was displayed in Lateran IV in the stance taken against Jews and heretics.²⁴¹

²³⁸ I am grateful to Dr. J. Hillaby, pers. comm., 2 December 2012, for confirming the categorisation of these hats. Dr Hillaby is an Honorary Research Fellow of the University of Bristol, a former President of the Jewish Historical Society of England (2006-8) and has published detailed studies of the medieval Jewries of London, Hereford, Worcester, Gloucester and Bristol.

²³⁹ A few examples can be seen in the windows showing the Life of Stephen in Chartres Cathedral, where they are worn by a Jewish doctor and by two of the false witnesses against Stephen, and in that showing the lives of St Simon and St Jude, *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedral at Chartres: Bays 1 and 13. A similar cap is worn by a philosopher in the Abbey Church of St-Père of Chartres, Bay 226: left-hand lancet. See also *Online Archive*, "English sites," Canterbury Cathedral, n15:6b. Other English examples are in the Ramsey Psalter, fols. 1v, 2r, 2v and 3r. Without their points, they can be seen in the twelfth-century York Psalter, Boase, *The York Psalter*, 1962), 24. Their use elsewhere, however, is clearly intended to denote scholars' caps, as shown above.

²⁴⁰ Knowles, "Manuscript Notes," fol. 153r- fol. 155r. Knowles refers to them as a "doctor's" cap in CHn4:7, 9, 17, 18, 20, 27 and 39.

²⁴¹ *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, no. 3, 233-35, no. 67 and no. 68, 265-66.

A second sub-theme concerns CHs4. Because of the inclusion of five saints across five lights (hence interfering with the narrative structure of the other windows and removing the relevance of corner positions), it is the one window which cannot comply with all the conclusions of this chapter. Here, only the Margaret light contains, in abbreviated form, all the possible relevant narrative elements of the other windows, namely the visual and thematic similarity of the central panels, the demonstration of an initial grant of efficacious grace, the culmination in a glorious martyrdom, with an indication of divine approval. It raises the possibility that at one stage in the evolution of the chapter house design there was an intention for CHs4 to be devoted entirely to Margaret, a decision that had been changed by the time the window was created although some of the main features were retained.

Of the remaining windows, the conclusions suggest that there are, to a greater or lesser extent, coincidences and anomalies for which one explanation is that the iconography reflected theological and liturgical, as well as social and religious concerns of the time and place and that these were sufficiently consistent across all the main windows for this to be part of a deliberate scheme. The ideas conveyed suggest that the design was created with intellectual and theological input. If this is the case, it is difficult to imagine that the rest of the chapter house was constructed and designed without any intellectual input or that the iconography for the different parts of the building was designed at random. Word constraints mean that it has not been possible to explore other avenues of theological research here, such as Paul's literary parallels between construction and the Church, or visual themes, such as the pattern in the use of borders and grisaille around the chapter house, and the extent to which these features may have been part of a central production.

Nevertheless, despite Kemp's argument that the emergence of architecturally-determined windows in the late thirteenth century meant that there was "no longer any scope for creative narrative and complex systematic statements",²⁴² it seems that there is sufficient evidence of a centralised scheme of patterning and order in the way the chapter house windows were designed and the narratives presented, thus demonstrating, yet again, that "position, grouping, symmetry and number are of extraordinary importance".²⁴³ In varying degrees of certainty, there seems to have been a stress on the individual's contribution to the Christian project, on the demonstration of their receipt of the Divine gift of efficacious grace and on the way their lives reflect that of Christ. Given that the appearance of the medallions and their relationship with the surrounding grisaille cut across the workshop allocation, it makes it less likely that individual designs were the result of choices made by workshops, and more compelling that there was a unified scheme, thus presenting a picture of Chapter unity which is contradicted by evidence of the historical context. In this, it is likely that Chapter operated similarly to universities and colleges, which seemed to have had overall direction of glazing schemes "even when there were prominent benefactors".²⁴⁴ A second effect is that the chapter house glazing contradicts Hahn's suggestion that, "systematic order does not seem to be as important an element as some stained glass scholars have argued".²⁴⁵

²⁴² Kemp, *Narratives*, 7.

²⁴³ Mâle, *Gothic Image*, 5.

²⁴⁴ Ayers, *Merton College*, Part 1, lxx.

²⁴⁵ Hahn, *Portrayed*, 330.

CHAPTER 4: A MARIAN AND VIRGINAL FOCUS

4.1 *Introduction*

Having demonstrated the ways in which the chapter house glazing exploited theological and liturgical themes, Chapter 4 will determine whether there is an additional element, specifically, the veneration of the Virgin Mary. Allusion has already been made to the Virgin's symbolic status in relation to the Jews. Here consideration will extend to the decorative and even architectural features and whether the virgin saints, both female and male, are honoured because of this Marian association.

4.2 *Focus on the Virgin Mary*

4.2.1 *The importance of CHn2: the Life of the Virgin*

CHn2, showing the life of the Virgin Mary, was adjacent to the Passion and Resurrection in CH1. Its significance is emphasised by what may be either an anomaly in the construction of the building or what may even have been a deliberate aspect of the original layout. The octagon of the chapter house is preserved as such to the east of its entrance, but is slightly twisted clockwise, although a 1ft 1in. difference in thickness of the wall on each side of the entrance means that the orientation of the Minster is retained on its external western face. From the way the west wall of the chapter house is constructed, it is clear that the original plan was to abut a structure to its western exterior.¹

The reason for the orientation of the chapter house is unclear, except that it must have been part of the design from the start, because of the way the

¹ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 58.

entrance adjustment was incorporated into the early stages of the construction.² Christopher Norton's argument is that, because it aligns with what may have been buildings pre-dating the Norman Conquest, it replaced an Anglian building on the same site, which may, itself, have been used as an earlier chapter house,³ and he continues that congestion in this part of the Minster Close meant that the footprint of the earlier building had to be followed when the current chapter house was constructed in the late thirteenth century. Brown has suggested that there might have been a transitional chapter house on the site, constructed as part of Roger Pont-l'Évêque's rebuilding of the east end of the Minster.⁴

However, what has not so far been discussed in the scholarship is the impact of the alignment on the sight-lines of the chapter house windows as one approaches along the vestibule from the west. The entrance has been considered elsewhere, with its painted wall decoration linked to the Virgin,⁵ painted trumeau Virgin,⁶ and painted and gilded doors,⁷ but, without the construction anomaly, the approach to the chapter house would have revealed CH1 immediately ahead, with increasing and equal amounts of CHn2 (the Virgin Mary) and CHs2 (Peter) visible the closer the viewer came to the chapter house and crossed the threshold. The effect of the misalignment, however, is that CHs2 is not visible until the viewer is on the point of entering the building: instead, what is fully within sight is CHn2 on the left and CH1 on the right. From a position slightly to the right of the trumeau Virgin, appropriate for a procession whose leader would be heading to the Dean's seat under CH1, there is a point

² Norton, "Anglo-Saxon," 14.

³ Norton has suggested that this may have been the Anglian Church of Alma Sophia.

⁴ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 55.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 73.

⁶ The Virgin shows signs of red, blue and gold, Geddes, "Assessment," 10. Drake said that it "has been all richly gilt and painted as to be above description", *Eboracum*, 476.

⁷ Harrison, "Archaeological Survey Report," 5-6; Geddes, "Assessment," 6-7 and 9-10.

at which, not only do the windows appear adjacent to each other, but the sculptured Virgin at the entrance is visually aligned between the two (Figure 30a).⁸

An additional effect of the sight-lines is that the first narrative panel in CHn2 to be seen as any procession approached the chapter house entrance is location 2e. While, under the Option 1 reconstruction, its original content is unknown, under Option 2 it would have contained a Coronation of the Virgin, visually adjacent to the trumeau Virgin (see Figure 30a), and with a halo which is larger than that of Christ. The Coronation may well have been echoed in the quatrefoil above the trumeau Virgin in the east wall of the vestibule, where Brown suggests there could have been a painted version.⁹ This all lends some support to the fact that the Coronation may have originally existed in row 2 in CHn2 and hence that Option 2 is the more likely sequence for CHn2.

The head of the trumeau Virgin, together with that of Christ, is a later addition, but the body is intact and shows her standing on a lion and a serpent and under a high canopy. The imagery of Christ standing on the beasts, from Psalm 90:13 in the Vulgate, is relatively common, but in the thirteenth century it was extended to the Virgin,¹⁰ so the Christological overtones would have enhanced her status even further. Alternatively, the image may have deliberately echoed Genesis 3:15, albeit with the lion in addition to the serpent.

The perception of Mary as the new Eve, based on Genesis 3:15, was initially developed by Justin Martyr who compared Christ's rejection of Adam's

⁸ Sheila Bonde, Edward Boyden and Maines Clark, "Centrality and Community: Liturgy and Gothic Chapter House Room Design at the Augustinian Abbey of Saint-Jean-des-Vignes, Soissons," *Gesta*, 29, No. 2 (1990): 197-98. This is among many works which show the seating for the dignitaries as being on the east wall of chapter houses.

⁹ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 73.

¹⁰ Nigel Morgan, "Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in thirteenth-century England," in *England in the Thirteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1989 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. W.M.Ormrod (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1991), 89-90. Other examples found by the writer are an ivory carving from mid-thirteenth-century France and an early twelfth-century tympanum at Neuilly-en-Donjon.

sin, as established by Paul,¹¹ with Mary's voluntary acceptance of her role in Christ's Passion and Last Judgement, itself contrasting with Eve's disobedience.¹² Justin Martyr was followed and extended by Irenaeus, building further on Romans 5:12-21 and 1 Corinthians 15:20-22:¹³

For just as the former [Eve] was led astray by the word of an angel, so that she fled from God when she had transgressed His word; so did the latter [Virgin Mary], by an angelic communication, receive the glad tidings that she should sustain God, being obedient to His word. [...] And thus, as the human race fell into bondage to death by means of a virgin, so is it rescued by a virgin; virginal disobedience having been balanced in the opposite scale by virginal obedience.¹⁴

The concept continued through the Middle Ages: "having overcome the principal temptation of the devil, she crushed his corrupt head with the foot of her virtue",¹⁵ and is included in the York Missal.¹⁶ Whichever is the intended reading of the iconography, the trumeau Virgin was clearly meant to show, as

¹¹ Rom. 5:12-21.

¹² Reynolds, *Gateway*, 55 and 109.

¹³ Herman Ridderbos, *Paul, an Outline of his Theology* (London: SPCK, 1977), 90 and 98-99.

¹⁴ "Et seductione illa soluta qua seducta est male illa quae jam viro destinata erat virgo Eva per veritatem qua evangelizata est bene ab angelo jam sub viro Virgo Maria - quemadmodum enim illa per angelicum sermonem seducta est ut effugeret Deum praevaricata verbum ejus, ita et haec per angelicum sermonem evangelizata est ut portaret Deum obaudiens ejus verbo; [...]"; et quemadmodum adstrictum est morti genus humanum per virginem, solutum est per virginem, aequa lance disposita virginali inobaudientia per virginalem obaudientiam," Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, Book 5, chapter xix:1, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jacques Paul Migne. In *Library of Latin Texts, Series A* (Turnhout: Brepolis' Publishers Online, n.d.), <http://clt.brepolis.net.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/llta/pages/Toc.aspx?ctx=905313>.

¹⁵ Fulbert of Chartres (d.1028) *Sermo 4, De Nativitate beatissimae Mariae Virginis*. In *Testi Mariani de secundo millennio*. 8 vols. Vol.3, 848, quoted in Reynolds, *Gateway*, 133. "Sicque principali suggestionem diaboli victa, vitiosum caput virtutis pede contrivit," in *Patrologia Latina*, I ed. Caroli de Villiers. In *Library of Latin Texts* (Turnhout: Brepolis' Publishers Online, n.d.), http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk.libproxy.york.ac.uk/all/fulltext?ALL=Y&ACTION=byid&warn=N&div=4&id=Z400148916&FILE=../session/1509053222_4303&CURDB=pld.

¹⁶ *Missale*, 82.

Drewer suggests, “the victory of Christ and the Virgin Mary over original sin through the Incarnation”.¹⁷

4.2.2 The Relationship between CHn2 and CH1

The main link, however, between CHn2 and CH1, emerges from the subject matter: the greater the emphasis in the high Middle Ages on the personal suffering of Christ, the more closely the iconography resonated with Christ’s suffering mother. In the western church, this intensification of the sense of her anguish reflected the evolution of the presentation in the Temple from a scene in Christ’s infancy into the Feast of the Virgin’s Purification, which was prominently displayed in 6c in CHn2. The personal anguish of Christ in the garden in CH1:6, the unusual emphasis in CH1:7 on Christ’s concern to heal the injured Malchus (at the expense of a rendering of the kiss of Judas), and the way CH1:17 is shown, with a collapsing Christ still able to hold his hand in blessing towards those who are arresting him, all show the intimate side to the abbreviated Passion.

More specifically, of the twenty panels in CH1, Mary is or was included in at least seven:¹⁸ she accompanies Christ on the way to Calvary (CH1:20),¹⁹ she is at the foot of the cross (CH1:18),²⁰ she is present at the Entombment (CH1:19)²¹ and would have been at the Deposition (CH1:37).²² She may have been shown as one of the Marys with the angel at the empty tomb (CH1:26):²³ although not included in the textual sources, it is clear that the angel carries the

¹⁷ Lois Drewer, “Margaret of Antioch, the Demon-Slayer, East and West: The Iconography of the Predella of the Boston Mystic Marriage of St Catherine,” *Gesta*, 32, No.1 (1993): 17-18.

¹⁸ Moxon, “How ‘lost’,” 41. See Appendix C: CH1.

¹⁹ Volume 2, 411.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 403.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 407.

²² *Ibid.*, 441.

²³ *Ibid.*, 415.

palm leaf which was identified as a sign of her impending death in the Annunciation in CHn2:6, and Haskins outlines the efforts made by early Church Fathers to include her as this first witness to the Resurrection.²⁴ Mary is present at the Ascension (CH1:36).²⁵ She is among the group of Apostles at Pentecost (CH1:40),²⁶ in contrast to glass elsewhere, although she is included in some illuminated manuscripts. Finally, there is her Coronation, an extremely rare if not unique inclusion in a Passion cycle, originally in the top centre in 8c (CH1:38),²⁷ one of the most significant locations in the entire chapter house. Her inclusion is all the more remarkable given the number of standard Passion scenes which are omitted from CH1.²⁸

Further, in addition to both windows containing a panel of the Coronation (CHn2:36 and CH1:38), other scenes in CHn2 seem to have been selected to resonate with CH1, despite the fact that they were produced by different workshops. Mary is greeted by Gabriel at the Annunciation holding, unusually, a large palm leaf (CHn2:6), just as Christ is greeted on entering Jerusalem (CH1:30).²⁹ Mary rides on a donkey (CHn2:27) to Egypt, as Christ rides into Jerusalem in CH1:30.³⁰ She offers her first-born son in the Temple (CHn2:18) as God offers his only son for Salvation and as Christ makes his own sacrifice (CH1:18).³¹ After her death (CHn2:38), her soul is elevated (CHn2:28),

²⁴ Susan Haskins, *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor* (London: Harper Collins, 1993), 61; Katherine Ludwig Jansen, *The Making of the Magdalen: Preaching and Popular Devotion in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 31-33 also discusses the attempts made to identify the various Marys.

²⁵ Volume 2, 436.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 453.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 445. Spraker, "East Window," 89-90 also discusses the unusual inclusion of a Coronation of the Virgin in the window.

²⁸ For example, the crowning with thorns, facing the High Priests, Herod and Pilate as figures in authority, the kiss of Judas.

²⁹ Volume 2, 457 and 431.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 523 and 431.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 499 and 403.

resonating with the Ascension (CH1:36).³² Her followers are amazed at her empty tomb (CHn2:29) just as the three women find the empty sepulchre of Christ (CH1:26).³³ One of the Apostles, like Mary Magdalen in CH1:9, possibly witnesses the immediate aftermath of the Virgin's Assumption (CHn2:29),³⁴ and finally she is elevated (CHn2:28) as Christ ascends to heaven (CH1:36).³⁵ The two windows share representations of structures: beds and tombs as shrines, under the Virgin Mary in CHn2 in the Nativity (CHn2:9), the deathbed scenes (CHn2:39 and 38) and under Christ in the Entombment of CH1:19.³⁶

Not only do scenes in CHn2 and CH1 appear to have been selected to underline their parallel lives, but the two entire windows stood side by side with resonances of the groom and bride, or "sponsus/sponsa", theme of the *Cantica Canticorum* and the liturgy,³⁷ a theme which had been particularly developed by Aelred of Rievaulx in the twelfth century.³⁸ The juxtaposition and orientation of the windows support a possible interpretation that Mary was not only a type of the Church,³⁹ but she was "the entire Church [...] because by God's grace she assuredly brings forth his members, in other words his faithful ones".⁴⁰ She was "increasingly portrayed as equal to her son in dignity and purpose",⁴¹ and both the content and location of CHn2 were designed to demonstrate that her cult

³² *Ibid.*, 559, 525 and 435.

³³ *Ibid.*, 533 and 415.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 387 and 533.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 525 and 435.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 477, 565, 559 and 407.

³⁷ *Breviarium*, cols. 492, 496 *passim*; Ann W. Astell, *The Song of Songs in the Middle Ages* (London: Ithaca, 1995), 2 and 15. Note also the significance of the Virgin as "a sister and a spouse" in the Bull of Canonisation of William of York, Browne, *History*, Vol. 1, 52. "[...] ut sororem [...] et ut sponsam," *Historians*, ed. Raine, Vol. 3, 126.

³⁸ Fulton, "Virgin Mary," 223.

³⁹ Rachel Fulton, *From Judgment to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800-1200* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 248, quoting extensively from the *Seal of the Blessed Mary*, of Honorius Augustodunensis.

⁴⁰ "Mater eius est tota ecclesia quia membra eius, id est fideles eius, per dei gratiam ipsa utique parit," Augustine. *De Bono Coniugali. De Sancta Virginitate*, ed. Peter G. Walsh (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 70-71.

⁴¹ Miri Rubin, *Mother of God: a History of the Virgin Mary* (London: Penguin, 2009), 210.

had developed to the extent that her life could be seen as a parallel of Christ's.⁴² After all, according to Augustine, "Mary alone is both mother and virgin in both the spirit and the flesh: she is both Christ's mother and Christ's virgin".⁴³ By the high Middle Ages, with the emergence of a new mysticism, she became the Bride of Christ,⁴⁴ and was almost elevated to the role of co-redemptrix.⁴⁵ This was the catalyst for a new iconography whereby, as Christ and Mary were made "equal in their love, the King and Queen of Heaven appear nearly equal in their power".⁴⁶

4.2.3 *The Virgin Mary in the painted decoration of the chapter house*

Discussion can now turn to the question of the extent to which Marian iconography permeated the remaining decoration of the chapter house. There is an obvious link between the Virgin Mary and all of the other windows in the association between the physical qualities of the medium and the preservation of virginity. The symbolic substance of glass, in that it could be penetrated by light without being damaged, was well-established by the eleventh and twelfth centuries,⁴⁷ and that this concept continued in the thirteenth can be seen in William of Shoreham's translation of a poem by Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of

⁴² For example, the eighth-century writings of Germanus of Constantinople, Fulton, "Quae est," 98-99.

⁴³ "Sola ergo Maria et spiritu et corpore mater et virgo, et mater Christi et virgo Christi," Augustine, *Sancta Virginitate*, 73.

⁴⁴ Arthur Green, "Shekhinah, the Virgin Mary, and the Song of Songs: Reflections on a Kabbalistic Symbol in its Historical Context," *Association for Jewish Studies Review*, 26, No.1 (2002): 6.

⁴⁵ This was first suggested by Arnold of Bonneval (d. after 1156). See Reynolds, *Gateway*, 274.

⁴⁶ Green, "Shekhinah," 27.

⁴⁷ Ivo of Chartres (d. 1115) wrote, "for if a ray of sun penetrates a crystal it does not perforate it in entering nor does it destroy it on exiting," Reynolds, *Gateway*, 72. "Si enim solis radius crystallum penetrans, nec ingrediendo perforat, nec egrediendo dissipat," (Ivo of Chartres, *Sermo XI. Annuntiatione Beatae Mariae*, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jacques Paul Migne 1844-55 (Turnhout: Brepolis' Publishers Online, n.d.)

http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/all/fulltext?ALL=Y&ACTION=byid&warn=N&div=4&id=Z400125711&FILE=.%2Fsession%2F1421949477_6612&CURDB=pld.

Lincoln, *On the Virgin Mary*.⁴⁸ It can be understood in the context of Camille's reminder that an object was seen not only as a work of art, "but as something far more powerful and instrumental because of its capacity not just to reflect the world, but to re-shape it in God's image".⁴⁹

However, it is necessary to move beyond such generalised associations to explore whether there are any specific connections between the chapter house decoration and Mariology. To some extent this has been examined by Dawton, leading to his conclusion that the building was a replica of the Church at Josephat, citing in evidence the trumeau Virgin, architectural parallels with descriptions of the Church there (traditionally the site of the burial of the Virgin) and the reference to the rose in the painted inscription at the entrance: "*Ut rosa flos florum sic est domus ista domorum*" (as the rose is the flower of flowers so is this the house of houses) (Figure 30b).⁵⁰ His argument has been discounted in the literature, because of inadequacies in his evidence,⁵¹ but it is necessary to revisit his conclusions in the light of current research.

It has long been recognised that the inscription at the entrance is the same as the one in the floor tiles of the chapter house at Westminster Abbey (Figure 30c), which was nearing completion in 1253,⁵² well before the dates suggested for the York chapter house. On this basis it appears that, in copying the claim, there was a deliberate attempt in York to emulate Westminster.

However, the Westminster inscription is far less prominently displayed than that

⁴⁸ William Shoreham, *The Poems of William Shoreham*, ed. Matthias Konrath (London: Kegan Paul Trench Truebner, 1902), 129.

⁴⁹ Michael Camille, *Gothic Art: Visions and Revelations of the Medieval World* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1996), 25.

⁵⁰ Dawton, "Chapter House," 48-54. The earliest reference to the inscription is in William Camden, *Britannia, sive Florentissimorum Regnorum Angliae Scotiae, Hiberniae et Insularum adjacentim ex intima antiquitate* (1607), first published 1582, 575.

⁵¹ Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 74.

⁵² Lawrence Keen, "The chapter house decorated tile pavement," in *Westminster Abbey Chapter House: the history, art and architecture of 'a chapter house beyond compare'*, eds. Warwick Rodwell and Richard Mortimer (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 2010), 209.

at York, being situated close to the outer edge of the floor, presenting towards a seat on the side wall, alongside four other inscriptions, none of which displays Marian references. The tiles are “44-46 mm” long and “14-30 mm” wide,⁵³ visible only to the monks sitting in the immediately adjacent stalls. In York, the claim is at eye-level, immediately inside the chapter house entrance, in letters which themselves are 3.15 ins (80mm) high.⁵⁴ They would have been seen by anyone entering, leaving or seated in the building, effectively advertising Chapter’s status.

Thus the inscription alludes to two of the themes which can be associated with the Virgin, *rosa* and *domus*: certainly Mary as the rose and, possibly, as the physical home of Christ, in that she carried him in her womb. However, before iconographic interpretations are addressed, the linguistic aspects of the phrase itself need to be considered. Its grammatical structure resembles what can best be described as a simile comparing the quintessential elements as perceived at the time, *ut flos florum* and *sic est domus [...]* *domorum*, with resonances of the rhetoric which pervades the *Cantica Canticorum* and, indeed, formed its Latin title.⁵⁵ It was a device which was explained by Bernard of Clairvaux as indicating “unique excellence: which is why He to Whom it is addressed alone is called the King of kings and the Lord of lords”.⁵⁶

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 230.

⁵⁴ A similar expression of the specific value of a chapter house could be seen at Riechenau Abbey, where the inscription formerly at the door of the chapter house read in translation as, “how good it is that the brethren live in unity,” Gardner, “Role,” 182.

⁵⁵ Aileen Bloomer, Teaching Fellow, Department of Linguistics, York St John University, pers. comm., 15 June 2017.

⁵⁶ “Igitur pro sui excellentia reor nuptiale hoc carmen huiusmodi titulo praesignitum, ut merito cantica canticorum singulariter appelletur, sicut is quoque cui canitur singulariter est dictus rex regum et dominus dominatum,” Bernard of Clairvaux; *Saint Bernard on the Song of Songs: Sermones in Cantica Canticorum*, trans. Religious of C.S.M.V. (London, Mowbray, 1952), 22-23.

4.2.3.1 Flora and foliage

The reference to the rose can be seen as providing a textual allusion to the visual decoration of the chapter house complex: the walls of the vestibule were originally painted with red and white roses and fleurs-de-lys,⁵⁷ the latter also featuring in most of the strip features surrounding the panels of both CHn2 and CHs2, in the borders of the centre lights of CH1 and CHs3 and in the tracery lights. In addition, roses were painted in the ceiling, both in the central circle surrounding the Agnus Dei boss and in the outer panels.⁵⁸ The rose had long been associated with Mary: as a thornless rose, it was interpreted further as an attribute of her as the “new Eve”,⁵⁹ with inferences of the new, and, on this occasion, eternal, Paradise.⁶⁰ The association between Mary and roses may have been initiated by Ambrose in Chapter 8 of his treatise, *Concerning Virgins*, when he wrote of:

a garden, scented with the olive, and [...] resplendent with the rose, that religion may increase in the vine, peace in the olive, and the modesty of consecrated virginity in the rose.⁶¹

⁵⁷ Browne, *Representation*, 31; Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 74.

⁵⁸ YMA L1/7, Torre, 121.

⁵⁹ Aelred of Rievaulx. *Sermo XXV. De Beata Maria* draws on the parallel with the strong and wise woman of Proverbs xxxi in “Mulierem fortem quis inveniet? Haec est illa, de cujus fortitudine serpenti Dominus minabatur,” in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. D. Tissier (Turnhout: Brepolis’ Publishers Online, n.d.), http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/all/fulltext?ALL=Y&action=byid&warn=N&id=Z500095237&div=5&file=../session/1423148854_14450&SOMQUERY=1&DBOFFSET=156374519&ENTRIES=1&CURDB=pld. See also Nigel Morgan, “Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in English Twelfth-Century Monasticism, and Their Influence on the Secular Church,” in *Monasteries and Societies in Medieval Britain: Proceedings of the 1994 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Benjamin Thompson (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1999), 132.

⁶⁰ A reference to Eve occurs in the Missal of the Use of York, *Missale*, 82, and to Mary as the “rosa sine spina”, “the rose without a thorn,” *Missale*, 83.

⁶¹ “Itaque sicut hortus furibus inaccessus uitem redolet, fraglat oleam, rosam renidet, ut in uite religio, in olea pax, in rosa pudor sacrae uirginitatis inolescant,” Ambrose, *De Virginitate*, Book 1, chapter viii, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jacques Paul Migne in *Library of Latin Texts, Series A*, (Turnhout: Brepolis’ Publishers Online, 2014), <http://clt.brepolis.net.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/lita/pages/Results.aspx?qry=c321ba3b-e85c-4239-bc97-ae0d547057b3&per=0>).

Its significance as a Marian symbol had intensified by the thirteenth century; Krenzle shows that Helinandus Frigidi Montis “belabors a tedious comparison between Mary and the parts and attributes of a rose” in a lengthy section of his text on the Assumption.⁶² A rose, among its many other features, was circular, “describing a beginning without end, and a head without a tail”,⁶³ possibly echoed in the circularity of the central part of the ceiling design, the corner emphasis of the window narratives and even intimating the theme of eternity in the ground plan of the chapter house itself. Helinandus is also one among many writers who adopted the linguistic structure associated with the *Cantica Canticorum*: “for as the rose is the most beautiful of flowers so is Mary the most beautiful of women”.⁶⁴ As well as appearing in the decorative scheme of the chapter house and the vestibule, the rose is mentioned on numerous occasions in the York responsories and antiphons for the Feast of the Assumption.⁶⁵

What is less certain are the other potential implications of this suggestion. Foliate decoration was common in contemporary churches, but its extent in the chapter house is of a different order from the norm. Brown has pointed out that this has not been explained, with the exception of Givens’s recognition of the prevalence of plants connected to the agrarian economy and to the hedge-planting that was common in late thirteenth-century England.⁶⁶

⁶² Beverly M. Kienzle, “Maternal Imagery in the Sermons of Hélinand of Froidment,” in *De Ore Domini*, ed. Thomas L. Amos, Eugene A. Green and Beverly M. Kienzle (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 1989), 95.

⁶³ “Describens alpha sine omega, et caput offerens sine cauda,” Helinandus Frigidis Montis, *Sermon xix. De Assumptione B. Mariae Virginis*, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. D. Tissier (Turnhout: Brepolis’ Publishers Online, n.d.), http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/all/fulltext?ALL=Y&action=byid&warn=N&id=Z400078448&div=4&file=../session/1423151220_2966&SOMQUERY=1&DBOFFSET=168860037&ENTRIES=1&CURDB=pld.

⁶⁴ The original text is, “Sic enim rosa pulcherrima florum, sic Maria pulcherrima mulierum,” Helinandus, *De Assumptione*.

⁶⁵ *Breviarium*, 75, cols. 476-502, *passim*.

⁶⁶ Givens, “The garden,” 195.

Populated foliage dominates the lower, darker level of stone carvings in the chapter house, and branches transport the narrative of the saints through the grisaille as though up towards the dome of heaven. Camille has attributed the increased portrayal of plants in the thirteenth century to “the new importance given to perception and sensation in the experience of the divine”,⁶⁷ and it is popularly associated with the increasing acceptance of Aristotelian observation in the syllabus of thirteenth-century universities,⁶⁸ but, in the chapter house, there may have been more specific resonances.

Several of the medallions in CHn2, CHn4, CHs3 and the Margaret light in CHs4 and CHs3 include unexplained plants along their edges (mainly CHn2:8, 18, 19 and 27,⁶⁹ together with CHs3:9, 17, 18, 20, 26, 27, 28, 30, 39, and possibly 37,⁷⁰ but also CHn4:36 and 40,⁷¹ CHs4:17, 27 and, probably originally, 37).⁷² There are also small circular features in the scenes in the medallions in all windows (with the exceptions of CHn2 and CHn4); although most have lost their original glass, on those occasions where the original, painted glass survives, they appear to show flowerheads.⁷³ They are dotted prominently albeit

⁶⁷ Camille, *Gothic Art*, 135.

⁶⁸ Leff, *Paris and Oxford*, 187-240.

⁶⁹ Volume 2, 473, 499, 505 and 525.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 901, 919, 925, 935, 941, 947, 953, 961, 981 and 971.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 749 and 769.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 1025, 1051 and 1075..

⁷³ They (or something similar) can now be seen in CHs2 (six in CHs2:6, possibly four in the corners of CHs2:9, possibly one in CHs2:10, four in the corners of CHs2:30, one of which is a small white flower); in CHn3 (two balls in CHn3:6, one in CHn3:9, one striking one in the centre of CHn3:16, which may have actually been a shield, three in CHn3:18 of which the right-hand one appears to have had two radiating lines which may have been part of a floral design, and the uppermost one contains one piece of glass which may depict a petal and hence possibly the whole circle represented a petal. There was one large ball at the base in CHn3:19 and four balls, possibly original, along the same line as the base of the wheel of the wagon. Three of these contain flower heads and the fourth has inserted glass. There are vestiges of two white flower heads in CHn3:18, two small white flowers in CHn3:20, one ball at the base in CHn3:28, two red balls with paint possibly indicating flora in CHn3:30, one in CHn3:37 and one is visible in the pre-restoration photograph of CHn3:38); in CHs2:30 there is one in the top right-hand corner and probably three others in the other corners, probably one in each corner of CHs2:9 and possibly there was one in each corner of CHs2:36; in CHs3 there are six in CHs3:7; in CHs4 (one modern one in the top centre of CHs4: one in CHs4:16, one floral shape in the top centre of CHn4:26 and probably originally in CHs4:6 and 36, two in CHs4:27, one small flower and three yellow ones along the bottom in CHs4:28). The same motif, even more pronounced,

somewhat erratically around both the narrative scenes and the standing figures of saints in the vestibule windows and were also shown in Carter's 1790 sketch of two of the painted figures on the lower row of the west wall of the chapter house (Figure 17).⁷⁴ They are a feature that has only rarely been encountered in stained and painted glass elsewhere: notably, given the other similarities with St-Urbain discussed in Chapter 1, they appear in a modified form in some of the panels there which have experienced fewer interventions (see Figure 33 and Bays 0:4a, 1:4b and 2:4b).⁷⁵ Similarly, there are several triangular shapes at the base of medallions, most of which have also lost their original glass, but, of those which have survived, all but two contain a leaf.⁷⁶

The same foliate themes continued in the ceiling: both the vestibule and chapter house bosses of the *Agnus Dei* show the Lamb almost suffocated by fruit and foliage and the original central circle of roses in the chapter house ceiling was itself surrounded by 16 smaller bosses showing more foliage (examples in Figure 33), most in fruit.⁷⁷ Fruitfulness is a recurring theme in Augustine's *On Virginity* where, "[the Virgin] had two things in the flesh worthy of honour, virginity and fecundity",⁷⁸ although "no fruitfulness of the flesh can be compared to Holy Virginity".⁷⁹ Building on this tradition, Bernard of Clairvaux, in Sermon 47 on the *Cantica Canticorum*, describes the flower of the garden as

can be found in the vestibule glass, showing fleurs-de-lys as well as more indecipherable flowers.

⁷⁴ They were also seen painted on the badge of the label stop in the north transept which is discussed in Chapter 1.

⁷⁵ *Online Archive*, "French sites".

⁷⁶ In CHn2, there is an animal face in CHn2:7 and 30, and blank glass in CHn2:9, 19, 27 and 36; in Chn3 there is a leaf in CHn3:6, 30 and 37 and blank glass in CHn3:26, 36 and 39; and in CHs4 there is a leaf in CHs4:7, 17 and possibly 28 and blank glass in CHs4:7, 27 and 37.

⁷⁷ Torre described the roses in the ceiling, YMA L1/7, Torre, 121 and 122, which are also visible in the etching in Drake, *Eboracum*, facing page 476. There is no record of the bosses having been replaced, so it assumed they are original. Drake described the bosses as, "large, silver knots at the uniting of the timbers; all of which are now much defaced and sullied by time," *ibid.*

⁷⁸ "Illa in corpore duas res habuit honorandas, uirginitatem et fecunditatem," Augustine, *Sancta Virginitate*, 72.

⁷⁹ "Nulla ergo carnis fecunditas sanctae uirginitas etiam carnis comparari potest," *ibid.*, 74.

virginity, “related as it is to modesty, shunning publicity, rejoicing in seclusion, docile and biddable [...] for in a garden flowers are enclosed”.⁸⁰ Perhaps not surprisingly, plants and their scents are referred to throughout the York Office, forming one of three fundamental antiphons appearing in the liturgical texts of the Assumption.⁸¹

The problematic development of the liturgy for the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary and the ultimate solution to base the texts on the *Cantica Canticorum* has been examined in Chapter 3, noting especially the degree to which the mystical, allegorical content of the *Cantica Canticorum* created difficulties for those concerned with producing a visual image of the Assumption. However, it is plausible to suggest that such symbolism could be incorporated as part of a non-narrative, decorative scheme. Flowers, fruits and foliage and their scents may well have been associated with the [*H*]ortus Conclusus,⁸² the enclosed garden in the *Cantica Canticorum* which itself became a symbol of Mary’s virginity and was associated with the “new”, paradisaical Garden of Eden. This can be seen as early as the fourth century, when Ambrose, in *Concerning Virgins*, drew on the *Cantica Canticorum* (notably 1, 4:12) to explain Christ’s meaning:

A garden enclosed is my sister, my spouse, a garden enclosed, a fountain sealed; because in gardens of this kind the water of the pure fountain shines, reflecting the features of the image of God.⁸³

The concept appeared regularly in theological writings. Honorius Augustodunensis in *The Seal of the Blessed Mary*, for example, identified the

⁸⁰ “Et bene in horto virginitas, cui familiaris verecundia est, fugitans publici, latibulis gaudens, patiens disciplinae. Denique in horto flos clauditur,” Bernard of Clairvaux, *Saint Bernard*, 145.

⁸¹ Fulton, “Virgin Mary,” 118.

⁸² The initial letter “h” is omitted from the text in the Use of York.

⁸³ “Hortus conclusus soror mea sponsa, hortus conclusus, fons signatus, eo quod in hortis huiusmodi inpressam signaculis imaginem dei sinceri fontis unda resplendeat,” Ambrose, *De Virginitibus*, Book 1, chapter viii, para. 45.

“hortus conclusus” of Song 4:12 as “the virginity of Mary at the moment of the birth of Christ”,⁸⁴ and went on to explain that there were two reasons:

why the custom came to grow that flowers and grasses are consecrated on her festival. One, because her feast day is adorned with flowers, since on that day it is sung concerning her ‘They will surround her with flowers of roses and lilies of the valley’.⁸⁵

On this basis, it is possible that not only the rose and foliage associated with the Virgin were being depicted in the chapter house, but that the upper parts of the entire building were decorated to resemble an enclosed garden, resonant of the *Cantica Canticorum*. Given that the cedars, pomegranates and cypresses would perhaps have been unfamiliar to the glass painters and sculptors of Northern England in the thirteenth century it is plausible that they were replaced with plants more familiar to the artists.

4.2.3.2 Construction analogies

While such visual references to the rose and the garden seem to substantiate the Marian focus of the entrance inscription, the various ways Mary is textually referred to as a building also suggests the *domus* reference may be part of a claim that the chapter house was intended to represent her.

Mary’s association with buildings had been long established. Jerome wrote in *The Perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Mary* of “the Lord Jesus [...]

⁸⁴ Matter, *Voice of my Beloved*, 157; “Hortus conclusus iterum quia post partum non est reclusum virginitatis signaculum,” Honorius Augustodunensis, *Sigillum sanctae mariae ubi exponuntur cantica canticorum*, chapter iv, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jaques Paul Migne (Turnhout: Brepolis’ Publishers Online, n.d.).
<http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/all/fulltext?ACTION=byid&warn=N&id=Z500115546&div=5&FILE=.PL 172, 507 D.>

⁸⁵ Honorius, *Seal*, 87; “Cur autem mos inolevit, quod flores et herbae in ejus festivitate consecrantur, ob duas causas fieri comprobatur. Una quod floribus ejus festivitas decoratur, quia ea die de ea cantatur: Circumdabant eam flores rosarum et lilia,” Honorius, *Sigillum*, chapter viii.

guard[ing] the sacred lodging of the womb in which he abode for ten months".⁸⁶ Subsequently, Aelred of Rievaulx praised the Virgin because she "had prepared this castle within herself" to enable Christ to enter her womb.⁸⁷ The apocryphal *Gospel of James* created an early life for her which centred on the Temple,⁸⁸ and the concept of her as its personification was introduced in the fourth century, again by Ambrose.⁸⁹ It had been further developed by the ninth century,⁹⁰ and is echoed in texts from the early thirteenth century,⁹¹ with references in the York Missal, such as, "*Tu es Jesu mater bona, Tu Sancti Spiritus es templum facta*" (the Temple),⁹² and in the York Breviary, as *templum domini* (the Temple of the Lord).⁹³

She was not only referred to as a temple: in the Office, she is *virginalem aulam* (a court),⁹⁴ *in sepulchro* (a sepulchre),⁹⁵ and there are numerous references to her as the *castellum* (the castle).⁹⁶ The spiritual symbolism of these reached a zenith in Robert Grosseteste's poem, *Carmen de Creatione Mundi*, where direct parallels were made between the structure of the castle and virginity of Mary.⁹⁷ It can also be associated with the crenellations over the

⁸⁶ "Invocandus est Dominus Jesus, ut sacri ventris hospitium, cujus decem mensibus inhabitator fuit," Jerome, *Adversus Heluidium de Mariae uirginitate perpetua*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Book 1, chapter 2, ed. Jacques Paul Migne. In *Library of Latin Texts, Series A* (Turnhout: Brepolis' Publishers Online, 2014), <http://clt.brepolis.net.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/llta/pages/Toc.aspx?ctx=857273>.

⁸⁷ "Hoc castellum praeparasset in se," in Aelred of Rievaulx, *Sermon XVII: on the Assumption of the Blessed Mary*, Abigail Wheatley, *The Idea of the Castle in Medieval England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004), 78.

⁸⁸ James, *Apocryphal*, 41-43.

⁸⁹ Fulton, "Virgin Mary," 75.

⁹⁰ Fulton, "Quae est," 78.

⁹¹ See the poem by Robert Grosseteste in Shoreham, *Poems*, 128 and discussed in Cecilia Panti, "Robert Grosseteste's Cosmology of Light and Light-Metaphors: A Symbolic Model of Sacred Space?" in *Bishop Robert Grosseteste and Lincoln Cathedral: Tracing Relationships between Medieval Concepts of Order and Built Form*, eds. Nicholas Temple, John Shannon Hendrix and Christian Frost (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2014) 73.

⁹² *Missale*, 82. "You are the good mother of Jesus; you have been made a temple of the Holy Spirit," John Gough, pers. comm., 29 October 2017.

⁹³ *Breviarum*, 75, col. 476.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 478.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, col. 481.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, cols. 476-504 *passim*.

⁹⁷ Wheatley, *The Idea*, 94-95.

stalls by the entrance to the chapter house, especially in the light of similar features over the piscina at St-Urbain in Troyes (a possible source for York, as discussed in Chapter 1) and their Marian associations.⁹⁸ If structures which can be associated with buildings are included, she was also seen as a wall and her association with towers are clear in Honorius Augustodunensis's *The Seal of the Blessed Mary* examination of the sources for the liturgy of the Feast of Mary's Assumption which placed great stress on their use. Not only was this work largely based on the *Cantica Canticorum*, it also included a reference in Luke,⁹⁹ with Honorius's (somewhat tortuous) explanation, associating towers with the Virgin's humility.¹⁰⁰

Thus the chapter house inscription, referring to the *domus [...] domorum*, may have been intended to allude to Mary as a protective building. The fact that the decoration was being associated with what was almost certainly the Marian rose suggests that the *domus domorum* phrase was meant to imply more than a simple claim that the chapter house was very beautiful.¹⁰¹ That it did not refer explicitly to the Virgin could have reflected a desire not to be too audacious in the Minster's claims, but the result of such caution means that it is difficult to make the connection today with certainty. Equally, the allusions may have been self-evident to literate contemporaries. These resonances will be examined further below.

⁹⁸ Paul Binski, "Imagery," in *Architecture*, eds. Opačić and Timmermann, 267-68.

⁹⁹ Luke 10: 38.

¹⁰⁰ Honorius, *Seal*, 48.

¹⁰¹ In Ronald Edward Latham and D.R. Howlett, *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (London: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2013), 719-21, eighteen clusters of possible meanings for "domus" have been identified, ranging from "house" or "home" to definitions more suggestive of religious overtones, such as "sacrament house" or "Church building or institution".

4.2.4 The Virgin Mary: a pervasive theme

Norton has observed that the Virgin is the only one of the chapter house religious figures in the windows to have been omitted from the images in the chapter house ceiling.¹⁰² While she may, as he suggests, have been represented by Ecclesia, it is equally possible to argue that a specific image was superfluous because at least the upper part of the entire building was devoted to her. She was represented in the roses and lilies in the ceiling and glass, both in the main ceiling panels and filling the inner circle around the central boss. As a *[H]ortus Conclusus*, she may have been indicated in the foliage of the grisaille glass and the bosses. The approach to the chapter house was along the vestibule whose walls were also painted with Marian white and red roses and lilies,¹⁰³ the entrance to which, from the north transept, is carved with cinquefoils, the terminals of which open into prominent foliate shapes resembling fleurs-de-lys (Figure 34) and through which the viewer faces CHn6, with a central Coronation of the Virgin above a Crucifixion. As a result, the Virgin may well have been alluded to as the *domus* of the entrance inscription and in the crenellations over the entrance stalls. As argued below, it is also possible that she was represented in the architecture of the chapter house itself.

While there is no evidence to suggest that the off-centre design of the building was deliberately created to give prominence to CHn2, it is arguable that the original scheme made full use of the orientation of the building to stress its iconographic focus. It is therefore possible to redefine Dawton's suggestion that there was an overall theme involving the Virgin in the iconographic scheme for the chapter house, but rather than any specific attempt to copy the Church of the Virgin at Josephat and her tomb, as he suggests, the connection was made

¹⁰² Norton, "Medieval paintings," 47.

¹⁰³ Browne, *Representation*, 31; Brown, *Magnificent Fabrick*, 74.

through the glazing and decoration of the chapter house and vestibule, the wording of the liturgy, the connection with the *Cantica Canticorum* and the influence of theological texts.

4.3 *The links between the virgin saints and the Virgin Mary*

From the fourth century onwards, descriptions of Mary's virginity had extended beyond her virginal state at the moment of her conception to her inviolate virginity while giving birth,¹⁰⁴ and thence developed to encompass the possibility of her perpetual virginity, involving the discussion of whether she had, as a maiden in the Temple, sworn to preserve her virginity permanently. This was extended early as a model for Christian living. Jerome based the importance of male and female virginity on the pure state of the Virgin Mary, and claimed the highest status for virgins, because "it is this angelic purity which secures to virginity its highest reward".¹⁰⁵ Ambrose, in *Concerning Virgins*, had woven interconnecting threads between the Virgin Mary, the *Cantica Canticorum* and virgins generally. In Chapter 7 of Book 1, he quoted from Song 4: 7-8, describing the qualities of beauty, concluding that thereby "is set forth the perfect and irreproachable beauty of a virgin soul" and drew extensive parallels between virgins and the *Cantica Canticorum* in Chapter 9.¹⁰⁶ In the second book of *Concerning Virgins*, especially in the extensive Chapter 2, he elaborated on the special relationship between the Virgin Mary and virgins, in that Mary set an example of how all virgins should behave and that all ultimately joined in a

¹⁰⁴ Ireneus, in seeing Mary as the "new Eve", believed she would not have suffered the pangs of childbirth, Reynolds, *Gateway*, 77.

¹⁰⁵ "Volo vos esse, quod Angeli sunt: unde et virgo majoris est mercedis," Jerome, *Adversus Heluidium de Mariae uirginitate perpetua*, in *Patrologia Latina*, edited by Jacques Paul Migne, in *Library of Latin Texts, Series A*. Turnhout: Brepolis' Publishers Online, 2014, <http://clt.brepolis.net.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/lita/pages/Toc.aspx?ctx=857273>, Book 1, chapter xxi.

¹⁰⁶ "Quibus indiciis ostenditur perfecta et inreprehensibilis uirginalis animae pulchritude," Ambrose, *De Virginitibus*: Book 1, chapter vii.

heavenly procession. The comparison extended to the fact that virgins' bodies could be seen as "a temple",¹⁰⁷ that "emit a fragrance through divine grace as gardens do through flowers, temples through religion" in what, collectively, can be seen as resonating with the iconography of the chapter house.¹⁰⁸

Augustine's contribution to the link between the Virgin Mary and virgins rested on the mystical spousal theme. Virginité and fruitfulness were the main attributes of the Virgin's flesh but characteristics which would commonly be restricted to her were extended to all virgins. Christ was

the son of a virgin and the bridegroom of virgins, born in the flesh of a virgin's womb and wedded in the spirit in a virgin marriage [...]. [...] the whole Church, as the apostle has it, is herself a virgin espoused to Christ her only husband.¹⁰⁹

He also saw the connection as having been created through the interpretation of the *Cantica Canticorum*: "the virginal body functions as a physical representation of a mystical image, that of the 'bower' or 'chamber' in the *Canticles* [*Cantica Canticorum*], in which Christ is united with his earthly spouse, the pure soul".¹¹⁰ Later, Honorius Augustodunensis and Fulbert of Chartres linked the Virgin Mary to celibacy, claiming that she was the first to take such a vow in her youth in the Temple, and, as such, set the precedent.¹¹¹ Together, these long-established ideas provided the intellectual framework in which the iconography in the chapter house may have extended beyond the Virgin Mary in honouring other virgin saints, thus enhancing even further the

¹⁰⁷ "Templum es," *ibid.*, Book 2, Chapter ii.

¹⁰⁸ "Beatae uirgines, quae tam immortalis spiritalis gratia, ut horti floribus, ut templa religione, ut altaria sacerdote," *ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ Augustine, *Sancta Virginitate*, 67, "Adiuuet Christus, uirginis filius et uirginum sponsus, uirginali utero corporaliter natus, uirginali conubio spiritaliter coniugatus. Cum igitur ipsa uniuersa ecclesia uirgo sit desponsata uni uiro Christo, sicut dicit apostolus."

¹¹⁰ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 24.

¹¹¹ Honorius, *Seal*, 22; Reynolds, *Gateway*, 70-71.

status of the Virgin herself. As Binski has written, the Virgin was “the absolute model for this notion of freedom from bodily and spiritual corruption”.¹¹²

Of the two prominent female virgin saints depicted in the chapter house, Katherine of Alexandria is in CHn4 and Margaret of Antioch was in the first light of CHs4: hence CHn4 is now the more extensive. Its location may be revealing, being immediately to the north of the painted *ut rosa* claim at the entrance. Margaret of Antioch, almost as important as Katherine in the anchoritic literature of the thirteenth century, was in the first light of CHs4. Margaret would thus have balanced Katherine on the south of the entrance, albeit only in one light (although it has been suggested in Chapter 3 that the original intention may have been that a narrative of her life should fill the window).

4.3.1 Katherine of Alexandria

Turning to examine these two narratives, it is clear that specific similarities between the Virgin and Katherine are visually stressed in the windows. As noted, the scenes of Katherine’s martyrdom and her elevation (CHn4:36 and 40) show foliage and fruit, echoing the symbols of the *Cantica Canticorum*. Katherine’s is the only narrative in the chapter house which shares with that of the Virgin Mary a post-death image of the soul’s elevation. In the earlier stages of the historiography of her *Vita*, it was believed that Katherine might have shared with the Virgin the honour of Corporal Assumption. Later, in the ninth century, the dilemma created by the non-existence of any relics was solved by their “discovery” on Mount Sinai, but some ambiguity remained, which is expressed in the fate of Katherine’s soul in York; this is not repeated elsewhere (in Dol, Angers, Auxerre and St-Père in Chartres, for instance, where, as in n25

¹¹² Binski, *Becket’s Crown*, 94.

in the nave of York Minster, a clear distinction is made between her soul and her body).¹¹³ Clearly CHn4 provided a visual version of the fact that, not only did Katherine share Christological features with Jesus, but, through her virginity, she could also be identified with the Virgin Mary.¹¹⁴

In the York Breviary for her Feast, Katherine is constantly referred to as the “virgin”,¹¹⁵ while in *Seinte Katerine*, she is always described as a “maiden”,¹¹⁶ with its connotations of virginity, and this is the way she is addressed by Maxentius.¹¹⁷ This stress in the lives of female saints was extended to other virgin martyrs. Its intensification coincided with increasing involvement of women in the life of the Church in various different forms, and, by the early thirteenth century, there was a trend for women to become anchoresses and recluses, as well as nuns.¹¹⁸ Despite the fact that neither Katherine nor Margaret was held to have been any of these, they became particularly associated with this extreme form of worldly separation.

Relevant here are the representations of Katherine’s prison. Despite the number of occasions that the male chapter house saints were imprisoned for their faith, Peter, Paul and John the Baptist are only shown in prison once each, in respectively CHs2:29, CHs3:29 and CHs4:9.¹¹⁹ In contrast, no fewer than six out of the twenty panels in CHn4 show Katherine in or being moved towards or

¹¹³ *Online Archive*; “French sites,” the cathedrals at Dol, 0:H6; Angers, Bay 125:6a and 6b; the church of St-Père, Chartres, Bay 226:5a-5c; at York Minster, n23:5c (*Online Archive*; “English and Welsh locations”). This reflects the fact that the absence of any early relics of Katherine was explained by the fact that she was elevated to heaven. Only later was her body “discovered” on Mount Sinai.

¹¹⁴ Anke Bernau, “A Christian *Corpus*: Virginity, Violence, and Knowledge in the Life of St Katherine of Alexandria,” in *St Katherine of Alexandria: Texts and Contexts in Western Medieval Europe*, eds. Jacqueline Jenkins and Katherine J. Lewis (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 117.

¹¹⁵ “Virgo”: *Breviarium*, 75, cols. 719-27.

¹¹⁶ “Meiden,” *The Martyrdom of Sancte Katerine, passim* in *The Katherine Group MS Bodley 34*, eds. Emily Rebekah Huber and Elizabeth Robertson (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2016), <http://d.lib.rochester.edu/teams/text/martyrdom-of-sancte-katerine>

¹¹⁷ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 259-284.

¹¹⁸ Winstead, *Virgin Martyrs*, 21.

¹¹⁹ Volume 2, 845, 957 and 1009.

away from her prison (escorted there in CHn4:8 and CHn4:6, removed in CHn4:16, receiving the visit from Christ in CHn4:37 and from the Empress in CHn4:39),¹²⁰ a proportion far exceeding other renderings of the male saints within the chapter house and of Katherine elsewhere.

Furthermore, in marked contrast to other prisons in the chapter house, the construction of Katherine's prison is distinctive because of the inclusion of a tower which breaks the frame of the medallion and thrusts into the grisaille above. This feature occurs in seven of the panels (the angel appearing to Katherine in prison in CHn4:6, being escorted to prison in CHn4:8, visited by the angel in CHn4:9, removed from prison in CHs4:16, returned there in CHn4:26, Maxentius riding from the city in CHn4:30, and visited by the Empress in CHn4:39).¹²¹ While this resonates with Caviness's suggestion, that in the late thirteenth century, the tower was "an easily recognized signifier of patriarchal phallic authority",¹²² it is important to acknowledge that this subliminal response was accorded conscious expression in contemporary literature through the architectural feature of the tower. In Maxentius's departure from the city (and hence away from her prison), in CHn4:30, one of the city towers breaks the frame of the medallion to an extraordinary degree and in this respect can be particularly contrasted with the panel probably painted by the same workshop in CHs4:10 (Workshop 1), where the tower is abruptly cut off at the edge of the medallion showing Edmund meeting his foe.¹²³ In addition to extending the narrative to enable the Faustina and Porphyrius visit to occupy the corner position in 8a above, Maxentius's departure, at the expense of some of the other topics at the end of Katherine's life, may have been included because it

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 683, 671, 699, 755 and 763.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 671, 683, 687, 699, 721, 745 and 763.

¹²² Caviness, *Visualizing*, 113.

¹²³ Volume 2, 745 and 1013.

shows the Emperor defeated by Katherine's faith, as indicated symbolically by the tower of her virginity from which he is riding.

A similar emphasis on prisons and towers in the context of virginity can be seen in windows elsewhere. These include the mid-thirteenth-century windows showing the lives of the virgin saints, Agatha and Margaret, in the Cathedral at Clermont Ferrand,¹²⁴ St-Julien-du-Sault where nine out of the eighteen panels of the Life of Margaret similarly present her in a towered prison,¹²⁵ and Chartres Cathedral, where two of the panels show Katherine's prison with towers.¹²⁶ There is a large tower in her prison in Dol,¹²⁷ while the early fourteenth-century image of Katherine being visited by the Empress in York's n23:5a (Figure 35) depicts her enclosed inside a complicated prison structure, this time sporting two towers.

The textual sources for this analogy are found, for example, in *Holy Maidenhead*, included alongside *Seinte Katerine* in the Katherine Group as part of the *Ancrene Wisse*, where virginity is described as "a high tower" which "signifies the sublimity of maidenhead". The construction analogy observed in the context of the Virgin Mary is thus extended to all virgins. "The maiden stands through sublimity of life in the tower of Jerusalem, [...] the high tower of heaven",¹²⁸ but the greater her virtue the more it is threatened "[...] the higher the tower, the greater the winds",¹²⁹ but the comforting thought is that "no tower, nor castle, nor city is assailed when it is already won".¹³⁰ It is continued in the

¹²⁴ *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedral at Clermont Ferrand, Bays 4 and 5.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, the church at St-Julien-du-Sault, Bay 9.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, the cathedral at Chartres, Bay 16:4b and 8b.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, the cathedral at Dol, east window: H4.

¹²⁸ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 225-226. "Ant meiden stont þurh heh lif i þe tur of Ierusalem," Bella Millett and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, *Medieval English Prose for Women: from the Katherine Group and Ancrene Wisse* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 2-4.

¹²⁹ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 131; "For eaver se herre tur, se haveth mare windes," Anon, *Stanzaic Life of Katherine*, lines 592-601.

¹³⁰ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 131; "Ne castel ne cite, hwen ha beoth i-wunnen," Anon, *Stanzaic Life of Katherine*, lines 592-601.

Somme des Vices et des Vertus by Lorens d'Orléans, dated to around 1279.¹³¹

In its fourteenth-century translation into English, the virgin ranks even higher than the angel, because she is a castle.¹³² There is, therefore, evidence from the textual sources of the thirteenth century about the relationship between building structures, the state of virginity and the New Jerusalem, a line of thought that can be traced back to Ambrose, who prayed that “peace be on your virtue and abundance in your towers”.¹³³

There is also variation in the way Katherine's body is presented within her prison. In contrast to the other incarceration scenes in the chapter house, there is a clear barrier across the lower part of the building, shielding some of her lower body from view (the probable original appearance of the cell in the angel appearing to Katherine in CHn4:6, taken from prison in CHn4:16, re-incarcerated in CHn4:26, visited by Christ in CHn4:37 and by the Empress in CHn4:39).¹³⁴ The lead lines also suggest that, while Katherine may have been dragged towards her prison in CHn4:8 and 26,¹³⁵ on other occasions she is shown as though holding court with the angel, the Empress and Porphyrius and Christ respectively (CHn4:6, 39 and 37).¹³⁶ In CHn4:16,¹³⁷ from the direction of the gaoler's feet, she is shown being dragged reluctantly out of the prison; while this may reflect the enormity of the task she will face in arguing with the philosophers, it also suggests that her prison was becoming a type of sanctuary (and so contrasts with the enthusiasm with which she left prison to face the

¹³¹ Lorens d'Orléans, *The Book of Vices and Virtues*, ed. W.Nelson Francis (London: published for the Early English Text Society by H. Milford, 1942), ix-xii.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 252.

¹³³ “Fiat pax in uirtute tua et abundantia in turribus tuis,” Ambrose, *De Virginibus*, Book 1, chapter viii.

¹³⁴ Volume 2, 671, 699, 721, 755 and 763.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 681 and 719.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 671, 763 and 755. Morgan, “Catherine,” 168 sees this as “reconfigure [ing] the oppositional iconography of the court scenes into one of communication, reassurance and devotion”.

¹³⁷ Volume 2, 699.

philosophers as described in the texts, where she was “delighted to be summoned”).¹³⁸ This aspect of the representation would have deliberately created resonances of the “physical intactness” associated with the religious, virginal female.¹³⁹

A secondary aspect of virginity is also possibly indicated in CHn4. It has been said that, “virginity is not necessarily to be understood in exclusively physical terms, but could also be taken to encompass a state of mind”,¹⁴⁰ following Jerome who, in *The Perpetual Virginity of Mary*, stressed that “a virgin is defined as she that is holy in body and in spirit”.¹⁴¹ Inevitably in the prison episodes Katherine is separated from the other figures (with the significant exception of the presence of a protecting angel in CHn4:39),¹⁴² but this sense of physical and psychological isolation extends to non-prison scenes. With the exception of CHn4:10 (the start of the conspiracy against her which probably does not include Katherine),¹⁴³ she stands to the right, separated from her antagonists, erect, with her hand raised (while protesting to Maxentius in CHn4:7 and in the dispute in CHn4:20), surrounded by empty space.¹⁴⁴ When she is being physically attacked, she is the only figure in the window shown facing forwards (being scourged in CHn4:28 and saved from the wheels in CHn4:38).¹⁴⁵ She is always outnumbered by her opponents in her confrontations, whether they are Maxentius and his advisers or the philosophers. The space around her suggests that a deliberate emphasis was

¹³⁸ Wogan-Browne and Burgess, *Virgin Lives*, 12. “De la sumunse grantjoie ad. Vers le palais mult tost s’en va,” Clemence of Barking, *Saint Catherine*, 19.

¹³⁹ Bernau, “Christian *Corpus*,” 114.

¹⁴⁰ Lewis, *Katherine*, 84.

¹⁴¹ “Virginis definitio, sanctam esse corpore et spiritu,” Jerome, *Virginitate*, Book 1, chapter xx.

¹⁴² Volume 2, 763.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 693..

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 677 and 715. Morgan, “Catherine,” 168. Morgan has identified the space between Katherine and her opponents as resembling the chapter house itself, as a “place of deliberation and the locus of its just resolution”.

¹⁴⁵ Volume 2, 733 and 761.

being placed on Katherine's virginal "state of mind" as well as her physical separation, a feature which resonates with recent assessments of the nature of preferred virginity from the thirteenth century onwards.¹⁴⁶

Again, there are clear associations with contemporary literature, particularly evident in the thirteenth-century *Ancrene Wisse*, featuring *Seinte Katerine* as one of its most significant components: this was directed specifically at anchoresses, but in its stress on their "inner disposition and outer state" as key elements of female virginity,¹⁴⁷ it reflected wider contemporary attitudes. Enclosure was key to demonstrating a religious vocation, with "clear boundaries" created by the cell.¹⁴⁸ This understanding of the nature of their relationship with the world was extended to coenobitical nuns. Bynum's examination of the house at Helfta in Saxony has suggested that, in the late thirteenth century, even they "derived their authority [...] not from office, but from their mystical union with Christ" manifested by their virginity.¹⁴⁹ Ambrose had written of virginity, in the context of the *Cantica Canticorum*, that "that modesty of virgins fenced in by the wall of the Spirit is enclosed lest it should lie open to be plundered".¹⁵⁰ According to Bernau: "the attainment of the 'true' state of virginity involved both the achievement of a correct spiritual disposition, characterized mainly by humility, and physical intactness".¹⁵¹ Thus, the way the female mind protected itself from assailants was a key part of virgin martyr

¹⁴⁶ Ruth Mazo Karras, *Sexuality in Medieval Europe: Doing unto others* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005) 53 quotes Clarissa W. Atkinson, "Precious Balsam in a Fragile Glass: the Ideology of Virginity in the Later Middle Ages," *Journal of Family History* 8 (1983): 131-43 as identifying "a shift in the thirteenth century onward toward the conception of virginity as a psychological and spiritual state [...] rather than a physiological fact".

¹⁴⁷ Anke Bernau, "Virginal effects: text and identity in *Ancrene Wisse*," in *Gender and Holiness: men, women and saints in late medieval Europe*, ed. Samantha J.E. Riches and Sara Salih (London: Routledge, 2002), 36.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 38.

¹⁴⁹ Caroline Walker Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 249.

¹⁵⁰ "Hinc ille murali saeptus spiritu pudor clauditur, ne pateat ad rapinam," Ambrose, *De Virginibus*, Book 1, chapter viii.

¹⁵¹ Bernau, "Christian *Corpus*," 14.

hagiography and its significance may have extended beyond the interest of women to the wider Church.

4.3.2 Margaret of Antioch

The abbreviated cycle which needs to be considered in this respect is the current second light of CHs4, illustrating scenes from the life of Margaret of Antioch.¹⁵² As well as achieving status because of the way she might have dealt with demons and dragons, there is an additional reason for Margaret's potential significance to churchmen. Along with Katherine, she entered the tradition of anchorite literature in the *Ancrene Wisse* as one of the three saints "who best exemplified the Church's ideal of chastity [...] with its sublimation of all earthly desire in the joy of mystic communion with Christ".¹⁵³ As well as being a steadfast virgin, she became a role model for anchoresses through the power she demonstrated in combating the dragon and the demon.¹⁵⁴ In this context, her dragon "is more splendid than any preceding Latin or English version".¹⁵⁵

Of the windows examined which depict events relating to Margaret's life,¹⁵⁶ St-Julien-du-Sault stresses her virginity: as at Clermont Ferrand her incarceration is emphasised, but here the stress is even greater with no fewer than nine out of twenty panels showing her prison and a visual reference to the "virginal tower". In the York narrative, after her initial confrontation with Olybrius, Margaret is cast into prison where she remains for CHs4:17 and 27, and which is implied in her martyrdom in CHs4:37, thus involving three out of the four

¹⁵² It is also to be noted that one of the scenes in the Nicholas light is associated with virginity (CHs4:8), in that Nicholas's gift to the three sisters saved them from prostitution.

¹⁵³ Anon, *Seinte Marherete*, xii.

¹⁵⁴ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 20.

¹⁵⁵ Jocelyn Price, "The Virgin and the Dragon: The Demonology of Seinte Margarete," *Leeds Studies in English*, 16 (1985): 357.

¹⁵⁶ *Online Archive*, "French sites," respectively Bay 15 in the cathedral at Auxerre; Bay 3 in the cathedral at ClermontFerrand, in the amalgamated East window in the cathedral at Dol, Bay 4 in the Abbey Church at Fécamp and Bay 9 in the church at St-Julien-du-Sault. The Chartres panels are in Bay 16 of the Cathedral.

panels of her reduced narrative. While her prison is not as spectacularly constructed as Katherine's and lacks its high tower, colour has clearly been used to mark out the space, blue inside and red outside: she is shown inside a trefoil-headed arch which almost fills the medallion. She remains alone within this space confronting the dragon and, even when she is about to be beheaded, she remains separated from her executioner because, even though the scene has moved outside her prison, an extra pillar divides the arch in two (CHs4:37). As in the texts, "Margaret is provided with a liminal space in which to prepare for her inevitable fate".¹⁵⁷

Margaret's many statements in *Seinte Margarete* focus on her virginity and the rewards she will recoup as a result of its preservation. For her, because of the torture she was enduring, "I can have the reward of maidens in heaven [...].He has set his mark on me with his seal; not life nor death either, can divide us in two".¹⁵⁸ Later, as she was thrown once more into prison, she begged Christ, "always and above all, that you keep my maidenhood unstained for yourself, my soul from sin, my wit and my wisdom from the senseless creature".¹⁵⁹ Finally, she triumphed because, as she was about to be beheaded, she cried, "Bring me to your bright bower, Bridegroom of joy".¹⁶⁰ The textual emphasis tends to be on her relationship with Christ: the dialogues and debates concerning the Virgin Mary which appear in Katherine's *Vitae* are absent.

¹⁵⁷ Katherine J. Lewis, "The Life of St Margaret of Antioch in Late Medieval England: a Gendered Reading," in *Gender and Christian Religion: Papers Read at the 1996 Summer Meeting and the 1997 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. Robert N.Swanson (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by the The Boydell Press, 1998), 129-42, 132.

¹⁵⁸ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 291. "Ich mote meidene mede habben in Heovene. [...] He haveth His merke on me iseiled with His in-seil; ne mei unc lif ne deth nother twemen otwa," *The Liflade ant te Passium of Seinte Margarete*) in *Katherine Group* eds. Huber and Robertson, <http://d.lib.rochester.edu/teams/text/liflade-ant-passium-of-seinte-margarete>.

¹⁵⁹ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 293. "For an thing I biseche The eaver ant overal: thet Tu wite to The mi meithhad unmerret, mi sawle from sunne, mi wit ant mi wisdom from unwitlese wiht. on ecnesse," fol. 24, *Liflade*, eds. Huber and Robertson.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, "Bring me to Thi brihte bur, Brudgume of wunne," fol.32r.

Visually, Margaret's connection with Christ can be inferred from the hand, originally surrounded with its own cruciform halo,¹⁶¹ which blesses her at her execution in CHs4:37.¹⁶²

In *Seinte Margarete*, Margaret picked up the dragon, threw him to the ground and put her right foot on his neck. This is similar to the way she is depicted in CHs4:27.¹⁶³ In the texts, she then stamped hard on him, reciting as she did the extract from Genesis 3:15, possibly with resonances of the trumeau Virgin at the entrance (together with representations of Archbishop Walter de Gray). Visually, the main links with Mary come in the way that foliage grows up the exterior of the prison in CHs4:17 and 27, which may also have originally appeared in the martyrdom in CHs4:37. If the theory that the original intention had been to fill CHs4 with Margaret scenes is correct, it is plausible that these two dragon images, with their Marian associations, were not only the ones intended to fill the key central locations of 4c and 6c but were also those selected for the reduced space if an earlier design scheme had been amended before insertion.

4.3.3 *Significance of the location of the female saints*

Extending these associations is the fact that the only female saints in the ceiling are grouped together, directly above and, in the glass, around the entrance to the chapter house (see Figure 36).

In Christopher Norton's reconstruction of the iconography of the ceiling, of all the religious figures, only Margaret and Katherine were placed above their own windows, mirroring each other in a manner similar to that expressed in their

¹⁶¹ YMA Green Photographic Collection.

¹⁶² Volume 2, 1075.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 1051.

narratives in the glass below. In addition, each was paired with a second female saint.¹⁶⁴ Norton has concluded that, of the second saints in each pair, one is unidentified and the other is “almost certainly” Mary Magdalene.¹⁶⁵ Despite a troubled initial hagiography, Mary Magdalene’s saintly reputation was established by the late sixth century,¹⁶⁶ and she was associated with the Virgin Mary, particularly in the Virgin’s later life. She was possibly represented in the much disturbed CHn2:39,¹⁶⁷ in the scene of Mary’s death, because, before the latest two interventions, Knowles described the presence of two females, one of whom could certainly have been Mary Magdalene.¹⁶⁸

This arrangement of the two windows and the ceiling panels resembles an arch around the entrance, the windows themselves positioned as though in support, and, of the three females that can be identified in the ceiling, all are representative of, or associated with, virginity (Figure 36). The virginal significance of the crenellations on the two entrance stalls will be considered in the context of the chapter house sculpture below. This iconography can be linked to the fact that doors and gateways were specifically associated with the Virgin as an extension of the construction analogy because, “the gate is the eternal virgin, through which, though closed, the King of Heaven entered into the world, into us”.¹⁶⁹

A related observation concerns the links between the border pattern of the light-types of certain windows. It has been concluded that both CHn4 and CH1 were originally in a similar B-B-C-A-A/A-A-C-B-B sequence respectively, while CHs4 was, uniquely to reflect its inclusion of five saints, A-B-C-D-E.

¹⁶⁴ Norton, “Medieval paintings,” 42.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 44.

¹⁶⁶ Jansen, *Magdalen*, 32-33.

¹⁶⁷ Volume 2, 565.

¹⁶⁸ Knowles, “Manuscript Notes,” fol.165r and fol.169v.

¹⁶⁹ Honorius Augustodunensis, *Seal*; Green, “Shekhinah,” 49; while Carr gives “the gate is the eternal Virgin” as the translation of, “porta est perpetua Virgo,” Honorius, *Sigillum*, chapter vii.

However, if, as suggested in Chapter 3, an original design for CHs4 was for it to be devoted to Margaret alone, it is possible that its original design might also have intended an A-A-C-B-B pattern, thus creating a triangle across the chapter house, with CH1 at its apex and the female virgin windows in the remaining angles. Because of what may have been a change in design before the window was created, this has to remain speculation.

4.3.4 *Virginal associations of the male saints*

If links between the Virgin Mary and female virgin saints are manifest, it may finally be profitable to consider whether the inclusion of male saints can be explained on similar grounds. It needs to be recognised that males as well as females were regarded as virgins or as being chaste, the feminisation of virginity and chastity occurring only in the later Middle Ages.¹⁷⁰ This underpins Swanson's argument for the perceived existence of a third gender, which he calls "emasculinity", and which had transcended the male/female dichotomy to apply to all virgins.¹⁷¹ Medieval concepts of chastity, celibacy, abstention and virginity developed and overlapped, with few clear demarcations between these various states.¹⁷² Virginity could be seen as "a spiritual as well as a bodily condition, an asexuality which can be aspired to, or adopted or achieved".¹⁷³ That such links were perceived in contemporary writings may conceivably be

¹⁷⁰ Katherine J. Lewis, "Becoming a virgin king: Richard II and Edward the Confessor," in *Gender and Holiness*, ed. Riches and Salih, 87-88.

¹⁷¹ Robert N. Swanson, "Angels Incarnate: Clergy and Masculinity from Gregorian Reform to Reformation," in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley (London: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999), 161. See also Samantha J.E. Riches, "St George as a male virgin martyr," in *Gender and Holiness*, ed. Riches and Salih, 69.

¹⁷² Karras, *Sexuality*, 29.

¹⁷³ Riches, "St George," 68-69.

connected with the campaign against married clerics in the Church, intensified by the Constitutions of Lateran IV.¹⁷⁴

Members of the York Chapter would have been conscious of their vows of chastity, although, even in the second half of the thirteenth century, married clergy were not completely unknown.¹⁷⁵ Clerical marriage seems to have been particularly persistent in the York See: in the late twelfth century a Willelmus in York often witnessed documents as “filius Archiepiscopi”, probably referring to Roger Pont l'Évêque. In the 1220s Pope Honorius wrote to the Archbishop of York about the presence of married clergy and there was another attempt to remove them from their livings.¹⁷⁶ Birkett has shown how the topic of clerical celibacy featured in the York statutes of 1241 and 1255,¹⁷⁷ although it is not possible to read behind the lines of the statutes to establish the full extent of contemporary breaches.

What is uncertain is the extent to which the iconography of the chapter house extended beyond female virginity to encompass male virginity or chastity.¹⁷⁸ Christ, the supreme male virgin, featured in CH1, Paul initiated the concept of virginity; while Peter's narrative has been shown to vary from the others in its dominant theme because of his special relationship with the Minster liturgy. If the saints included in CHs4 had all been intended from the outset, virginity was associated with John the Baptist,¹⁷⁹ and Edmund, while Thomas

¹⁷⁴ *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 242.

¹⁷⁵ Christopher Brooke, “Gregorian Reform in Action: Clerical Marriage in England, 1050-1200,” *Cambridge Historical Journal*, XII. (1956): 7.

¹⁷⁶ *The Register or Rolls of Walter Gray, Lord Archbishop of York*, ed. James Raine, Surtees Society, 56 (Durham: Andrews, 1872), xxix.

¹⁷⁷ Helen Birkett, “The Pastoral Application of the Lateran IV Reforms in the Northern Province, 1215-1348,” *Northern History*, 43 (2006): 209.

¹⁷⁸ I am grateful to Oliver Fearon, fellow PhD student, pers. comm., 7 June 2015, for drawing my attention to this possibility.

¹⁷⁹ Claire M. Waters, *Virgins and scholars: a fifteenth-century compilation of the lives of John the Baptist, John the Evangelist, Jerome, and Katherine of Alexandria* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 71, 95, 131, 139, 177 and 191.

Becket was seen as chaste,¹⁸⁰ even by his enemies.¹⁸¹ This leaves Nicholas in Chs4 and William in CHn3, whose cults do not emphasise their virgin states but, as Lewis has suggested,

Virginity or chastity was an important aspect of male sainthood in general, and more so than much scholarship has allowed,¹⁸² because it entailed the self-mastery required of any men in positions of authority [...] and [represented] part of what made them distinctive from and superior to laymen. So I suspect it was taken for granted and not mentioned unless sexual continence was a conspicuous part of the saint's life/reputation.¹⁸³

While Lewis's focus is on the male saints of the later medieval period, her research has examined the evolution of the idea of male sexual purity from the early Christian Church.¹⁸⁴ Further support for its importance can be found in Huntington's assessment of the cult of Edward the Confessor, who shows that his incorrupt corpse was associated with both his claimed virginity and his miraculous healing powers,¹⁸⁵ both of which would have been relevant to William. Similarly, Hugh of Lincoln had famously demonstrated his chastity in his resistance to feminine charms to the extent that he cut out a small portion of

¹⁸⁰ Roger of Pontigny, *Vita Sancti Thomae Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi et Martyris* (Vol. 4), 13; and Willelmo, Monacho Cantuariensis. *Vita, Passio et Miracula S. Thomae Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi et Martyris* (Vol. 1), 6 in *Materials*, eds. Robertson and Sheppard, 7 vols.

¹⁸¹ Frank Barlow, "Becket, Thomas (1120?-1170)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/27201?docPos=1>. Note, however, that Callum stresses that his status as a martyr outweighed that of his chastity, P.H.Callum, "Virginitas and Virilitas: Richard Scrope and his Fellow Bishops". In *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr*, ed. P.Jeremy P.Goldberg, (Donington: Shaun Dyas, 2007), 94.

¹⁸² Callum has commented on the way academics "have found the idea of male virginity problematic and not addressed its implications" in an assessment of the significance of virginity in the cult of Richard Scrope in the early fifteenth century, *ibid.*, 93.

¹⁸³ Dr K. Lewis, lecturer at the University of Huddersfield, who has written extensively on medieval attitudes to virginity, pers. comm., 19 August 2015.

¹⁸⁴ For example, Katherine J. Lewis, "Male Saints and Devotional Masculinity in Late Medieval England," in *Gender and History*, 24 (2012): 112-33.

¹⁸⁵ Joanna Huntington, "Edward the Celibate, Edward the Saint: Virginity in the Construction of Edward the Confessor," in *Medieval Virginites*, ed. Anke Bernau, Ruth Evans and Sarah Salih, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2003), 125 and 130.

flesh that a young woman had touched.¹⁸⁶ In his discussion of saint-bishops, Vauchez has shown that, by the thirteenth century, the bishop “ought to be chaste and of irreproachable morals”,¹⁸⁷ as the Papacy pursued a policy of encouraging bishops to accrue the qualities traditionally associated with monks.¹⁸⁸ The thirteenth-century Englishmen to be canonised showed the “strict asceticism [...] so assiduously promoted by the Becket cult”.¹⁸⁹ It is possible that virginity was seen by contemporaries as a part of the saintly status of both William and Nicholas, as well as the other male saints, even if it was not identified or articulated as such.

4.3.5 Theological underpinning

It is clear that there was a general awareness of the association between virginity and the chastity of the saints in the period, but, in the context of a highly educated group of canons, this does not preclude their superior knowledge about the origin of the concept. In Chapter 3 it was hypothesised that Paul was included in the chapter house by virtue of his role as the most important theologian in the early Church, especially through his description of the unity of the Church and the diverse contributions of its members. It has already been noted that his is the only window which shares with the virgin saints a regular feature of foliage up the sides of the medallions. However, further support for his inclusion may be provided by the fact that his writings are also well established as originally setting in train the development of the ultimately prevailing strand of Christian thought on the topic of celibacy. Specifically, the

¹⁸⁶ *The Metrical Life of Saint Hugh*, trans. Charles Garton (Lincoln: Honeywood Press, 1986), 23.

¹⁸⁷ Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 296.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 288.

¹⁸⁹ Anne Duggan, “The Cult of St Thomas Becket in the Thirteenth Century,” in *St Thomas Cantilupe, Bishop of Hereford: Essays in his Honour*, ed. Meryl Jancey (Leominster: Friends of Hereford Cathedral, 1982), 43.

Apocryphal Gospels show that Paul blessed virgins,¹⁹⁰ while 1 Corinthians 7 was “the one chapter that was to determine all Christian thought on marriage and celibacy for well over a millennium”.¹⁹¹

Paul wrote only briefly on the topic, but his influence on the fourth- and fifth-century Church doctors was immeasurable. As well as the works of Ambrose and Jerome, Paul was “a lifelong source of theological inspiration for Augustine”,¹⁹² himself one of the pre-eminent theologians of the early Christian Church, and one whose tussle with his private demons in satisfying the demands for a celibate existence was reflected in many of his writings.¹⁹³ As either “Paul” or, more frequently, “the Apostle”, references to the earlier figure pervade works by Ambrose,¹⁹⁴ Jerome and Augustine on the Virgin Mary and wider virginity and, in Jerome’s case, his text against Jovinianus.¹⁹⁵ In the campaign mounted by Gregory VII against married priests at the end of the eleventh century, the Pope drew on these early patristic texts to justify his policy of clerical asceticism.¹⁹⁶ Peter Damian, in the twelfth century, followed Paul’s lead in explaining the sacramental need for chastity because, “just as Jesus was born of a chaste Virgin, so his rebirth in the blessed sacrament must be

¹⁹⁰ *The Acts of Paul* contain his specific blessing: “Blessed are the bodies of the virgins, for they shall be well-pleasing unto God and shall not lose the reward of their continence, for the work of the Father shall be unto them a work of salvation in the day of his Son, and they shall have rest world without end,” James, *Apocryphal*, 273.

¹⁹¹ Peter Brown, quoted in Will Deming, *Paul on marriage and celibacy: the Hellenistic background of 1 Corinthians 7* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 1. The current study does not enter the debate about St Paul’s meaning in this epistle. It is the way it was perceived and used that is relevant to the thesis.

¹⁹² Allan D. Fitzgerald, ed. *Augustine through the Ages: an Encyclopedia* (Michigan: B.Eerdmans, 1999), 621.

¹⁹³ Eric Leland Saak, *Creating Augustine and Augustinianism in the later Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 2.

¹⁹⁴ Ambrose, *De Virginibus*, *passim*.

¹⁹⁵ Jerome, *Epistolae Secundum Ordinem Temporum ad Amosim Digestae*, *passim*, ed.

Jacques Paul Migne (Turnhout: Brepolis’ Publishers Online), <http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/all/fulltext?ACTION=byid&ID=Z300069344&WAR=N&TOCHITS=N&ALL=Y&FILE=>.

¹⁹⁶ Charles A. Frazee, “The Origins of Clerical Celibacy in the Western Church,” *Church History*, 57, Supplement: Centennial Issue (1988), 123.

solemnized by a priest sworn to chastity”.¹⁹⁷ Augustine’s influence was particularly felt “in the theological, philosophical, religious, cultural and political history of European culture from 1250 to 1550”,¹⁹⁸ notably among thirteenth-century theologians such as Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas,¹⁹⁹ and it is plausible that the thirteenth-century Chapter would have been fully aware of the central position of Paul’s contribution to the discussion. Paul’s significance within the chapter house would thus have been even further enhanced.

4.4 *Sculptural context*

So far, this study has focused on the decoration above the gallery, in the windows and the ceiling. In due course, however, it may be possible to investigate links between this and the carvings in the niches for the seats of the Chapter members, although this research is at a very early stage.

In addition, to the crenellations over the entrance stalls, noted above, under each window there is a row of six seats, articulated with arches and finials, which can also be associated with St-Urbain in Troyes.²⁰⁰ Above these are carvings which have been examined by Aberth and McLaughlin,²⁰¹ both of whom have made suggestions about their original meaning, but whose explanations fail to explain the majority of the figures. Aberth believed that some of the figures represented the medieval Vices and Virtues, but McLaughlin has pointed out that fewer than one half of the carvings can be identified with these

¹⁹⁷ Brooke, *Gregorian Reform*, 3.

¹⁹⁸ Saak, *Creating Augustine*, 7.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 2.

²⁰⁰ See Chapter 1.

²⁰¹ Aberth, “Sculpted Heads,” 37-45 and McLaughlin, “Monstrous beauties,” 2-15. These ideas have been expanded by Julie Thompson, “The Bestial Sculptures of York Minster’s Chapter House: a Moral Program of Vice and Virtue,” MA Dissertation, Southern Methodist University, 2017.

themes.²⁰² The same observation can be made about McLaughlin's main proposal that the carvings are connected to Revelation imagery, although some of her comments allude to what is potentially a more productive line of enquiry addressed in turn by Williamson.²⁰³ None of the scholarship, however, examines the foliated faces mentioned in Chapter 3.²⁰⁴

Williamson's intriguing line of research has examined the most prominent carvings in each bay in the context of the thirteenth-century theological focus on the significance of the five physical senses, linking these with animals as they were depicted in bestiaries (three examples are given in Figure 37).²⁰⁵ In the most persuasive explanation to date, he has suggested that thirty-four out of the forty-two original sculptures can be associated with the senses, either directly or through the portrayal of associated animals. These animal carvings are especially significant because certain creatures were associated with specific examples of the over-indulgence of sensory organs.²⁰⁶ His thesis is that the main carvings demonstrate the medieval preoccupation with the dangers of the misuse of the senses.

These carvings can be further linked to the virginal theme emerging in the decoration of the chapter house in that virgins, above all, were required to be extra vigilant in the way they used their senses. A thirteenth-century summary of the history of the virgin martyr saints asserted that, "as famous champions, they overcame and cast down their three kinds of foe – the devil, and this weak

²⁰² McLaughlin, "Monstrous beauties," 6.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 7-9.

²⁰⁴ These are not explored in this research, although it may be a fruitful line of enquiry to investigate the extent to which they are associated with the Virgin Mary. Certainly in Exeter Cathedral, there are six prominent bosses in the Lady Chapel, together with one label stop of the Virgin standing on a foliated face in the arcade on the north side of the choir.

²⁰⁵ Williamson, "Sculpted figures," 3-9. Ayers has pointed out associations between similar sculptures and the senses, particularly of sight, at Merton College, Ayers, *Merton College*, Part 1, xcvi-xcvii.

²⁰⁶ Williamson, "Sculpted figures," 3-9; Morton W. Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins* (Michigan: Michigan State College Press, 1952), 132-50 and 245-49.

world, and their *body's lusts*" [italics added].²⁰⁷ More obvious links were made in the sermons of Bernard of Clairvaux on the *Cantica Canticorum*. Between 1135 and 1153, he examined each verse and each song up to and including Song 3:1. Here, the relevance lies in the fact that Bernard's clear aim was to reach a level of mystical empathy with the meaning of the *Cantica Canticorum* by which the Word entered the soul "without external manifestation to the senses".²⁰⁸

Certainly it was not by my eyes that He entered, for He has no colour; nor was it by my ears, for He made not a sound. Neither was it my nostrils that discerned His presence, for His sweetness mingles with the mind, not with the air. The sense of taste did not detect Him either, for He is nothing that one eats or drinks; and touch was likewise powerless to apprehend Him, for He is utterly intangible. [...] I knew that He was present only by the movement of my heart.²⁰⁹

In other words the highest level of contemplation in twelfth-century mysticism rendered the physical senses redundant, the same senses whose misuse in a worldly environment could wreak havoc in the interior of man's soul. Inevitably this type of thinking impacted on practical matters. Aelred of Rievaulx's advice to his sister on the *Rule for a Solitary*, for example, does not specify that control of the senses is fundamental to the religious life, but it is

²⁰⁷ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 288.

²⁰⁸ Duncan Robertson, "The Experience of Reading: Bernard of Clairvaux's 'Sermons on the Song of Songs 1,'" *Religion and Literature*, 19, No.1 (1987): 12.

²⁰⁹ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Saint Bernard*, 229-230. "Sane per oculos non intravit, quia non est coloratum; sed neque per aures, quia non sonuit; neque per nares, quia non aeri miscetur, sed menti, nec infecit aerem, sed fecit; neque vero per fauces, quia non est mansum vel haustum; nec tactu comperi illud, quia palpabile non est. Qua igitur introivit? An forte nec introivit quidem, quia non deforis venit? Neque enim est unum aliquid ex his quae foris sunt. Porro nec de intra me venit, quoniam bonum est," Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*. Sermo: 74, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. by Jacques Paul Migne, in *Library of Latin Texts, Series A* (Turnhout: Brepolis' Publishers Online, 2014), <http://clt.brepolis.net.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/lita/pages/Toc.aspx?ctx=1580386>.

implied in the way his section on the “Inner Person” is structured.²¹⁰ There is no indication of whether his sister was even a virgin, but the advice is none-the-less relevant. Following the example of the Desert Fathers, the recluse, according to Aelred, needs to avoid listening to gossip at her window, because of the effect it could have on her private thoughts (Chapter 2),²¹¹ she must be silent and only speak to Christ (Chapter 5),²¹² she must not touch others (Chapter 6),²¹³ she should be veiled and avoid looking at others (Chapter 7)²¹⁴ and food must be taken with the intention of “satisfying [...] without gratifying her appetite” (Chapter 12).²¹⁵ That such ideas were extended to male ecclesiastics can be seen from the steps taken by Edmund Rich (a rare image of whom appears in the vestibule, CHS5:4c) “to make the impact of his external senses as low as possible, not allowing them to admit through their gateways bad influence that would alter his soul”.²¹⁶ Instead, “his inner senses were turned to God and the messages that were conveyed out through the gateways of the senses reflected the goodness of the inner man”.²¹⁷

Turning again to the *Ancrene Wisse*, not because this document by itself influenced the chapter house iconography, but because it has been established

²¹⁰ Aelred of Rievaulx, *De Institutis Inclusarum*, in *Opera Omnia, 1. Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio Mediaevalis*, eds. A.Hoste and C.H.Talbot (Turnholt, Brepols, 1971), chapters 2-12, 638-648.

²¹¹ Aelred of Rievaulx, *Treatises. The Pastoral Prayer*, int. David Knowles, trans. Mary Paul Macpherson (Michigan: Kalamazoo, Cistercian Publications, 1971), 47. “Ante cuius fenestram non anus garrula uel rumigerula mulier sedeat, quae eam fabulis occupet, rumoribus ac detractionibus pascat. [...] Reddita quieti misera, eas quas auditus induxerat, in corde uersat imagines, et ignem premissa confabulatione conceptum uehementius sua cogitatione succendit,” Aelred, *De Institutis*, 638.

²¹² Aelred, *Treatises*, 51. “Silentii grauitatem inclusae seruandam praecipe suademus. Sedeat ergo sola, taceat, Christum audiens et cum Christo loquens,” *ibid.*, 641.

²¹³ Aelred, *Treatises*, 52. “Verum, quia inclusum membris malum illud quod timemus plerumque suscitatur et emollit emortuam senectutem, nec ipsi manum suam tangendam, praebeat, uel palpandam,” *ibid.*, 642.

²¹⁴ Aelred, *Treatises*, 52. “Et ideo inclusa etiam facie uelata loqui debet cum uiro et eius cauere conspectum, cui timore solum debet praestare auditum,” *ibid.*, 642.

²¹⁵ Aelred, *Treatises*, 60. “Sic necessitate conulat, ut et famem repellat, et appetitum non satiet,” *ibid.*, 648.

²¹⁶ Chris M. Woolgar, *The Senses in Late Medieval England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 192. For possible reasons discussed in Chapter 1, Rich is included in CHS5:5c-6c.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*

that the writer was familiar with a large corpus of theological writings which were in wide circulation at the time and which drew heavily on the language of the *Cantica Canticorum* as well as twelfth-century Cistercian mystical writings, Barrett has shown that Part II is a “lengthy discussion of the Five Wits as guardians of the heart”, the five wits/senses being associated with the five wounds of Christ.²¹⁸ Again, the control of the five senses was seen as fundamental to the anchoress’s spiritual path, with the result that they, and the organs of the body associated with them,²¹⁹ form the explicit structure of the text. In the Life of St Margaret in the *Ancrene Wisse*, the terrifying description of the dragon who appeared in her prison cell is similarly based on the sense organs.²²⁰ In *Seinte Margarete*, Margaret’s plea for help from Christ is that he should

Protect my body which is entirely given over to you from fleshy filths, so that my soul is never soiled with sin through the body’s desire [...]. Never let the evil one make war on my wits.²²¹

Inevitably, as the possible avenues for sin, the senses were further associated with the seven vices,²²² supporting and in part perhaps explaining Aberth’s interpretation of the chapter house carvings.

The importance of the five senses in thirteenth-century religious practice cannot be overestimated. The introduction of the obligation for annual penance in the third and fourth Lateran Councils has been described as “the most

²¹⁸ Alexandra Barratt, “The Five Wits and their structural significance in Part II of *Ancrene Wisse*,” *Medium Aevum*, 56 (1987): 12.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 19.

²²⁰ Anon, *Ancrene Wisse*, 294.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 289. “Biwite Thu mi bodi — thet is al bitaht to The — from flesliche fulthen, thet neaver mi sawle ne isuled beo in sunne thurh thet licomes lust thet lute hwile liketh. [...] Ne thole Thu never the unwiht thet hewori mi wit,” in *Liflade*, eds. Huber and Robertson.

²²² Barratt, “Five Wits,” 15.

important legislative act in the history of the Church”,²²³ inspiring texts advising priests on how to conduct these confessions.²²⁴ While several of these concentrated on the seven vices,²²⁵ the sins against the seven virtues,²²⁶ or breaches of the Ten Commandments,²²⁷ they were also structured around instances when the penitent may have misused their five senses.²²⁸ When used to perceive inappropriate objects, specifically the senses could be “the instruments of carnal love”,²²⁹ because “men could be overcome if they did not keep well the sensory gates to the body [as] by these gates the soul went out to outward things and outward things came into the soul”.²³⁰ Conversely, the senses are the means “whereby the outside world enters into man, speaks to him, forms him by means of its latent ability to lead him to God, but this ‘book of the world’ has been made obscure to us by sin”.²³¹

That well-educated thirteenth-century ecclesiastics were aware of the importance of the senses in protecting their souls is beyond doubt. The more they aspired to redemption the greater this imperative would be. Not only did it permeate the ritual of the Church’s annual requirement for penance but the correct use of the senses would affect their own afterlife. If, as argued, Chapter members felt themselves to be assured in their role as part of the Church

²²³ Marion Gibbs and Jane Lang. *Bishops and Reform, 1215-1272, with special reference to the Lateran Council of 1215* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), 97.

²²⁴ *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 245; Woolgar, *Senses*, 11.

²²⁵ J. Goering, “The Summa ‘Qui bene present’ and Its Author,” in *Literature and Religion in the Later Middle Ages: Philological Studies in Honor of Siegfried Wenzel*, eds. Richard G. Newhauser and John A. Alford (Binghamton, N.Y: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1995), 149.

²²⁶ Wenzel, Siegfried. “Robert Grosseteste’s Treatise on Confession, ‘Deus Est’,” *Franciscan Studies*, 30 (1970): 219-20.

²²⁷ Catherine Rider, “Lay religion and pastoral care in thirteenth century England: the evidence of a group of short confession manuals,” *Journal of Medieval History*, 36 (2010): 331.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, 331. D’Orléans, *The Book*, 180 and 225-243.

²²⁹ Carl Nordenfalk, “The Five Senses in Late Medieval and Renaissance Art,” *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 48 (1985): 3.

²³⁰ Woolgar, *Senses*, 13.

²³¹ Geoffrey F. LaNave, “Bonaventure,” in *The Spiritual Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity*, eds. Paul Gavilyuk and Sarah Coakley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 161.

Triumphant and connected to it through William, the saint who had been one of their members, they may also have chosen to reflect the temptations and obstacles encountered by ordinary mortals in the terrestrial world in the lowest level of the chapter house, the implication being that, as canons, they were able to resist such snares. As Ayers has stated, in the context of Merton College, the sculptures would have served additionally as “a reminder of the self-regulation that was required of the new community of secular scholars: all should practise what they were intended to preach”.²³² Even though they may have left their university studies behind them, it is reasonable to suggest that the same considerations were involved at York.

Thus there are indications that the sculptural scheme demonstrates a link between the iconographic focus on the Virgin Mary and virginity and the prevailing attitude towards the five senses, the gateways to the soul, of which virgins, above all, were specifically told to be vigilant. The contortions and grimaces on the faces of some of the main carvings in the terrestrial level, together with the depictions of animals and birds either with their associated “sense” or else attacking the same sense organ in humans, can be seen as a warning to ordinary mortals about how they could best protect their souls. As indicated, it may also be possible to combine the suggestions of Aberth, McLaughlin and Williamson and create an overarching interpretation of the chapter house carvings, which can, in turn, contribute to the debate about the extent of “artistic integration” in medieval art.²³³ The examples in the iconography of the windows and ceiling panels are of those chaste and virginal individuals who, by their faith and their self-control have achieved total unity

²³² Ayers, *Merton College*, Part 1, xcvi.

²³³ Peter Draper, “Interpreting the Architecture of Wells Cathedral,” in *Artistic Integration*, eds. Raguin, Bush and Draper, 127.

with the divine and have succeeded in joining the Church Triumphant;²³⁴ it is entirely plausible that the terrestrial level of the chapter house reflected more earthly concerns as the earliest stage of a vertical progression to redemption.

4.5 Architectural context

However, if the glass, ceiling and wall decoration (together, possibly, with some of the sculpture) indicate an emphasis on Marian and Marian-related themes, can this, too, be detected in the architecture? According to Ayers, stained glass:

can be fully understood only in relation to its architectural context.

Conversely, the medium may be revealing of the ways in which the buildings within which it is set were conceived and perceived.²³⁵

This idea is not new. In connection with the chapter house at Worcester Cathedral, Heslop considered, “the coherence of the scheme was not limited to its pictures and verses but extended to the architectural form of the chapter house itself, which seems to have been regarded as an allegorical representation of Mary”.²³⁶ A similar Marian focus would not negate the possibility of the other resonances already set out, but could complement the themes already examined. If, as Crossley put it, “French churches [amounted to] an accumulation of ambiguous and contradictory meanings, not just the embodiment of a philosophical system”,²³⁷ then the same multi-layered approach might well apply to the York chapter house. Here, with Crossley’s words of caution in mind, what follows is an attempt to explore the possibility

²³⁴ Robert N. Swanson, *Religion and Devotion in Europe, c. 1215-c1515* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 31.

²³⁵ Ayers, *Merton College*, Part 1, lxxviii. Camille, *Gothic Art*, 40, refers to Abbot Suger’s vision of Gothic as “a complete space, a total environment” that transported the observer to “some strange region of the universe which neither exists entirely in the slime of the earth nor entirely in the purity of heaven”.

²³⁶ Heslop, “English Origins,” 792.

²³⁷ Paul Crossley, “Medieval architecture and meaning: the limits of iconography,” *Burlington Magazine*, 130 (1988): 120.

that one of these layers in the overall chapter house design may have been Marian.

One immediate question is whether the pyramidal roof, resembling on a larger scale the top of the towers in the Katherine window and the conical roof surmounting the trumeau Virgin, was in some way also connected with the emerging theme of virginity.²³⁸ Harrison and Norton have drawn attention to its unnecessarily vast size and have demonstrated that it would have been visible, not only above the roof of the north transept, but even above the roof of the twelfth-century choir. By the end of the thirteenth century, in the centrally-planned chapter houses which were unique to Britain, the pyramidal roof was rare. Westminster Abbey's roof was originally low-pitched, like those of Salisbury and Wells.²³⁹ An examination of other roughly contemporary chapter houses suggests the only major pyramidal chapter house roof before York's was that at Lincoln,²⁴⁰ with the building's intriguing thirteenth-century description discussed below. While there is insufficient evidence of any specific iconographic motivation for such a shaped roof, a possible relationship with the towers of virginity, as they appear in CHn4, cannot be ruled out.

Turning to the shape of the chapter house, Gardner's examination of the association between "function and form" in the context of centrally-planned chapter houses was based on monastic, Romanesque structures.²⁴¹ He concluded that the unbroken outer line created a circle, with no beginning and

²³⁸ Stuart Harrison and Christopher Norton. *York Minster: An Illustrated Architectural History 627- c1500* (York: 2015), 36.

²³⁹ William Richard Lethaby, *Westminster Abbey and the kings' craftsmen: a study of a mediaeval building* (London: Duckworth & Co., 1906), 44.

²⁴⁰ Dr J.Alexander, pers. comm., 27 October 2015. Another pointed roof may have been built on the late-twelfth-century tower at the east end of Roger Pont-l'Évêque's eastern arm, Harrison and Norton, *York Minster*, 30.

²⁴¹ Gardner, "Role," 173.

no end,²⁴² and hence was linked to ideas of absolution and regeneration of baptisteries and mausolea, themselves traditionally associated with centrally-planned structures.²⁴³ These in turn resonated with the cult of the Virgin,²⁴⁴ possibly through writings linking her to “death and rebirth, loss and restitution, sinfulness and purity”.²⁴⁵

Supporting evidence for the latter observation is to be found in the tradition of centrally-planned churches dedicated to the Virgin, from the fifth century onwards.²⁴⁶ One theory, that many of these structures were based ultimately on imitations of the rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, has existed since at least the late nineteenth century,²⁴⁷ and it was Krautheimer who explained the variety of the copies of the Anastasis in the Holy Sepulchre by arguing that “the medieval conception of what made one edifice comparable to another was different from our own”.²⁴⁸ In particular, he believed that circles and polygons were interchangeable throughout the Middle Ages.²⁴⁹ An example of which he may not have been aware is the early thirteenth-century description of the chapter house at Lincoln, probably by Henry of Avranches, who saw it as “a circular space” or “*orbiculare*”,²⁵⁰ when it was, and is, polygonal.²⁵¹ Thus, a polygon could be seen as a type of circle, and, hence, the fact that centrally-

²⁴² *Ibid.*, 175.

²⁴³ This link has been established by Richard Krautheimer, “Introduction to an ‘Iconography’ of Mediaeval Architecture,” *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 5 (1942): 22-20.

²⁴⁴ Gardner, “Role,” 173.

²⁴⁵ Anselm in Gardner, “Role,” 213, see also Krautheimer, “Introduction,” 21.

²⁴⁶ Gardner, “Role,” 221, lists La Dourade in Toulouse, the Mausoleum of Theodoric at Ravenna, the Palatine Chapel in Aachen, the round tower church built by Wilfrid at Hexham and the mausoleum of St Edmund (also dedicated as a Chapel to the Virgin Mary), in Bury St Edmunds. See also Krautheimer, “Introduction,” 21 and Richard Gem, “Towards an Iconography of Anglo-Saxon Architecture,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 46 (1983): 7-12.

²⁴⁷ Krautheimer, “Introduction,” 3.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

²⁵⁰ Henry of Avranches, *The Metrical Life of St Hugh*, appended to *The Life of St Hugh of Avalon, Bishop of Lincoln, 1186-1200*, ed. and trans. Richard M Loomis (New York: Garland Publishing, 1985), 93 and 91.

²⁵¹ Binski, *Becket’s Crown*, 56.

planned structures were polygonal does not negate the possibility that they were originally conceptually associated with a circular structure.²⁵²

York's chapter house also needs to be seen in the context of the Marian themes of other chapter houses, whatever the shape, date and nature of the institution. If the discussion is confined to centrally-planned English chapter houses, the importance of her cult has already been identified at Worcester, in the original paintings, where Heslop further argues that "the image, the design shows an iconographic unity without parallel in Romanesque England".²⁵³ At Westminster Abbey, the entrance to the mid-thirteenth-century vestibule and chapter house included sculptures of the Annunciation, the Tree of Jesse and a Virgin and Child,²⁵⁴ and what are possibly some pomegranates and briar roses can both be linked to the Virgin and Child, the former through the *Cantica Canticorum*.²⁵⁵ There was a Coronation of the Virgin over the entrance to the chapter house at Salisbury.²⁵⁶ On the inner side of the west wall of the oval chapter house at Lichfield Cathedral, above the entrance to the vestibule, is a wall painting of the Corporal Assumption of the Virgin. Finally, the possible Marian links in Lincoln are considered below. There is widespread evidence of a general Marian element in chapter houses, whatever the shape of their ground plan.

²⁵² Krautheimer, "Introduction," 6.

²⁵³ T.A. Heslop, "Worcester Cathedral Chapterhouse and the Harmony of the Testaments," in *New Offerings, Ancient Treasures: Studies in Medieval Art for George Henderson*, eds. Paul Binski and William Noel (Stroud: Sutton, 2001), 280.

²⁵⁴ Richard Foster, Pamela Tudor-Craig and Laurence Keen, "The Sculptural decoration of the Westminster Chapter house portals," in *Westminster Abbey Chapter House: the history, art and architecture of 'a chapter house beyond compare'*, eds. Warwick Rodwell and Richard Mortimer (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 2010), 166, have interpreted the sculptural decoration of the chapter house portals as demonstrating that, "in minds contemporary with the chapter house there was [...] an association between the Tree of Jesse and the Virgin Mary, both as channels for holy wisdom – one through prophecy, the other through incarnation".

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 172.

²⁵⁶ Schuler, "Chapterhouse Decoration," 107.

This coincidence of the decorative aspects means that it is more than likely that the overall architectural design of the York chapter house was consciously related to Marian themes, despite Gardner's conclusion that, by the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the adoption of the central plan was "due more to architectural fashion".²⁵⁷ It is thus plausible that a centrally-planned building, a concept originally developed in the context of Romanesque monastic requirements with connotations of the Virgin Mary, might have been retained in non-monastic contexts. Thus the Marian element of the overall design may have been influenced, whether consciously or unconsciously, by two strands of interpretation; first, an association between chapter houses generally and the Virgin Mary, and, second, a connection between centrally-planned churches and her cult.

As already indicated, most of the recent literature has concentrated on the impact of the Holy Sepulchre on the western Church, both in terms of its focus as a pilgrimage venue and of attempts to replicate some of its features.²⁵⁸ However, if a Marian focus is one possible explanation for the specific shape of these centrally-planned chapter houses, it raises further the question of whether perceptions of the Temple may have been a catalyst, especially given its Marian associations.²⁵⁹

Unfortunately, we have no means of knowing precisely what features Henry of Avranches had in mind when he continued his description of the

²⁵⁷ Gardner, "Role," 289.

²⁵⁸ Colin Morris, *The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 41-283.

²⁵⁹ Perring discusses both the Temple and the Holy Sepulchre as significant in the design of the Chapter House, but, because of similarities with Italian Baptisteries, comes down on the side of the Holy Sepulchre, "Iconography," 24-26. She does, however, believe that "the landscape of Jerusalem", whatever its precise manifestation, was "embedded in the construction of the Chapter House," *ibid.*, 27.

chapter house at Lincoln by comparing it with the Temple,²⁶⁰ in that it was “rivalling Solomon’s temple in its stonework and architecture”.²⁶¹ Given the polygonal floor plan and the pyramidal roof shared by the Lincoln and York chapter houses, this comment is especially tantalising. On the one hand, we have York’s chapter house with its decorative allusions to the *Cantica Canticorum* and the Virgin Mary, together with the *Agnus Dei* boss also associated, *inter alia*, with Revelation,²⁶² and the inscription at the entrance. On the other hand we have Lincoln’s, with its “overscaled” stiff leaf corbels,²⁶³ and its perceived contemporary association with the Temple.²⁶⁴ Solomon, of course, was the putative author of the *Cantica Canticorum* as well as the builder of the first Temple, while the Apocryphal Gospels stress Mary’s association with the Temple: as someone who had vowed “perpetual virginity”, this was where she had served.²⁶⁵

Early Christians may have been uninterested in the site of the Temple in Jerusalem, many following the literal teaching of Paul who saw the emphasis on the Christian body as the temple for Christians and not its physical structure,²⁶⁶ but interest in the historical reality of the Temple grew, especially after the Islamic conquest of Jerusalem and their construction of the Dome of the Rock on the Temple Mount. This structure, with its octagonal ground plan and dome,

²⁶⁰ Henry of Avranches, *Metrical Life*, 83; Schuler, “Chapterhouse Decoration”, 104, errs in attributing this description to Gerald of Wales.

²⁶¹ *Metrical Life*, trans. Garton, 61. This is translated from “Materia tentans tempulum Salomis et arte,” *ibid.*, 60.

²⁶² References to the Lamb in Revelation include 5:8, 6:1, 6:16, 7:10, 7:14, 12:11, 13:8, 14:4, 14:10, 15:3, 19:9, 21:9, 21:14, 21:22, 21:23, 21:27, 21:9, 22:1 and 22:3.

²⁶³ Binski, *Becket’s Crown*, 88.

²⁶⁴ It is unfortunate in this respect that Lincoln has lost its decorative scheme, but the reference further connects with the traditional link between pyramidal structures and the Jewish Temple, Heslop, “Worcester Cathedral,” 293.

²⁶⁵ *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew* in James, *Apocryphal*, 73; *History of Joseph the Carpenter*, *ibid.*, 84.

²⁶⁶ 1 Cor. 3:16.

itself influenced by Byzantine structures at the end of the seventh century,²⁶⁷ subsequently became a specific focus for Crusaders and was converted to a Church to the Virgin Mary.²⁶⁸ There is evidence that the Islamic seventh-century Dome was considered to be the original Temple,²⁶⁹ despite biblical descriptions clearly indicating a building of rectangular proportions.²⁷⁰ The particular, if visually mistaken, fascination with the appearance of the Temple of Solomon reached a new level of intensity from the late twelfth century onwards,²⁷¹ and it is not impossible that some connection with what was thought to be the Temple was envisaged in the design of the chapter house (the elevation of Pope Urban IV in 1261, from his previous six-year official role as Patriarch of Jerusalem, with his indirect associations with York, may well have contributed to a renewed focus on Jerusalem constructions).²⁷² It is also of note that the erroneously identified Temple/Dome of the Rock was described as carrying inscriptions stating the importance and merit of the building.²⁷³ This argument conforms to Morris's conclusion that the construction of the Ste-Chapelle to house the "Crown of Thorns" marked a switch of focus away from the Holy Sepulchre in the second half of the thirteenth century.²⁷⁴

²⁶⁷ Simon Goldhill, *The Temple of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2005), 116.

²⁶⁸ C.H. Krinsky, "Representations of the Temple of Jerusalem before 1500," *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 33 (1970): 4.

²⁶⁹ Goldhill, *Temple*, 121. Note the late-twelfth-century description of the "Temple" as "octagonal" by Theoderich, in his *Guide to the Holy Land*, trans. Aubrey Stewart (New York: Ithaca Press, 1986), 25.

²⁷⁰ Krinsky, "Representations," 19, has commented on the extent to which western artists ignored the familiar verbal descriptions of the Temple.

²⁷¹ Giotto showed a structure with a high, four-sided, pyramidal roof on two occasions in his thirteenth-century *Presentation in the Temple* and *Presentation of the Virgin* in the Scrovegni Chapel; Guido da Siena's Temple in the *Presentation of Christ* in the 1270s shows the Temple as a low rise cone supported by eight pillars; it was similar in Uccello's ca. 1435 picture of the Presentation of the Virgin.

²⁷² Connections between York and the Pantaléon family are presented in Chapter 1. Heslop, "Worcester Cathedral," 293, also raised the possibility of a connection between the chapter house there with "the tradition which envisaged the Jewish temple as a cylindrical structure".

²⁷³ Theoderich, *Guide*, 25.

²⁷⁴ Morris, *Sepulchre*, 286-292.

There is thus a tenuous connection linking the Marian and Marian-related themes of the upper parts of the chapter house with medieval visions of the Temple, and they may resonate with the *domus* inscription already discussed. Bearing in mind Krautheimer's words of caution about the way comparators were viewed in the Middle Ages, it is not possible to make a claim for the original inspiration of these centrally-planned structures with any confidence, although equally links cannot be discounted. It is to be hoped that more light will be thrown on the extent of representations of the idea of the Temple and its impact on European architecture in the course of the European Research Council-funded project, *SPECTRUM-Visual Translations of Jerusalem*, led by Professor Bianca Kühnel of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Therefore, a tentative suggestion for the remarkable appearance of the chapter house might involve the grafting of a Marian focus on to a traditional, centrally-planned scheme, which itself might reflect issues close to the heart of the possible instigator of the scheme.

4.6 *Re-assessment of the Five Saints Window*

A theme throughout this thesis has been the unusual appearance of the Five Saints Window. It is unusual not just in the obvious fact that five saints are represented, but also in the degree to which four of their abbreviated narratives fail to reflect the narrative patterns detected in the other windows (Chapter 3). It has already been suggested, both on this basis and because of the relationship between the subject matter of one light of CHs4 and the painted ceiling over the doorway, that there may have been a later modification to an original design in which the life of Margaret was to have filled the entire window. Had this original design been enacted, the virginal focus in the chapter house glazing would

have been even more pronounced. Therefore, the reason for what has been proposed as a later amendment to such a design in order to include the remaining saints, Nicholas, Thomas Becket, John the Baptist and Edmund, needs to be considered.

In Chapter 1 (and shown in Figure 15) it was shown that, of the transept and crossing chantries, three were connected with saints whose images appear in CHs4. One was for John de Craucumbe in the chapel of St Nicholas in the north transept,²⁷⁵ where he was also buried.²⁷⁶ Thomas de Wythene had created a chantry at the altar of Thomas Becket.²⁷⁷ Langton had his special relationship with John the Baptist, where one of his three chantries was located,²⁷⁸ and a perpetual obit was established after 1281 with an annual payment on his anniversary, St John the Baptist's day.²⁷⁹ The nature of the "anniversary" which linked him to St John the Baptist is not clarified although, as the date for the Feast of St John the Baptist falls on 24 June, it predates his death date and therefore is more likely to represent a date of importance to him in his lifetime. Certainly the inclusion of the abbreviated narratives of these three saints breaks the patterns already observed.

There are numerous possible permutations. While there may be no specific explanation other than the fact that they were all popular saints in their own right, the fact that they appear in this specific combination and in a design which differs from the other windows increases the likelihood that a particular symbolism was involved. There is no indication of the reason for the inclusion of Edmund: it is possible that there was another, unidentified, member of Chapter involved for whom Edmund was their personal saint. Alternatively, and more

²⁷⁵ *Fabric Rolls*, ed. Raine, 299.

²⁷⁶ Le Neve, *Fasti*, 43.

²⁷⁷ *Fabric Rolls*, ed. Raine, 302.

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 290.

²⁷⁹ *Charters*, 49-50.

convincing, is the possibility of royal associations: although Edward I was not known as a particularly devout man compared with his father, one of the saints with whom he was associated was Edmund,²⁸⁰ probably because he also perceived himself “not as a man of ideas” but as “crusader and conqueror”.²⁸¹ This raises the possibility that, at some stage, Edward or another unknown major donor, such as his brother, Edmund of Lancaster (whose arms appear, along with those of Clare, most frequently in the tracery, with the exception of the royal arms, and who was named after the East Anglian saint),²⁸² expressed a desire that the evolving scheme should contain a saint with whom they might be associated. While such an alteration was being made, and in order to preserve the inclusion of Margaret, it could have been agreed to devote one light to each, with Nicholas representing Craucumbe and John the Baptist, Langton.

The inclusion of Thomas Becket may have represented some involvement by Thomas de Wythene, but he appears to have remained apart from Chapter activities and was the canon for whom Scarborough cast his oppositional vote in the election for a new archbishop in 1279.²⁸³ He also only survived Langton by four years and died during the possible gap in construction. However, an alternative explanation is that Becket may have been included in the prestigious centre light because of the sub-theme relating to the Barons’

²⁸⁰ St Edmund’s arms were included in the royal host along with those of St George and St Edward in the Scottish campaign, Michael Prestwich, “The Piety of Edward I,” in *England in the thirteenth century: Proceedings of the 1984 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. W. Mark Ormrod (Grantham: Harlaxton College, 1985), 124.

²⁸¹ Jeffrey Denton, “From the Foundation of Vale Royal Abbey to the Statute of Carlisle: Edward I and Ecclesiastical Patronage,” in *Proceedings of the Newcastle upon Tyne Conference, 1991*, ed. Peter R. Cross and S. D. Lloyd (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1992), 123-24.

²⁸² Walter E. Rhodes, “Edmund, Earl of Lancaster.” *English Historical Review*, 10, No. 37 (1895), 20; Simon Lloyd, “Edmund, first earl of Lancaster and first earl of Leicester (1245-1296),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, online edn, Jan 2008, <http://oxforddnb.com>).

²⁸³ *William Wickwane*, 309.

Wars which has emerged from the analysis of Minster politics of the 1260s to the 1280s.

If an underlying Montfortian theme were significant in the politics of the construction of the chapter house, Becket's prominence in CHs4, under the only canopy in the chapter house (and a highly complex one at that), might imply that he was belatedly included because of his status as "the ultimate symbol of political as well as religious opposition" to royal governance.²⁸⁴ This aspect of Becket's cult had been re-launched at his translation in 1220,²⁸⁵ and continued during the baronial conflicts, although, in the atmosphere of official peace and reconciliation of the 1280s, it is unlikely that any such reason would be broadcast.

4.7 Conclusion

Whatever the reason for the five different saints shown in the unusual CHs4, in the rest of the chapter house glazing the emphasis on the Virgin Mary and her role in the Passion and Resurrection is a major theme that emerges from the iconography. As well as Marian aspects of anti-Semitism, there is a stress on female, and possibly male, virginity, not only in the windows but also possibly in the sculpture. These may have been discrete themes demonstrating specific concerns of the late thirteenth-century Chapter, but it is possible, textually, to relate them to a unified Marian focus. There are certainly sufficient common elements across the different media to suggest that the iconographic scheme was planned centrally.

²⁸⁴ Philippa M. Hoskin, "Diocesan Politics in the See of Worcester 1218-1266," in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54 (2003): 430.

²⁸⁴ *John le Romeyn*, Part I, 364 and 391; Hoskin, "Worcester," 438. See also Ambler, "Montfortian bishops," 195 and Duggan, "Thomas Becket," *passim*, but especially 41-43.

²⁸⁵ Sherry L. Reames, "Reconstructing and Interpreting a Thirteenth-Century Office for the Translation of Thomas Becket," *Speculum*, 80, No. 1 (2005): 142.

The conclusion is that the chapter house was at least partly intended to invoke the cult of the Virgin Mary and that this was presented in its decoration, and possibly in its overall architectural design. In this, the glazing scheme was a major component: the main evidence is the prominence given to CHn2, showing the Life of the Virgin and its association with her role in the Passion and Resurrection, together with the parallels between it and the adjacent CH1.

Supporting evidence is found in the unusual trumeau sculpture of the Virgin standing on the beasts at the entrance, together with the original prevalence of the roses (now removed and only partially replaced) which decorated the ceiling and the roses and lilies which were present in the vestibule. The inscription inside the chapter house, on the left, has clear *Cantica Canticorum* associations in its grammatical structure and Marian links in the *rosa* and, possibly, the *domus*. The *Cantica Canticorum* was the text which had finally been adopted as the basis for the liturgy for the Marian feasts in the western Church, there having been a prevailing sense of caution about the value of the Apocryphal Gospels in its description of the Virgin's death and Assumption. It may be possible to link the extent of foliage in the carvings, bosses, grisaille and key scenes in the narratives in, for example, CHn4 (Katherine) and CHn2 (the Life of the Virgin) to the same inspiration, just as perceived Jewish attacks on the concept of the virgin birth may have been the catalyst for the anti-Semitic nature of some of the imagery. It is also possible that the architectural design of the entire building was intended to resonate with Marian structures elsewhere. Finally, as Binski has pointed out, aspects resonate with the "battlement figures" over the piscina at St-Urbain, whom he

associates with the “custodians, watchmen, of a Marian building, following Isaiah, 62:5-6” (see Figure 7d).²⁸⁶

While the concept of virginity clearly emanated from contemporary intellectual concerns, its emphasis in the decorative scheme could have been related to Gray’s memory, for whom it appears that the state of virginity had special significance. Having resisted his imposition as archbishop for several months in 1215, when the York Chapter eventually reluctantly succumbed and supported his nomination, the only reason they gave was the unusual accolade that he “had been a virgin from the day he left his mother’s womb”,²⁸⁷ even Innocent III reportedly acknowledging his chaste reputation.²⁸⁸ In Gray’s appointments, “he insisted upon clerical celibacy”,²⁸⁹ insofar as he repeatedly resisted the hereditary acquisition of benefices.²⁹⁰ The possibility of a contemporary, if unexpressed, association between William and the concept of virginity has been discussed: William was placed opposite the narrative of Paul, the originator of the theme of virginity in Christianity, and between the leading virginal figures of Mary and Katherine of Alexandria.

²⁸⁶ Paul Binski, *Gothic Wonder: Art, Artifice and the Decorated Style, 1290-1350* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014), 152.

²⁸⁷ Roy Martin Haines, “Walter de Gray, Archbishop of York,” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/11566?docPos=2>.

²⁸⁸ Solloway, “de Gray,” 3rd page; Dixon, *Fasti*, 281 gives Innocent’s words as “per Sanctam Petrum virginitas magna virtus est et nos eum damus vobis”.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 3rd page; Haines, “de Gray”.

²⁹⁰ H. Lowther Clarke, *Walter de Gray, Archbishop of York (1215-1255)*, 17-19. His success can be seen from the fact that there are only three recorded occurrences of hereditary parsons after 1215, in marked contrast to the previous century, J.E.Newman, “Parochial Patronage: Yorkshire in the Thirteenth Century,” *The English Historical Review*, 92 (1977): 282.

CONCLUSION

The chapter house is one of the most extraordinary ecclesiastical structures from late thirteenth-century England, with a wealth of surviving or recorded decoration. Nevertheless, while studies have been conducted into its non-glazing elements, it is only with an assessment of the glass itself that it becomes possible to consider the full extent of its artistic integration.

C.1 *The Windows*

In order to examine the scheme, first the original narrative sequences of the windows have been established, necessitating, in turn, an examination of the different repair exercises. This has revealed the application of similar criteria and methods, enabling coherent suggestions for the original sequences and appearance of the panels to be made. From this process it has emerged that, until the eighteenth century, while plumbers and glaziers clearly repaired individual panels, they focused on the border designs as guides to replacing them in the windows. However, given that four lights generally share two border designs, it meant that some panels were erroneously moved between light-types and so the sense of a narrative sequence was lost. In the eighteenth century repairs concentrated on symmetry of design, moving entire lights to a different location within three of the windows, resulting in an additional major interference with the narrative sequence. Subsequent repairs concentrated on changes to individual scenes in the medallions, after which, until World War II, they were replaced in the position in which they were found. Fortunately, in the course of these repairs, the glazier/plumbers tended, as far as possible, to replace glass with that of a similar colour, which means that many panels still bear some resemblance to their late seventeenth-century descriptions even if

the glass itself is of a different date. This applied even to the window which exists only in a nineteenth-century copy (formerly CH1). The only interventions involving iconographic factors were those undertaken by Sanderson in the 1760s in CHs3 and, later, Dean Eric Milner White in the late 1950s, when alterations were made in accordance with the dean's preferred, but now sometimes debateable, interpretations, particularly affecting CHn2 and CHs2, but panels in other windows were also affected.

Only through a detailed examination of the restoration history of the glass, together with contemporary visual and textual affiliates, has it been possible to arrive at new reconstructions for five of the windows. These are generally plausible, with the exception of the two less-than-satisfactory suggestions for CHn2. These, in turn, have demonstrated a common iconographic approach across all the original designs, which reinforced the unifying visual effect of the bands of colour and grisaille circling the building. The narratives were largely chronologically sequential, starting with 2a and culminating in 8e, except CHs4 where separate saints are represented in each light and, to a lesser extent, CHs2, which shows the life of Peter, the Minster's patron saint. The eighteenth-century re-ordering of CHs3, showing Paul, has been largely confirmed and Morgan's explanation of the re-arrangement of CHn4, containing the life of Katherine, has also been upheld.

In the descriptions of the windows below, the CVMA numbers for the panels relate to their original locations as shown in Figure 26.

C.1.1. The narrative of the Passion and Resurrection window

The theme of the east window actually extends beyond the Passion and Resurrection to encompass the Last Judgement. In this, it covers a more

extensive part of the triumph of the Christian message than has been found elsewhere in thirteenth- and fourteenth- century schemes. Only in St-Père, Chartres does another window include all three elements,¹ although a Last Judgement is included in more extensive manuscript sequences, such as the Carrow Psalter, Grandisson Psalter, the Taymouth Hours and the Queen Mary Psalter.²

With this exception, and based on the hypothesis that the copied CH1 panels are reasonably accurate, most of the scenes are generally ones which would have been expected. In common with the other chapter house windows, the focus on the Crucifixion and Resurrection is shown in the central panels (4c and 6c) with a thematic and visual relationship between the two. The narrative starts in 2a with Christ demonstrating his role in the Christian scheme by opting to enter Jerusalem, juxtaposed with the culmination of his role in redemption with him in Judgement in 8e. The pairing of his Arrest in 2e and his Ascension in 8a is less explicable: the obvious observation that one represents his earthly incarceration contrasting with his divine liberation is possible, but does not immediately seem to be particularly central to the Christian message.

Within these parameters, there is an unexpectedly abbreviated Passion, showing Christ's Arrest, Flagellation and death, hence omitting his coronation with thorns and his encounters with figures of authority, the High Priests, Pontius Pilate and Herod (all, for example, are shown in Bay 0 in the Sainte-Chapelle).³ Unusually, his betrayal by Judas is excluded in favour of his healing Malchus's ear, severed by Peter, while the anti-Semitic tone found in several of the other windows is reduced (albeit alluded to in the panel in 2c where Judas

¹ *Online archive*, "French sites," the abbey church of St-Père, Chartres, Bay 217.

² Respectively, the Carrow Psalter, fol.30v; the Grandisson Psalter, fol.25; the Taymouth Hours, fols.136-38 and the Queen Mary Psalter, fol.302v.

³ *Online Archive*, "French sites," Paris, Sainte-Chapelle.

appears to be coming to his arrangement with the High Priests). The omission of several of the Passion scenes means the emphasis of the window has been changed to include not only Christ's suffering and sacrifice but also his eventual triumph. It is, however, notable that the two main omissions of, first, his confrontation with figures of authority and, second, an extended representation of his suffering and sacrifice, were the foci of the two flanking windows: in the central positions in CHs2, Peter represents the Church before the High Priests in Jerusalem and the secular authorities in Rome, while the central focus of the Virgin Mary window, in CHs2, is on sacrifice and suffering in the design of the Purification and the Adoration of the Magi panels.

Given the low number of panels devoted to the Passion, the post-mortem scenes are of particular interest in that they include the three incidents which had historically been relied on as evidence of Christ's Resurrection, namely the three Marys at the tomb, *Noli me Tangere* and doubting Thomas. For all three to be included possibly reflects their inclusion in a more litigious and theological milieu than other windows elsewhere on the same theme. Again, this collection has only been found in Bay 217 in St-Père, Chartres.

However, the most unusual features of the window are emphasised in the top narrative row where three of the panels, the Ascension, Pentecost and a highly unusual Coronation of the Virgin, in the prestigious central light, include the Virgin Mary. Earlier in the narrative, other scenes seem to have been modified to allow for her inclusion, meaning at least seven of the medallions show her. As discussed in Chapter 4, such a degree of Marian stress has not been found elsewhere, and it sets the scene for much of the Chapter House glazing programme.

C.1.2. The narrative of St Peter

To the right of the Passion and Resurrection window is that of St Peter. In its design it is visually associated with the Virgin Mary window. They are the only windows which share a similar large medallion shape within an inner iron frame, together with what in this work have been called “strip features” between the outside of the medallion and the iron frame. Given that the two windows were created by two different workshops, this must have been part of the original overall design. The location of the window is because of Peter’s status within the evolution of the church, his role as the first pope and his position as patron saint of the Minster.

The stress is on Peter’s selection by Christ, featuring, as it did, in his call by Christ, Christ’s invitation to him to walk on water and confirmation of his status when Christ described him as “rock” of the church, which was even more indicative of his status in the Church hierarchy than the more common granting of the key to heaven. These are all placed in corner locations, disrupting a simple chronological account. The fourth corner emphasised his identity with Christ in that he selected his martyrdom to be a more humiliating form of Christ’s Crucifixion. The first three scenes are the only ones in the window which show events before Christ’s Ascension, after which the role of leader falls on Peter.

The ways Peter exercised the powers given by Christ were evidenced through his miracles, his role in the evolving priesthood and the way he exerted discipline and authority. In row 2 were the two panels devoted to the miracle of the healing of the cripple, the first one he (or any apostle) performed after Christ’s Ascension and which was, by the thirteenth century, a rare inclusion in

Petrine narratives. The trust that he inspired is shown in the first two scenes in row 4 (where he preached to the multitude and healed with his shadow).

His exercise of discipline within the Church and his leadership role in combating Simon Magus show his authority, and, as discussed in Chapter 3, this is further stressed through his confrontations with powerful figures such as the High Priest in Jerusalem and the Emperor in Rome in the significant central positions of the window (4c and 6c). At the end of row 4 is the introduction of the theme of him as a disciplinarian within the Church in the way he punished Ananias and Sapphira for the way they tried to cheat him of Church funds.

Row 6 started with the leadership he exercised in welcoming non-Jews into the Church (another rare inclusion by the thirteenth century and ironic considering that he was the apostle who resisted such a course of action until the meeting with Paul shown in CHs3:37).⁴ It finished with his ever-increasing status in that it was he who confronted Simon Magus in the presence of the Roman Emperor. Unlike some of the other incidents in CHn2, scenes showing Simon Magus were popular in windows in the course of the thirteenth century, associated, as they were, with the papal campaign against simony, which had received a boost from the decisions of the Lateran Council in 1215. It has been demonstrated that the language of the liturgy is drawn overwhelmingly from the accounts of Cornelius and Simon Magus, as well as the panel in 8a in the row above.

The culmination of Peter's status can be seen in the top row, especially in the scenes relating to his two main feast days, that of St Peter in chains and his martyrdom, the two panels relating to the former being placed well outside

⁴ Of potential interest is the relevance of the fact that the healing of the cripple and the Simon Magus could have been seen in Old St Peter's and St John's Oratory in Rome in the middle of the thirteenth century.

their true chronological position, which would have been more appropriately in row 4.

The design of CHs2 thus demonstrates a roughly chronological narrative, but one that is superimposed by a vertical narrative of Peter's acquisition of authority and sanctity, from disciple to his role as the successor of Christ on earth. This means that there is a disruption from the strict chronology of the narrative to create a greater emphasis on the liturgy and his selection by Christ than in the other windows in the chapter house. Hence it seems that the vertical hierarchy worked in tandem with, and at times took priority over, the chronological evolution. No window has been found from the thirteenth- and early fourteenth centuries which stresses the implications of Christ's selection of Peter in such detail, nor the liturgical aspects of his cult.

C.1.3. The narrative of the Virgin Mary

It has been shown that the narrative of CHn2 is that of the Virgin Mary, rather than the hybrid title, combining her death with the early life of Christ, that has been used to date. This is stressed by the fact that Gabriel is holding a palm, the symbol of her death, in the Annunciation panel in 2a, serving to combine this with her death in the later part of the narrative. The palm also provides an association with the opening panel in CH1, when Christ was greeted by crowds outside Jerusalem who were also holding palms, and with the uncanonical scene opening the brief narrative of John the Baptist, when an angel visited him in prison. That the window shows her life is further emphasised by the fact that key scenes in the early stages, such as the Annunciation and the Purification, were celebrated as Marian rather than Christological in the thirteenth century. The change in title is intended to indicate the Marian focus in the window as

opposed to the way it is currently summarised as an adjunct to the early life of Christ.

The inclusion, if the slightly preferred Option 2 is accepted, of one scene of her Coronation in 2e reinforces the Marian/virginal focus which can be detected in the chapter house glazing. It is accepted that this positioning is not immediately convincing, but the conclusion has been arrived at as the result of a process of elimination. No other panel has been identified that could have been placed in 2e, while, as the glazing scheme of the chapter house was clearly designed as a unit, its position in CHn2 arguably sits more happily with the fact that the adjacent Coronation in CH1 is prominent in the centre of the top narrative row. Here it fulfils a different function, providing a juxtaposition with the burial of the Virgin in 8a (see below).

With this exception, the early scenes of the birth of Christ and the adoration of the shepherds and the Magi are such as would have been expected in a late thirteenth-century window, even if there are some unusual aspects of their presentation. As discussed, the Purification panel, in 6c, is the only example found where Simeon is placed on the same side of the altar as Mary and Joseph. This was presumably designed deliberately so that the three figures in the Purification mirrored the exaggerated pose of the three Magi offering their gifts in the panel below. The position of this Magi panel is also notable in that it was placed in an unusually extended Magi sequence, meaning it was placed centrally, while a more expected focus for the window might have been the Virgin and Child enthroned which is actually in the adjacent location in 4d. The focus thus becomes an emphasis on gifts, sacrifice and the portent of the suffering the Virgin will face, in which it arguably indicates the suffering which was reduced in CH1.

The suggestion in Chapter 4 is that many of the scenes in CHn2 were deliberately chosen to reflect those in CH1, thereby reinforcing the status of the Virgin as almost a co-redemptrix with Christ. This is particularly so in the choice of scenes for Mary's death, which are unusually detailed; indeed, only in the nineteenth-century panels in St-Urbain (relevant if they were accurate copies of the original) has such an extensive sequence of her death been identified, just as this is the only other sequence where there is an inclusion of the "whiteness" of the Virgin at the point of her death in CHn2:38.

This extended emphasis on Mary's death makes the omission of a scene showing the Corporal Assumption even more unusual. In this it is a clear confirmation of the circumspection of the York liturgy about its validity, and hence arguably reflects the determination of a small group within Chapter to uphold the liturgy of their cathedral.

The second main theme that is based on the Virgin Mary window is that of virginity and its ever-increasing importance in the course of the thirteenth century. This was focused on the intensifying hostility to the Jews which resulted, in England, in a series of limiting actions by the state and mob assaults, which culminated in their expulsion in 1290. In all of this, the literature makes it clear that the role of the champion of Christianity fell on the Virgin Mary. Jews were persecuted because they attacked her reputation, while she became the symbol of Christian resistance to their perceived onslaught. The worse they were seen to behave, the more her Coronation indicated this resistance. Hence, for Option 2, two panels showed the Jewish attack on her funeral procession and its aftermath, in 8a and 8b, juxtaposed by the Coronation scene in 2e.

Hence virginity is a central theme in the chapter house glazing (as well as, possibly, its sculptural and architectural programme). In the Passion and Resurrection window, virginity is stressed through the contrived number of panels where Mary is present. In the Peter window, it is less relevant because of the particular emphases of his cult. In CHn2, it is mainly shown in design features in the scenes which focus on the way the foliage associated with the liturgy of Virgin is used. This is not just in the grisaille (which occurs throughout the chapter house), but particularly in the way it is incorporated in so many of the panels, normally up the sides as through framing the scenes. In this it creates links with the other virgin representations, such as two key panels in the Katherine window, CHn4, the Margaret light in CHs4, as well as CHs3 showing Paul. In addition to foliage up the sides of some of the panels, CHs3 and CHn2 are the only windows which share a light with a blue and white border (CHn2 has snaking white oak leaves on a blue background in the B lights, while CHs3 has white fleurs-de-lys on a blue background in the C light). This link between the virgin saints and Paul has been explained by the fact that he was the theologian on whose ideas the cult of virginity was based.

C.1.4. The narrative of St Katherine

The window showing the life of St Katherine holds few surprises as far as its contents are concerned. What are significant are the way some of the scenes have been presented and, again, the emphasis placed on certain sequences as opposed to others. Iconographically, the significance of the window lies in the fact that it resonates with what Christ had to endure in his Passion, as well as the importance of virginity in the late thirteenth century.

The narrative opens with Katherine taking the decision to refuse to make an animal sacrifice in the pagan temple, which leads, inevitably, to her martyrdom in 8d. However, it is notable that the culmination of her cult is seen, not as her death, but as the elevation of her soul to heaven (8e), in a key resonance of the raising of the soul of the Virgin Mary in the same position in CHn2.

One way that Katherine appears in the window is that she is a virgin, which is also a feature of her liturgy. This is achieved in the way the contents of the panels have been designed. In addition to the foliage in the two key panels of her martyrdom and the elevation of her soul (resonating with the other virgin-oriented windows in 8d and 8e), the inclusion of the high tower of her prison and the physical lower barrier in front of her links her with the extensive literature about virgins and anchoresses prevalent in the thirteenth century. Not only is she a virgin in the way she protects her body but she is also shown as preserving a symbolic space around her in those scenes where she is not within the confines (or security) of her prison.

However, the structural emphasis in the narrative is on the perception of Katherine as being Christological. This is the similarity of her flagellation to that of Christ in the Passion and Resurrection window in her Christ-like stance in 6c and the culmination of the conspiracy against her in 4c. Her window may well have shared a border design with the same window (her B-B-C-A-A light pattern may have been reflected in a similar organisation of the sequence in the Passion and Resurrection window). The emphasis on the development of the Christ-like conspiracy between the secular and religious authorities against her takes up four panels in 2e-4c. In 4d Katherine is then dragged from prison to face the philosophers and the actual encounter is in 4e. The evolution of the

plot is further stressed because there is no interruption in the sequence: the slight relief in the textual sources of the angel coming to Katherine's support the night before the confrontation has been moved, out of sequence, to 2d in advance of the initiation of the plot. No other contemporary window shows such a protracted sequence: in the cathedral at Chartres, as elsewhere, the stress is on the confrontation and subsequent conversion of the philosophers, while in York only one panel is devoted to each (4e and 6a).⁵ The Christological aspect is further intensified by the fact that, as argued above, at least the leader of the pagan philosophers is, as normal by the end of the thirteenth century, presented as a Jew. In this, it combines the historical hostility of the Jews to Christ with the contemporary hostility of the Jews to the Virgin Mary and, hence, virginity in its wider sense.

In this Christological connection, Katherine is seen as a figure of faith more than of learning. This is the way she is presented in the liturgy for her Feast day. It is also reflected in the fact that the window, unusually, shows no interest in the fate of the Empress. Elsewhere Faustina's torture and death can occupy as much space as the end of Katherine's life (as in Auxerre and Chartres),⁶ but in York this would have been seen as a distraction from the main focus of the narrative.

It has been argued that the location of the Katherine window is significant, as one pillar of a virgin-oriented archway around the door of the chapter house. From this, and other evidence, it has been surmised that there may have been an original intention to devote an entire window to Margaret in CHs4 as the opposite pillar in the archway. If so, it would be reasonable to speculate that this original window might have shared a similar border

⁵ *Online Archive*, "French sites," the cathedral at Chartres, Bay 16.

⁶ *Ibid.*, the cathedrals at Auxerre and Chartres respectively, Bays 26 and 16.

sequence to the Passion and Resurrection and Katherine windows creating a visual triangle across the chapter house.

C.1.5 The narratives of the Five Saints

The suggestion that an original scheme may have been to devote the entire window to Margaret rests largely on the fact that her light alone, of the five in the window, shows the same elements that have been identified in the other main windows. She is linked to the Virgin Mary, Paul and Katherine windows through the motif of flowers up the side of the panels. She is shown as making a decision in the first light (currently 2b) which results in her martyrdom (8b) where there is also an indication of divine approval. The central panels (4b and 6b) show a strong visual and thematic association, even more remarkable in this presentation because they amount to half of the four of the panels devoted to her, the suggestion being that these might have been the scenes originally intended for the positions in 4c and 6c in a narrative that filled the window.

While the saints in the other lights in CHs4 fit the chapter house pattern in that they reflect the liturgy in the Use of York for their feast days (notably the emphasis in the Thomas Becket light on the events of his life rather than his post-mortem miracles), they do not display the same shared narrative emphases. In fact, they more closely resemble preferences about particular events made by individuals (whether donors or agents acting to honour deceased donors) than decisions taken as part of a unified narrative scheme. Possible connections with Edmund of Lancaster, John de Craucumbe, and executors or well-wishers of William de Langton and, possibly, Thomas de Wythene, have been identified.

Otherwise it is difficult to explain the appearance of the window. To state the obvious, it contains five saints as opposed to the one in the other windows, each one marked out by different medallions, colour schemes, border design and grisaille.

C.1.6 The narrative of St Paul

The Paul window falls into the same category as Peter, the Virgin Mary and William, in that its borders were definitely in the A-B-C-B-A sequence. A second visual link is made with the Virgin Mary window in that these are the only two windows to have a white on blue border as indicated above, while his involvement with the notion of virginity was indicated in the way the foliage is included in the designs.

The emphases in the Paul narrative were provided by the number and location of the panels. The narrative of St Paul largely follows the biblical sequence after he accepted the commission to travel to Damascus to persecute Christians in 2a, the decision which ultimately led to his martyrdom in 8e. The only adjustment to the chronology was the move of the panel showing Paul preaching within earshot of the youth who may have been Patroclus in 8a which should have occurred after 8d, when he arrived in Rome.

What is of note are the way that sequences have been contracted or curtailed to create a particular iconographic impact, and the selection of other unusual panels for inclusion. It has been shown that the chronology of his conversion on the road to Damascus (in 2b) and his subsequent baptism has been truncated, creating a space for a generalised preaching scheme to be located in 2e. This, in turn, created a diagonal across the window with the Patroclus panel in 8a, which, in turn, necessitated the use of only one panel for

Paul's condemnation and martyrdom, assuming the Malta scenes were desired. Doubtless, this was with a view to achieving an emphasis on Paul as a preacher and hence as a thinker and theologian (which is the way he is presented in the York liturgy). Related to this focus was the extremely rare inclusion of CHs3:17 in 4b, showing his powers of persuasion in that Peter was convinced to welcome non-Jews into the Christian Church, itself depicted in the Peter narrative when Peter is seen baptising the non-Jewish Cornelius.

Of equal importance is the rarity of the Lystra and Philippi scenes in both windows and manuscripts. Neither appear in the few windows to survive, while it was observed above that only individual incidents appear in manuscripts, namely one image each of Paul healing the cripple at Lystra,⁷ stoned there,⁸ and healing the mad girl in Philippi.⁹ Their extensive inclusion must have been significant for the York chapter house design, even though the partial Lystra sequence starts after the initial miracle and so is incomplete. The reasoning is not clear, but it can be observed that both of them either included Jews as evil characters (4c) or were amenable to an inaccurate depiction of a figure as an evil Jew (6b). The only other possible explanation is that these are the only two sequences in which Paul was punished by the authorities (as opposed to the rabble) and this punishment was manipulated in both rows so that it fell in the central locations (4c and 6c). This possibly resonates with Peter in the adjacent window, in that Peter, the leader, confronted the hostile authorities, while Paul was punished by them.

⁷ Avranches, MSS 2 and 3, fol.292v, Eleen, *Pauline Epistles*, 80-81.

⁸ Troyes, MS 2391, 225v, *ibid.*, 79.

⁹ Avranches, MSS 2 and 3, fol.294, *ibid.*, 80-81.

C.1.7 The narrative of St William

There has clearly been an attempt to incorporate William into the premier league of saints, even though the details of his life fall into a very different pattern from the others. They all (except Nicholas) made a decision which led to their lives being changed and which culminated in their deaths.

William's path to sanctity was different. The main emphasis in his *Vita* and hence the liturgy for his Feast is on the events after his death; namely the miracles at his tomb (and, after 1284, additionally his shrine). However, it was obviously important to those involved in the design of the window that he should be presented as one of the main saints and so his narrative is presented in a similar way to the others. The border design shares the A-B-C-B-A pattern of Peter, the Virgin and Paul. He is adjacent to the Virgin Mary, and the green and russet glass in his B border is resonant of the green and yellow B border in the Paul window opposite (the only other border to contain green is that of John the Baptist in CHs4).

The narrative omits the early part of William's career. There is no reference to his first tenure as archbishop. Instead the narrative starts with his decision to return to York for his second consecration: the first panel shows him crossing Ouse Bridge (at which it was later seen one of his miracles took place in that nobody drowned when the bridge collapsed). It can be seen as his making an irrevocable decision which resulted in his death, probably in 2d, within a few days of his arrival. Hence his death is not and cannot be presented as the culmination of his cult. When his tomb was opened after a fire, his body was discovered to be incorrupt and the corner position in 2e showed the authorities' amazement. Juxtaposed with this panel, in 8a, was a panel which might have showed the first involvement of a heavenly being in that an angel

may have been celebrating his imminent canonisation, but the evidence for this is based on a partial 1690-91 description.

After the opening of his tomb and judging from the partial survival of the panels, the narrative concentrated on the miracles that were performed there. However, the pattern of the other main windows was retained in that the central panels, in 4c and 6c, were similar in their appearance and their theme: both showed key miracles being performed at the tomb (in contrast to the way the tomb was shown in 2e, it has now, possibly, acquired the “shrine-like structure” which was erected over it).

By the top row, William’s miracles in reviving at least two dead boys are shown and the final panel probably indicated his canonisation (as opposed to his 1284 translation to the east end of the Minster).

Given the emphasis, William is thus presented as the most powerful of the miracle-workers among all the major saints and his narrative has been adjusted so that it matches the others. As discussed above, this claim would also entrench the importance of the Minster and the Chapter of which he had been a member for so many years and assert his status over that of Canterbury’s rival for the relics of a pre-eminent miracle-worker, Thomas Becket.

C.2 *The context*

A comparison with surviving illustrations and texts created or available in the late thirteenth century thus indicates certain anomalies in what was included and omitted, and the extent to which some sequences were expanded or contracted. The impression is that the narratives were manipulated to create particular emphases on the central and corner positions: the central panels in

each window demonstrating a visual or thematic similarity, the diagonal corners showing a concern with the way that the individual's exercise of free-will related to their saintly state, and their contribution to the Christian world through their individual qualities.

While all the scenes can be interpreted as expressing an *imitatio Christi*, there is a high degree of subtlety involved in the choices, which may have reflected more complicated themes of the unity and diversity of Church members and resonated with the varying contributions of individuals within a highly-educated Chapter. The suggestion here is that, in this, there was a deliberate attempt to reflect Pauline theology (or at least reflect a world view that originated in Paul's writings). There are also features in the glass which suggest the liturgical influence of the Use of York. The effect of the iconographic programme is of a unity of design and purpose, possibly reflecting a Chapter, most of whose active residential members perceived themselves as united in opposition to an archbishop who had been imposed on them between 1266 and 1279 and conscious of the liturgy it was responsible for upholding. Whatever the markers specifically informing the scheme, it appears that the early thirteenth-century tradition of structuring narratives for iconographic purposes, as identified by Kemp,¹⁰ may have continued longer than he suggested and extended into the period of bar tracery.

A second theme that has been identified is that of virginity: there is a clear emphasis on the Virgin Mary across the scheme and on the way the female virgin saints of Katherine and Margaret are depicted, but it may also have influenced the ways in which all the saints were perceived. Here the impact is not generally created by the manipulation of the narratives; rather it is

¹⁰ Kemp, *Narratives*, 23.

achieved by the subtle use of motifs in the design of key panels. It is plausible that this aspect of the glazing extended into other elements of the sculpture and even the architecture of the chapter house, the entrance inscription, the organisation of parts of the ceiling, and in the possible emphasis in the carvings on those physical attributes which were most closely associated with purity. While the polygonal design would have been closely influenced by the chapter houses at Lincoln and Westminster, it is also possible that the roof held a further resonance of virginity, and that even the shape, assuming Crossley's multi-layering of meaning in architecture,¹¹ could have been associated with contemporary understandings of the Temple and the Virgin.

The iconography thus largely reflects the religious climate created (or confirmed and re-invigorated) by Lateran IV in 1215. The Church had demonstrated its aim for unity through its encouragement of the education of clerics and the reform of chapters.¹² Preachers and schoolmasters were to receive basic religious instruction and there was a new imperative for the inclusion of the laity by means of penance, one form of which concentrated on the misuse of the senses. The need for chastity was a particular focus; just as clerics were pressurised to conform to the Christian ideal¹³ so physical purity was stressed through the need for sexual abstinence.¹⁴ At the same time as normalising expectations within the Church as a means of demonstrating its cohesion, ranks were closed against outsiders: even those who were perceived as "friendly" were marked out by their allegiances and their clothing. A stronger sense of "otherness" was developed for those who were seen as hostile, linking

¹¹ Crossley, "Medieval architecture," 120.

¹² *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, no.7, 237.

¹³ *Ibid.*, no. 14, 242.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 31, 249. See also 230 and 231.

to the ever-present enthusiasm for crusades (if not so often the reality),¹⁵ while Jews were subjected to even greater controls over clothing and conversion,¹⁶ a corollary of the increasing focus on their role in the vilification of the Virgin. It is arguable that many of these themes were evidenced in the glazing and sculptural programme.

Even if the spiritual aims of Lateran IV were more or less lost by the late thirteenth century when “the church was far less united, hopeful, fervent and proof against encroaching secularism than it had been in 1215”,¹⁷ Walter de Gray’s reputation would have been closely associated with its aspirations. Indeed, “there is ample evidence that he [had been][...] well aware of the contents of the decrees and endeavoured to enforce them in his diocese”,¹⁸ and his memory would have been sustained in the Chapter that he had done so much to support and enhance by virtue of his dedication to achieving the canonisation of York’s only saint and his improvements to their governance of the Cathedral. The manipulation of such nostalgia could have been usefully employed in the later part of the century, particularly in a scenario where the political situation at national and Minster level was moving in an unpalatable direction for those of his followers who were also involved in the chapter house construction.

The issue of patronage cannot be conclusively settled, although this study has indicated that it is extremely unlikely there was a corporate Chapter decision to fund the construction from prescribed individual contributions from all the canons. It is more likely that an individual, associated with the Minster,

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 3, 233-35.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, nos. 67 and 68, 265-66.

¹⁷ Marion Gibbs and Jane Lang. *Bishops and Reform, 1215-1272, with special reference to the Lateran Council of 1215* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), 175-76.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 107.

such as Gray's nephew, William de Langton, was responsible for the inauguration of the scheme. It is plausible that, as a close relative, who had benefited from Gray's largesse and who, despite support from Chapter and the Crown while it was dominated by Simon de Montfort, was thwarted in his personal ambitions for the archbishopric, he may have sought to pay tribute to his uncle and thereby identify himself with his uncle's religious, organisational and construction achievements. Features from St-Urbain, resonant with sources of awkwardness encountered by his perceived rival, Archbishop Giffard, could also be included and were prominently externally visible. In addition, internally, the contribution of the Gray family to the Minster was emphasised, with the chapter house forming the culmination of related features across the thirteenth-century transepts.

Inevitably this was closely associated with Gray's support for the cult of St William and his role in William's canonisation, and was possibly linked to his concern for the need for chastity and purity in the Church, as encouraged by Lateran IV. The project was probably largely funded by the dean, with moral and political, if not financial support, from the majority of the residentiary canons in the Chapter from 1265 onwards, while the final stages may have been paid for by donations from the laity (such as Edmund of Lancaster and Amaury de Montfort) or contributions from sympathetic canons in the late 1280s and early 1290s.

As long as a figure such as Langton could influence what happened on the site, controlled the funding, and could influence any necessary decision-making process, construction could proceed as planned. Once any of these aspects was disrupted, progress would be less secure. Hence the completion of the project is uncertain. Again, from a process of elimination, it seems that the

most likely person to have managed the final stages was John de Craucumbe, although John le Romeyn almost certainly put his weight behind the project after the removal of Robert de Scarborough as dean. The possibility is that any change to CHs4 to incorporate Edmund may also have included the abbreviated narratives of John the Baptist, Nicholas, the saints associated with William de Langton and John de Craucumbe respectively, resulting in a reduction in the space allocated to Margaret. By the final stages, with the death or departure of key individuals and the passage of time dulling the importance of events that had taken place a quarter of a century previously, Chapter seems to have become a more harmonious group, clearly prepared to work more closely with their archbishop.

The silence in the records about the project can partly be explained by the fact that the surviving sources, at least from 1266 until 1279, were mainly created by Giffard who was probably hostile to the patron and any building activities in which he was engaged. There is no direct evidence linking Langton or Romeyn/Craucumbe with the glazing as such, but the fact that the building and its decoration shows evidence of being a unified design means that the circumstantial evidence that is available is relevant. This examination cannot be conclusive, but is in keeping with twentieth-century scholarly trends which favour a “gradual shift towards new approaches which grounded architecture increasingly within the contemporary circumstances, interests and experiences of the individuals who conceived, constructed and perceived Gothic architectural form”.¹⁹

¹⁹ James Hillson. “St Stephen’s Chapel, Westminster: Architecture, Decoration and Politics in the Reigns of Henry III and the three Edwards (1227-1363),” PhD Dissertation, University of York, 2015, Vol. 1, 1.

Many of the ideas and influences appear to have reached York from the Continent, especially so if future research shows that John le Romeyn, professor of theology at the University of Paris, had an even greater part in the final stages of the window design than he is credited here. This means that, while the building was clearly part of the emerging English tradition of polygonal chapter houses, those influencing the decoration had their eyes directed as much towards European exemplars as to those of their southern English counterparts.

The chapter house, and its glazing scheme, may thus be the product of personal frustration and family pride, but its iconographic scheme is comfortably placed in its late thirteenth-century intellectual context. As well as the influences of theology, Mariology and hagiography, the networks at the Minster also reflected contemporary tensions and allegiances associated with the baronial movement and these, too, played a part in building the social world in which the chapter house was conceived. Thus, as one of the most important construction projects of the period, its evolution was rooted in contemporary politics, be they Minster, national, international, ecclesiastical or papal. The length of time, however, taken in its creation and the changes in its construction and personnel mean that alterations were made to the original design, themselves reflecting on-going social interests. These factors created anomalies, which, along with the ravages of time, today disguise some of the original iconography.

C.3 *Future Research*

In terms of future investigation, in addition to a theological, liturgical and architectural assessment, it would be beneficial to conduct further research into the grisaille in the chapter house: not only its design and influences, but also its

production and the way it, together with the borders, have been employed in creating patterns across the chapter house windows and so reinforcing the integrity of the scheme. Such studies may throw light on the way the project was managed: the extent to which designs were centralised and how far individual workshops were given discretion over their own artistic input and choice of medallion shape. In addition, this work has been largely silent about the glazing in the vestibule, itself probably the result of a two-stage campaign. Further examination of this, and particularly the east/west arm containing CHn5 to CHn7 and CHs5, can only enhance understanding of the chapter house itself. The question of whether the abundance of foliage and fruit indicates the Virgin Mary through associations with the *Cantica Canticorum* needs further investigation, as does the influence of Aristotelian thought on the naturalistic plant depictions. Finally, Williamson's theories about the relationship between the carvings and the senses also needs further examination.

In an ideal world, all the windows would benefit from a reorganisation of the panels into their original positions, even though it may ultimately be decided that such a programme would be too drastic an intervention. An equally distant hope is that the copied panels of CH1 could be relocated in its original east window, although this would involve returning the grisaille from CH1 to CHs4 and, given the fact that the copied medallions are smaller than the larger narrative scenes now in CH1, it would involve reconstructing much of the grisaille for CHs4. Such an intervention would achieve an iconographic cohesion, despite what would undoubtedly be a less than satisfactory aesthetic contrast in the colour tones of CH1.

This thesis does not constitute a condition report on the glass, but some initial comments can be made about shorter-term treatment. Probably because

of the varying degrees to which the windows have been sheltered, the glass has deteriorated at different rates. The two windows facing south and largely protected by the bulk of the choir (CHs3 and CHs4) are the ones which contain mostly original glass. The two facing north and north-east (CHn2 and CHn3), exposed to weather conditions (and, possibly, Civil War collateral damage in the case of CHn3 and the tracery of CHn4), have suffered the most. There are no means of establishing whether CH1 was selected to be copied because of its condition or its significance in the chapter house glazing design.

Since the early twentieth century, all the glass has been protected with quarry secondary glazing, which will have contributed enormously to its survival, but doubtless will have created the type of condensation problems that have been identified in the course of the recent East Window conservation by York Glaziers Trust. It would assist the glass if the chapter house could ultimately be included in the Minster programme to provide windows with ventilated protective glazing, but the writer is conscious of more pressing Minster priorities elsewhere in this respect. At least some of the original glass would benefit from a similar conservation exercise to the East Window, but an assessment of the feasibility of conserving all the windows would need to be made at some point in the distant future. Cleaning the glass would clarify the reasons for its darkness: it is probable that the use of thick lead and cement to secure the glass within their lead calmes, employed in the re-leading exercise of 1929 to 1932, will emerge as the most likely causes.

The outcomes of this research, therefore, are: first, the only attempt to date to reconstruct all the windows in the chapter house, significant because of its rarity as a late thirteenth-century glazing scheme; second, suggestions for the ideas which influenced the design of the windows; and, third, a plausible

explanation of the patronage of the chapter house, a mystery which has eluded all previous commentators. Because of the unusual extent of the survival, or at least knowledge of, the remaining decorative features, it has been possible to consider the glazing scheme and patronage as part of its whole. An argument has been made about the iconography and evolution of the entire building, which, it is hoped, will be subjected to fuller examination in the scholarly community in the years to come.